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# Executive Summary

## Introduction and brief description of the project

The project, “Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change”, is expected to address climate change induced, impacts on the water sector in Sierra Leone. The project has a focus on capacity building for climate resilient decision-making in the water sector and pilot intervention on the ground at four locations with in the country. The two planned Outcomes of the project are as follows:

Outcome 1: Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector.

Outcome 2: Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks, focuses on pioneering innovations that particularly address the dry season water supply problems.

Table 1 below gives details of the geographic locations where interventions under the projects are being carried out.

**Table 1: Geographical Location of Project Interventions and the Ground Situation**

| **Urban / Rural** | **District** | **Locations of Pilots** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Urban Areas | Area 1: Freetown and Guma Valley Reservoir |  |
| Rural Areas | Area 2: Pujehun district (Southern Province) | Location 1: Bandajuma SowaLocation 2: Gbondapi areas |
| Rural Areas | Area 3: Kambia district (Northern Province) | Location 1: Mambolo ChiefdomLocation 2: Malambay |
| Rural Areas | Area 4: Kono district (Eastern Province) | Location 1: Koeyor ChiefdomLocation 2: Jaima Sewafe Chiefdom |

Total budget for the project is USD 13.090 million. The executing agency /implementation partner for the project is the Ministry of Water Resources, Sierra Leone. GEF implementing agency is the UNDP CO. With the project reaching mid term of its implementation a ‘Mid Term Review (MTR)’ of the project has been carried out. This is as per the standard practice for all UNDP-GEF projects. This report presents the findings of the MTR, summary of which is provided in the following paragraphs.

## Summary of main findings and ratings

The following Table 2 provides a summary of the ratings for:

a) Progress towards Results

b) Project Objectives

c) Implementation and Adaptive Management

d) Sustainability

**Table 2: Mid-term review ratings and achievements summary d out under the project in the e to be reviewed and revised.ures for the yields of differetn rrid out under the project in the e**

| **Main criteria** | **Rating[[1]](#footnote-2)** | **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **NA** | The project, is expected to address climate change induced, impacts on the water sector in Sierra Leone. Due to the impacts of climate change the availability of water (particularly during summer) is reduced.The project has a focus on capacity building for climate resilient decision-making in the water sector and pilot intervention on the ground at the four locations. The project aims to support infrastructure and capacity building both, in the urban setting (Freetown and Guma Valley Reservoir) and in the rural setting (Southern, Northern and Eastern regions). The idea of the project is to attract private sector investment for creation of climate resilient technology based infrastructure facilities for making the water available to the communities. This is to be achieved by creating conducive policy and regulations on one part, while on the other demonstrate the climate resilient technologies at pilot locations. Accordingly, the project is structured around two Outcomes. The first Outcome is focused on the policy and regulatory aspects and the second Outcome is focused on implementation of the pilots at the selected locations. Replication of the pilot projects is to be facilitated by dissemination of the results of the pilots by way of case studies etc. |
| **Progress towards results** |  |  The project objective is to “enhance the adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources”. The indicator provided in the results framework to monitor the progress and achievement of the project objective is “number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability’. Project design has provision to increase the capacity by way of training and other capacity building measures. The work plan for the year 2017 provided for the training of the officials of MWR. Accordingly, the training has been delivered by hiring a consultant.As can be seen from the discussion regarding different Outcomes in the following rows of this Table, the progress towards achievement of the targets for the indicators for project objective is not good. Also, the progress towards results for the two Outcomes of the project is not good. The project team is taking adaptive action (corrective measures to make the non-working pilot projects, work) to overcome the technical challenges coming on the way to achieve the results of Outcome 2. Once the results of the two Outcomes of the project are achieved, the Objectives of the project would also be achieved. |
| **Project Objective** | **MS** |
| **Outcome 1** | **MU** | This Outcome of the project is, “Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector”. Somehow different Outputs (for Outcome 1) and the activities provided in the project design does not support the statement of the Outcome. Also, the indicators for the Outcome 1 as provided in the results framework does not reflect the achievement of the Outcome. Although, there is some progress towards achievement of the target value of the indicators for Outcome 1, the progress towards achievement of results for Outcome 1 is not good. This is considering that for a number of Outputs for Outcome 1 (e.g. dialogues between parliamentarians, local council members, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector on the impacts of climate change on water supply; dialogues under the Sierra Leone Business Forum and WASH Donors Investment Platform; sharing of relevant experiences/lessons from community-oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices) are yet to be carried out.  |
| **Outcome 2** | **MS** | Outcome 2 of the project is, “Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks”. This is to be achieved by implementation of about 31 pilot projects for different technologies (Bore Well, Spring Box, Rainwater Harvesting) to make water available to the communities. For all the pilots / technologies used varies in terms of the source of water (bore well, spring box, rainwater harvesting), but all the pilots invariably involve water pumping to an overhead tank using solar pumps and gravity flow of water from the overhead tank to the taps. Establishment of 12 pilots (out of total 31 planned) has been completed. However, only 5 (out of 12 pilots completed) are working satisfactorily. There are problems, with the rest of the completed pilot projects. The problems include theft of solar panels / pumps, blowing of the solar panels, technical problems with the solar panels / submersible pumps, inadequate water in the bore wells. Work for establishment of other pilots is underway and is at different stages of completion. However, even for the pilots under construction there are visible technical issues and problems.In spite of all these problems with the pilot project, the performance against this Outcome of the project, in terms of the target value of the indicator (5000 additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services) is good. This is largely due to the lower set value of the target (5000/31 = about 160 persons per pilot project). |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** | **MU** | As per the provisions made in the project document, the project board / steering committee is responsible for making management decisions for the project. SC is supposed to play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. These provisions in the project design (as detailed out in the Project Document are not being followed. In actual practise the management of the project is not happening as planned. In this regard it is important to note some of the minutes of the project steering committee meetings as given below;* SC members requested that updates be provided on a monthly basis to them and not just at SC meetings
* that minutes of SC meetings be shared with them in advance of meetings
* the meeting suggested for SC members to be involved in monitoring of project interventions
* that SC members part-take in the review of AWPs
* All TORs prepared for consultancy should be sent to SC members for a review and approval.

The actual project implementation arrangements, are not in line with the provisions in the project design. For example, there are only a few members (from a couple of government departments) in the steering committee. UNDP is supposed to be represented in the SC as the senior supplier, representing the interests of the parties which provide funding (GEF in the present case). However, there is no participation by UNDP (expect the project co-ordinator, which is a project appointee) in the steering committee (expect for the first SC meeting held in 2015 and the SC meeting in 2017). The project was to coordinate closely with public, private and community based stakeholders, however, this is not happening in actual practise. Except with the MWR and district level WASH engineers (from MWR) and the communities where the pilots are being implemented, there is no involvement of other stakeholders.The work planning is carried out on an annual basis. The work plans are prepared based on the outputs (for the two outcomes of the project) and the corresponding set of indicative activities mentioned in the project document. The project document has provided a set of ‘Projected Outputs’ along with the corresponding set of activities for each of the two Outcomes of the project. However, the project design has failed to carry these Outputs (and the corresponding activities) to the results framework for the project. The indicators have been put at the Outcome level and do not necessarily reflect the Outputs (and the corresponding activities) mentioned in the ‘Project Document’. Due to this the project is in a situation where the work planning is being done as per the provisions made in different outputs of the project and the monitoring of the progress is being done as per the projected Outcomes (and the corresponding set of indicators) as in the results framework, in spite of the fact that the indictors in the results framework are not in line with the ‘projected outputs’ of the project. Formal inception of the project happened in November 2015. As per the standard practice for all UNDP implemented projects, Project Implementation Reports (PIR) were required to be prepared for every year. The PIRs for the years 2016 and 2017 (30th June 2017 to 1st July 2017) were prepared. Draft PIR for the year 2018 was also made available during MTR. As there was not much progress in the year 2015, the PIR for 2015 was not prepared. In accordance with the provisions made in the project document, UNDP CO and the regional office makes visits to some of the pilot project sites to assess first hand project progress. The project has not been able to use the results framework of the project and the work plans as management tools, firstly due to the problems with the results framework itself and secondly because not much progress has been made towards actual implementation of the project. Communication is one of the aspects where the project is clearly lacking. The project design has failed to provide for any communication, outreach and dissemination activity as a part of the project.  |
| **Sustainability** | **ML** | There are a number of risks to the achievement of the project results. Such risks include lack of capacity of local and national institutions. The project has already suffered due to some of these risks. However, most of these risks are manageable and the project team has taken steps to mitigate the risks. Wherever the pilot interventions have been carried out in the communities and the pilot projects are working successfully, WASH committees has been formed amongst the community members to take care of the operations and maintenance of the water infrastructure facilities created. As confirmed by the stakeholders during the visits to the pilot projects, the WASH committee collects a minor user charge from the members of the community for using the water facilities, to create a fund to take care of the regular repair and maintenance requirements of the water facilities. The project team may facilitate continuation of the collection of user charges and also ensure implementation of such a practice in all the pilot projects. In cases of break downs requiring major repairs the funds are required to be made available by the MWR through the WASH engineers at the district level. Wherever, adaptive actions (pilot projects to make water available to the communities) have been implemented on the ground, they are expected to create a positive impact not only in terms of availability of water but also in terms of co-benefits like improved health (no water based diseases), savings of time, general hygiene. Due to these reasons there is high level of ownership amongst the communities of the newly created water facilities. There are no socio economic issues associated with the project. As such there is no institutional and governance risk to sustainability of the project results (in terms of the benefits of the pilot projects which has been implemented with positive results). However, at an aggregate level the institutional framework within the country for implementation of climate change adaptive actions and sustaining them is weak. There are practically no negative environmental impacts of the project, other than the minor possibility and impacts due to over exploitation of the ground water resources at some of the locations.  |

## Conclusions

Subsequent to the singing of project document, substantial delays in the start of the project implementation were caused by the protracted impacts of the Ebola crisis. The project team in consultation with the Steering Committee, adjusted the annual work plans by linking the project to ongoing interventions implemented by other partners as part of the Presidential Priorities for Post-Ebola Recovery to maximize delivery and impact of the project.

At the time of MTR, the project is not on track. The reasons include, problems with the results framework of the project and lack of human resources within the PMU, which oversees the implementation of the project. In order to ensure achievement of the results of the projects, a number of recommendations are being made, which are detailed below.

## Recommendations

**Table 3: Recommendations**

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **Description** | **Responsible Party** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Implement decision of Steering Committee to engage a M&E expert to revise and strengthen the results framework. | As was noted by the project team in the first PIR (PIR for 2016) the log-frame of the project is not able to adequately capture cumulative progress towards reaching the intended objective and outcomes of the project. For instance, the target for the indicator on mainstreaming of adaptation concerns within at least the Guma Reservoir management process under Outcome 1 is limited to the establishment of a climate change resilience plan. As the presence of a plan does not necessarily result in mainstreaming, this target needs to be revised. This issue got discussed during the Project Steering Committee meeting in April 2016 with a decision was taken, that a M&E expert be engaged to revise and strengthen the results framework. Somehow, this decision could not be implemented as yet. It is recommended that this decision of the Steering Committee be implemented and a M&E expert be hired to have a re-look at the result framework, the indicators and the targets. It may be noted that it is possible to make indicator level changes (as well as introduce new indictors) in the Outcomes, with the approval of RTA. However, procedurally it is not possible to change the project objectives and the Outcomes of the projects during the implementation of the project. | UNDP Project Team,UNDP CO,UNDP RTA |
| 2 | Facilitate a consultancy aimed at obtaining insights in the current investment climate, recommend solutions for increased investment and present these to relevant stakeholders | The PIR 2016 of the project pointed out that insufficient investment by the private sector could pose a risk for the longer-term sustainability of the project. The PIR also pointed out that the incentives of the private sector to invest in climate smart technologies will not only depend on increased awareness among key stakeholders of climate risks, but also on Government’s ability to adequately address barriers that may hamper private sector investment (e.g. tax-related issues). The project presently does not adequately address this issue. The PIR 2016 of the project suggested that to mitigate this sustainability risk, the project should facilitate a consultancy aimed at obtaining insights in the current investment climate, recommend solutions for increased investment and present these to relevant stakeholders.” It is recommended that this suggestion contained in PIR 2016 be implemented. | UNDP Project Team |
| 3 | Strengthen capacity of PMU and Steering Committee | The reasons for not good results of the project at the MTR, includes lack of institutional capacity, inadequate staffing of the project implementation team. For management of the project, the project design (as per project document) has provided for a project manager and a ‘project Implementation Unit’(comprising of a project coordinator, technical advisor, M&E expert and volunteers). Against this in actual practice the project is being managed by a lone project coordinator. It is recommended that a project manager is taken on board, who will focus on the work planning, monitoring and ensure timely implementation of different activities. One of the other recommendations is to broad base the structure of the Steering Committee by including members from the local government, NGOs, academic institutions, donor agencies etc. Considering that appointment of the resources may be a time consuming process, the option of bringing on board the UNVs (as provided in the project document) may be explored. | UNDP CO |
| 4 | Customise the design of the pilot project based on the need (population) of the communities | The project design has provided for more or less a uniform design of the water system (borehole size, size of solar panels, pump capacity etc.) for all the locations, accept for the size of the tank, the capacity of the tank depends on the yield of the source as for example for bore holes 20,000 litres tanks are provided. Due to this reason, at some of the locations, where the number of people being served is high, there is a possibility that the water system provided underserves the requirements. There should be some flexibility to allow for a bit of customization in the design to meet the site specific requirements. | UNDP CO |
| 5 | Wherever feasible provide additional facilities like lighting points and community television using the spare capacity of the solar panels and a small storage battery | At some of the pilot locations there is a possibility of availability of spare capacity of solar panels. This may be examined on a case to case basis and wherever feasible, a couple of lighting points and a community television may be provided. A couple of lighting points in the community centre will enable the children to study at night. This will also help the community members to charge their mobile phones. Presently, the community members travel long distances and also pay for getting the mobile phones charged. | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |
| 6 | Facilitate establishment of short term curriculum to ensure availability of trained human resources | From sustainability point of view, it is important to have availability of skilled and trained resources to carry out maintenance and repair of the solar pumping system. The project may facilitate establishment of a short duration curriculum at one of the technical training institutes / university to impart training on operation, repairs and maintenance of the solar water pumping systems. | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |
| 7 | Carry out technical due diligence to identify technical issues and suggest corrective measures at the pilot projects | During the mission it was felt, that at the pilots for making the water available to the communities, there are technical issues due to which the operational efficiency of the systems will get hampered. It is recommended that an independent consultant (or a team of consultants) may be appointed to carryout technical due diligence to identify the technical issues and suggest corrective measures. The issues which may be examined by the consultant (apart for other issues) may include the following:* Orientation of the solar panels (angle and direction and shading from the surrounding trees/ structures)
* Depth of the bore hole (may be restricted to as recorded at the time of drilling of the hole)
* Adequacy of the control system provided for the operation of the pumping system (provision of the start-up capacitor of adequate rating etc.)
* Rated capacity of the submersible pump (including motor) and the solar panels
* Adequacy of the civil structure (construction as per approved drawings, angle of the roof of the control room etc.)
* Layout of the piping network for supplying the water
 | Project Implementation Team |
| 8 | Vendors supplying the water system be made responsible for maintaining the system for initial two years | In case of the problems with the systems, it would not be possible for the communities to get the systems repaired, firstly due to the cost involved and secondly due to lack of availability of the skilled human resources. It is recommended that the vendor responsible for the supply and operationalization of the water system be made responsible for maintaining the system for two years. This can be achieved either by way of a separate maintenance contract or by way of provisions in the original contract of the vendor. | UNDP Project Team |
| 9 | Robust installation of equipment | Review of installation design of the equipment to make it more robust, so that the panels / water tanks do not get blown away and also the theft of the solar panel and the pump system is prevented. This can for example, be achieved by welding the frame of the solar panel to the structure (provided to support the solar panels). For preventing the blowing off of the solar panels / water tanks the space below the solar panels may be covered by brick work. | Project Implementation Team |
| 10 | Carry out the feasibility study to examine the replication using private sector funding | The project has successfully demonstrated the use of technology of solar PV pumping for meeting the water requirements. The community members where, the pilots were carried out are contributing money on a monthly basis to take care of any possible need of expenses to carry out repair and maintenance of the system. It is considered that it may be possible to replicate the interventions by involving either private sector investment or by forming the community groups, which borrow the funds from commercial banks. It is recommended that proper feasibility study be carried out to examine the replication of the business model wherein the ‘Capital Cost’ is provided by the private sector / commercial bank as loan and the revenues comes from a monthly subscription. | Project Implementation Team |
| 11 | Support creation of regulations and regulatory mechanism to have private sector investment in the water sector | In order to ensure smooth operations with the private sector investment in the water sector, it would be necessary to have the regulations (including a regulatory mechanism to determine the charges which can be collected from the households for the water supplied). The project may support development of the regulations (and the mechanism) for getting the private sector investment to implement solar pumping systems for water needs of the communities. | Project Implementation Team, Ministry of Water Resources |
| 12 | Promote private sector investment in the water sector | The project is weak in terms of private sector participation and attracting investment by the private sector. Other than a mention in the project title and at a number of other places in the ‘Project Document’, there is hardly any provision to take the private sector on board. It is recommended that the project include the activities to attract private sector investment in the water sector. | Project Implementation Team |
| 13 | Strengthen the monitoring and reporting activities | The work planning, monitoring and reporting part of the project implementation has gaps and needs to be strengthened. PIR was made available only for the year 2017. It is recommended that the requirements of regular monitoring of the project be complied with | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |

# Introduction

## Purpose of the Mid Term Review and Objectives

With the project ‘**Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change in Sierra Leone’** reaching midterm of its implementation, it is required that a ‘Mid Term Review (MTR)’ of the project be carried out. This is as per the standard practice for all UNDP-GEF projects. The target audience for the Mid Term Review are the funding agencies, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP CO at Sierra Leone, UNDP at regional and HQ levels, and the UNDP Evaluation Office.

The broader defined objective of MTR was to assess progress towards achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The review was also expected to provide early signs of project success or failure to facilitate a corrective action mid-way of the project to ensure positive results. The Mid Term Review was carried out by a team of consultants comprising of an International Consultant (Mr. Dinesh Aggarwal, India) and a National Consultants (Mr. Martin K. Gbonda, Sierra Leone). The MTR has been carried out in close cooperation with the project team and UNDP Sierra Leone CO. The MTR has been carried out in compliance with the monitoring and evaluation plan as elaborated in the project document, and in line with GEF funded UNDP implemented projects requirements.

## Scope and methodology

The design of the MTR was based on the requirements set out in the ToR prepared by the UNDP CO (please see **Annex A**). Before undertaking the MTR, an ‘Inception Report’ was presented which included the proposed tasks, activities and deliverables, as well as a table of main review questions that need to be answered to determine and assess project results, and to identify where the information is expected to come from (e.g. documents, interviews and field visits). The review efforts have been focused on the following four categories of project progress;

* Project strategy
* Progress towards results
* Project implementation and adaptive management
* Sustainability

The table of mid-term review criteria and questions is presented in **Annex B**.

Sources of data and data collection

Data have been collected through an extensive desk review of all relevant documents, meetings and interviews with key stakeholders and site visits to answer the MTR review questions. The sources of data were carefully identified, in order to obtain useful evidence-based information that is credible and reliable.

* A desk review of the documents was carried out. It is to be noted that the TOR has specified the List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR team. Some of the documents were made available during the mission to Sierra Leone and after the mission. A desk review of the following documents was carried out (see Annex C).
	+ Progress reports and project documents; such as the UNDP Project Document (ProDoc). Project Inception Report
	+ Project Monitoring documents, namely the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs); Minutes of the Project Board meetings, Work Plans.
	+ Reports by some of the consultants

Some of the documents required to be reviewed, could not be made available during the MTR. Some of the notable documents which could not be made available includes, GEF tracking tool at CEO endorsement and at MTR, Audit reports, CDRs (CDRs could be made available only for Q1, Q4 of 2016 and for Q2 of 2017), documents for extension of project timelines, UNDP country programme document, communication / dissemination / outreach products.

* Mission: Prior to the mission to Sierra Leone, stakeholders were contacted to schedule meetings and site visits in an optimum way in order to meet maximum number of relevant stakeholders. During the mission, interviews were held with the Project Team, UNDP CO, UNDP RTA, and a wide range of identified stakeholders, beneficiaries and key informants which included steering committee members, officials in the three districts where pilots has been implemented, community groups, officials related to water supply in Freetown, consultants. The mission was carried out during the period 23 July 2018 to 03 August 2018, and included visits to the sites of the pilots. The mission schedule and list of persons interviewed is given in Annex D.

The review of documents provided the basic facts and information for developing a first draft mid-term review (MTR) report, while the mission was needed to verify the basic facts, obtain missing data and to learn the opinions of respondents to help interpret the facts. The individual interviews with key informants were based on open discussion to allow respondents to express what they felt were the main issues, followed by questions that are more specific on the issues mentioned. The list of mid-term review questions of Annex B was used as a checklist to raise relevant questions and issues during the interviews that correspond to the level and type of involvement of the interviewee or the organisation visited.

Regarding the data analysis and methods for analysis, the documents listed in **Annex C** were reviewed and analysed. The notes of the interviews with key informants were used to verify facts and information presented in reports and documents and helped to formulate the conclusions and recommendations.

This review has been conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ (see **Annex G and Annex H**).

## Limitations of MTR

One of the limitations, of the MTR is that many of the required documents for MTR could not be made available and it was one of the limitations of this MTR. Also as mentioned before some of the documents to be reviewed could not be made available during the MTR.

The duration of the mission to Sierra Leone (including the sites of the pilot project) was ten working days. A ten working day mission has the limitation of potentially giving a snapshot impression only. Nonetheless, the mid-term reviewers feel that the mix of data collection and analysis tools have yielded viable answers to the review questions within the limits of available time and budget resources

## Structure of the mid-term review report

The review has been undertaken in accordance with the UNDP guidelines for mid-term reviews (UNDP, 2014)[[2]](#footnote-3) as well as general criteria of UNDP evaluations. This report is structured according to the table of contents that is given in Annex B of the MTR guidelines (UNDP, 2014), and the Terms of Reference for the MTR issued by UNDP Sierra Leone Country Office.

An Executive Summary has been provided at the beginning of the report. Chapter 1 provides an Introduction to the project and Chapter 2 covers the Project Description and background context. Due to the size of the text, the main findings are reported in four separate chapters: project strategy in Chapter 3, progress towards results in Chapter 4, project implementation in Chapter 5 and sustainability in Chapter 6. The Conclusions and Recommendations are stated in Chapter 7, and a number of key documents / information are included in the Annexes.

For easy and ready reference, Annex B shows where the main review criteria and questions of the MTR can be located in different sections of the report.

# Project description and Context

## Climate Change Impacts and Resilience in Sierra Leone[[3]](#footnote-4)

In Sierra Leone, the seasonal rainfall varies considerably on inter-annual and inter-decadal timescales, due in part to variations in the movements and intensity of the Inter-Tropical Conversion Zone (ITCZ), and also to variations in timing and intensity of the West African Monsoon. The most well documented cause of these variations is the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO). El Niño events are associated with drier conditions in West Africa. Some of the observed impacts of climate chance in Sierra Leone are as follows:

**Temperature**

* Annually, projections indicate that ‘hot’ days have increased by 38 – and additional 10.3% of nights – between 1960 and 2003.
* Annually, projections indicate that ‘hot’ days will occur on 26-63% of days by the 2060s, and 37-84% of days by the 2090s.
* Nights that are considered hot for the annual climate of 1970-99 are projected to occur on 41-79% of nights by the 2060s and 54-92% of nights by the 2090s.

**Precipitation**

* Projections of mean annual rainfall averaged over the country from different models in the ensemble project show a wide range of changes in precipitation for Sierra Leone, but tend towards overall increases. Rainfall in the period July-September is projected to change by -27 to +29% by the 2090s, and -19 to +33% in the period October-December.
* The proportion of total annual rainfall that falls in heavy events is projected to increase. Seasonally, this varies between tendencies to decrease in January-March and to increases in July-September and October-December.

**Regional Climate Change**

* Model simulation of precipitation changes for the Sahelian and Guinea Coast regions of Africa are strongly divergent and most models fail to reproduce realistic inter-annual and inter-decadal rainfall variability in the Sahel in twentieth century simulations. There is insufficient understanding of the processes causing tropical rainfall to allow a prediction of the direction of change with any certainty. IPCC identifies this as an area requiring future research to understand the variety of model responses in this region.
* Model simulation shows wide divergence in projected changes in the amplitude of future El Niño events as the West African climate can be strongly influenced by ENSO, thus contributing to uncertainty in climate projections for this region.

**The Vulnerability of Sierra Leone’s water sector**

In Sierra Leone, most of the communities rely on surface water, which has implications in terms of water-borne diseases. Further, a large proportion of the population has no access to clean water. It is projected that this will be further exacerbated due to climate change, especially during prolonged dry spells. Major water uses include domestic (drinking, cooking, hygiene), agriculture (irrigation), industrial (beer, spirits, soft drink, cooling and waste disposal), and energy production (hydro-electrical power production). Migration of the rural population to the capital, Freetown, during the civil conflict has also increased pressure on the water demand.

Shifting rainfall has created water supply problems resulting decreased supply to consumers, reduced stream flow of rivers and streams and also health related problems associated with the outbreak of water borne disease. For example, following the drop in rainfall since 1970s, the flows of major rivers has fallen significantly. The stream flow to the Manu River fell by 30% between 1971 and 1989[[4]](#footnote-5).

Long dry spells in north and western areas of the country have already disrupted water supply resulting in negative health impacts. As water resources become scarce and competition for water increases, polluted water may be used for drinking and bathing, and this spreads infectious diseases such as typhoid, cholera and gastroenteritis. These diseases particularly affect the urban poor. Moreover, decreased availability of water for irrigation food production heightens the risk of poor nutrition and increased susceptibility to disease.

The water sector is also already limited in terms of capacity and investment opportunity (especially in the forms of tariffs). The institutional and individual capacity for climate change adaptation is extremely low, leaving this sector particularly vulnerable. Because virtually all other sectors depend on an effective supply of water, the high vulnerability of the water sector has a “domino” effect on the increasing vulnerability of other sectors, e.g. agriculture, mining, health. It also has major implications on other important aspects, like food security. As a whole it can seriously undermine the Millennium Development Goals, the improvement of livelihoods.

The fact that 90% of Freetown’s population depends on a single source of water (Guma Valley reservoir), puts immense pressure on the source. The Guma Valley Water Company, the company responsible for water provision, has a severely weak monitoring system in place and a virtually non-existing risk management or contingency plan i.e. related to climate risks. In 2006, the water level fell way below the intake level causing a major water shortage in the city. On the other hand, during intense rainy seasons, the reservoir is at full capacity – leaving it highly vulnerable to overflow. Either one of these situations causes immense vulnerability to the city’s inhabitants, and with no Early Warning System, or effective monitoring in place, elevates the vulnerability.

## UNDP programme in Sierra Leone

In Sierra Leone, UNDP has been working in partnership with the Government guided by the national Agenda for Prosperity (2013-2018). UNDP Sierra Leone supports Government in three particular areas: inclusive growth and sustainability; effective and inclusive democratic governance; environment and energy.

In the area of ‘Inclusive Growth and Sustainability’, UNDP works with the people of Sierra Leone to reduce poverty and marginalisation - with particular regard to the most vulnerable and excluded - in ways that are economically, socially and environmentally sustainable.

In the area of Effective and Inclusive Democratic Governance, UNDP supports the people of Sierra Leone in creating an enabling environment for stability, rule of law and good governance. This includes strengthened service delivery, legal and judicial systems, and democratic institutions and processes.

Environment and Energy portfolio of UNDP CO in Sierra Leon, supports the Government’s efforts towards enhanced institutional and community capacities for sustained environmental management and Disaster Risk Reduction. UNDP CO works with key stakeholders to build on existing capacity and ongoing initiatives to address the issues of sustainable land management, renewable energy and natural resource management. As deforestation has significantly accelerated the negative impacts of climate change in Sierra Leone, UNDP is also focusing on the link between climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction. The programme aims to effect development change through two strategic programmatic areas:

* Strengthening mechanisms and frameworks that promote social and environmental sustainability in natural resource management.
* Enhancing capacity for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management at the national, district and community level.

UNDP support includes activities that focus on enhancing the legislative enabling environment (e.g. improving legislative frameworks, policy reviews, development of strategies and action plans), as well as at enhancing implementation capacities at national, district and community levels.

## Problems the projects seek to address

Sierra Leone is endowed with abundant water resources in the form of seven major rivers, yet only 34% of the population has access to safe drinking water (up to 80% of the rural population has no access). The NAPA states that the water supply in Sierra Leone (Freetown and inland settlements) requires urgent attention. This sector is also depicted as one of the most vulnerable to climate change. Climate change has the potential to severely disrupt the water regimes, possibly leading to floods, droughts, changes in the amount of runoff as well as changes in ground water levels.

Another priority project of the NAPA includes improving the existing supply of water in Sierra Leone. The third priority project related to water includes the promotion of rainwater harvesting techniques to improve access to water at household and community level.

The project addresses the climate change induced water related problems in Sierra Leone in general and in Freetown and the three districts (where the pilot projects are being implemented) in particular. The outcomes of the project are expected to provide the impetus for government and other stakeholders to intensify efforts geared towards adapting successfully to climate change induced impacts on the water sector in the country.

## Short description of the project (objectives, project participant)

The project, “Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change”, is expected to address climate change induced impacts on the water sector in Sierra Leone. Due to the impacts of climate change the availability of water (particularly during summer) is reduced.

The project has an overall focus on capacity building for climate resilient decision-making in the water sector and pilot intervention on the ground at the four locations. The project aims to support infrastructure and capacity building both, in the urban setting (Freetown and Guma Valley Reservoir) and in the rural setting (Southern, Northern and Eastern regions). In the rural settings, the intervention districts are Puhejun, Kambia and Kono. Two sites and communities have been identified per district for the pilots.

Table 4 provides the details (as per project document) of objectives and outcomes of the project. Also given in the Table are the indicators to determine the achievement of the results along with the target values for the indicators.

**Table 4: Project Results Framework (as per Project Document)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** |
| **Project Objective:** Enhance the adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources.  | Indicator 2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. | * Technocrats from MWR and EPA in Freetown, but particularly regional technical staffs have extremely limited opportunity for professional updating, and usually find it difficult to address newly emerging technical issues and practices into their ongoing work.
* One of the major limitations is the lack of capacity to deal with climate risks and understandings of managing these risks in the water sector.
 | * At least capacities of 2 line ministries and 2 Districts Council to mainstream adaptation concerns within water policies and local development plans are strengthened
* Capacities of two research /training centre to deliver relevant trainings on climate change issues are strengthened
 |
| **Outcome 1:** Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector. | Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation concerns and actions mainstreamed within at least the Guma Reservoir Management process | * The overall risk that climate change may pose on the sustainability of water supply to the capital not well integrated into Guma Reservoir management
 | * CC resilience plan for Guma reservoir established
 |
| Indicator 2.2.1: Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. | * Key decision-makers who are supposed to lead implementation of the policy have limited knowledge of climate change impacts or adaptation responses.
* Information, including inventory and mapping, is inadequate and staffs from MWR have limited expertise to internalize climate changes into existing local development plan
* Low interplay between public and private sector on adaptation strategies investment
* Existing coping strategies and adaptation action not documented at all, including for the water sector.
 | * 15% of staff from targeted institutions aware of predicted impacts of climate change and appropriate responses
* 60% of targeted stakeholders have access to relevant disseminated adaption experiences from the project
 |
| **Outcome 2:** Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Puhejun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks | Indicator 1.2.3: Number of additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services given existing and projected climate change | * Type and level: 0 (aside already existing local coping mechanism)
 | * 5.000 at intervention sites in Freetown and three districts
 |

Different Outcomes and the Objectives of the project are to be achieved by carrying out specific set of activities for each of the Outcome. Table 5 provides details of the outputs and activities which are to be carried out against each of the Outcomes of the project.

**Table 5: Indicative activities per Output for Different Outcomes**

| **Component / Outcome / Output** | **Suggested Activities** |
| --- | --- |
| **COMPONENT 1: Integrating climate change considerations into water policies****OUTCOME 1: Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector** |  |
| **Output 1.a:** More than 50 officers from the Ministry of Water Resources, esp. the Water Policy Planning Coordinating Unit (WPPCU), the Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Districts leaders provided with relevant climate risks management guidelines/tools and trained on how the results of the climate risk/vulnerability assessments should be used to adjust regulations and policies governing the water sector at national (NWSP, RWSS) and local level (Districts development plans) | 1.a.1 Undertake a Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity assessment of MWR-EPA and District staffs and profile their professional updating needs. This include also the assessment of required tools for climate risks management including vulnerability maps, climate scenarios, extreme event forecasts, indicators of vulnerability and monitoring systems.1.a.2 Based on the assessment, develop climate risks tools and learning programme (i.e. including modules on generating, analysing, and integrating climate risk information). The Canter for International Earth Science Information Networks (CIESIN) based at the Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Met Department will support the production of climate risk/vulnerability assessments for decision making;1.a.3 Conduct at least four trainings at the Lakka Centre or other relevant learning centres;1.a.4 Set up and test an on-the-job learning approach to ensure that learning objectives are directly applied to daily responsibilities; 1.a.5 Update the Water Point and Groundwater mapping tools to adapt them to new aspects of climate change developments; 1.a.6 Establish participatory roadmap to guide the adjustment of regulations and policies governing the water sector for the inclusion and the provision of climate smart finance;1.a.7 Monitor learning impacts and applications.  |
| **Output 1.b:** Climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for the Guma Reservoir | 1.b.1 Undertake a Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity assessment of Guma reservoir and prepare TOR for the selection of consultant;1.b.2 Commission a climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for the Guma Reservoir based on large consultation process engaging GVWC, Met Department and communities surrounding the reservoir; 1.b.3 Train GVWC staff to run the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan;1.b.4 Establish processes for review, reassessment and evaluation of the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan. |
| **Output 1.c:** Regular dialogues established between parliamentarians, local council members, traditional authorities, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector (WASH committees) on the impacts of climate change on water supply in Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts | 1.c.1 Conduct Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) for relevant national and district level stakeholders Freetown, Kambia, Kono and Pujehun (parliamentarians, local council members, traditional authorities, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector (WASH committees) to determine existing capacities and training needs on longer-term climatic and environmental changes. 1.c.2 Design and conduct a community awareness campaign on climate change risks using culturally appropriate tools and aimed at all genders, including information packs that comprise examples of community-based adaptation measures in the water sector. Key lessons learnt from the various project activities (especially the demonstrations under component 2) will be distilled and integrate them into the agenda of the dialogues, as relevant for the target groups;1.c.3 Train at least 10 WASH committees’ representatives to assess climate change issues, community-based adaptation planning, and household-level risk reduction interventions. Climate risks management and training tools developed under Output 1.a will be adapted to WASH committees needs;1.c.4 Create a sustainable communications platform in which a dialogue can ensure and further friendly communications can take place to inform a bottom-up decision-making process. 1.c.5 Monitor the effectiveness of awareness programs and improve quality of local capacity building efforts based on monitoring results  |
| **Output 1.d:** At least two dialogues under the Sierra Leone Business Forum and WASH Donors Investment Platform initiated on managing climate change risks on water provision and usage | 1.d.1 Undertake strategic stakeholder analysis and target group specific information and communication needs and strategic responses (e.g. communication plans) as they relate to climate change resilience in the water sector. This could include also the identification of target group’s engagements in addressing climate change risks and establishing relevant adaptation strategies; 1.d.2 Conduct two dialogues on the through (i) selected priorities;1.d.3 Create and make functional water engineers platform to support designing of resilient water supply systems;1.d.4 Develop a functional knowledge management system that documents such policy level dialogues to ensure that the outcomes find their way into national development planning and negotiation with investment partners.  |
| **Output 1.e**: Relevant experiences/lessons from community oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices (including gender differentiated issues) identified, and widely shared/disseminated to facilitate replication in other vulnerable areas | 1.e.1 Develop a catalogue of best practices of community oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices for wider dissemination. 1.e.2 Add onto the catalogue, as part of the project evaluation, any addition lessons learnt and best practices based on the successes of the project sites. 1.e.3 Develop participatory video and community radio shows on successful community-based adaptation approaches;1.e.4 Organise at least two exposure visits to bring decision-makers and planners at the national, districts and chiefdom levels and WASH Donors investments platform to demonstrate experience successfully adaptation measures;1.e.5 Inject such learning into policy level components of outcome 1, as well as through learning and training outputs under outcome 2. 1.e.6 Develop and implement knowledge sharing and management mechanism related to this project and climate change management.  |
| **COMPONENT 2: Strengthening the resilience of water supply systems to anticipated climate change risks****OUTCOME 2:** Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Puhejun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks |  |
| **Output 2.a:** Pilot demonstrations of innovative climate resilient rainwater collection in at least 3 public building with reservoirs established to support the bottleneck of drink water supply in the dry season | 2.a.1 Conduct relevant assessments to determine feasibility, cost-effectiveness and due-diligence with respect to environmental and other standards; 2.a.2 Commission design of innovation technologies and infrastructure 2.a.3 Construct the rooftop rainwater collection with reservoirs in MRW, Murray Town Hospital and EFA buildings. The system will consist to three basic elements: (i) a collection area which is the effective roof area; (ii) a conveyance system usually consists of gutters or pipes that deliver rainwater falling on the rooftop to cisterns or other storage vessels; (iii) and a storage tank or cistern.2.a.4 Establish procedures of maintenance including: (i) the procedure for eliminating the "foul flush" after a long dry spell; (ii) the periodical cleaning of the tank; (iii) the cover of the rainfall collection surfaces to reduce the likelihood of frogs, lizards, mosquitoes, and other pests using the cistern as a breeding ground; and (iv) the chlorination of the cisterns or storage tanks.2.a.5 Evaluate and map potential sites for replication in large communities in Freetown  |
| **Output 2.b:** Spring water improvement designed, tested and demonstrated in high density area in Freetown (benefiting at least 200 households) | 2.b.1 Commission design of innovation technologies and infrastructure and undertake independent feasibility assessment; identify/confirm intervention sites;2.b.2 Build and implement innovation demonstrations on spring boxes improvement (at least 5 demo sites);2.b.3 Design and run community training programmes for relevant communities;2.b.4 Document lessons learnt from this output and inject learning into policy debates and development (component 1).  |
| **Output 2.c:** Sustainable community reservoirs with 9 stand alone roof-top rainwater harvesting systems (in 3 hospitals and 6 schools), as well as 5 resilient gravity fed water distribution systems designed and pioneered in Kono, Kambia and Pujehun | 2.c.1 Conduct relevant assessments to determine feasibility, cost-effectiveness and due-diligence with respect to environmental and other standards; 2.c.2 Construct the sustainable community reservoirs with stand alone roof-top rainwater harvesting systems, as well as gravity fed water distribution mechanisms;2.c.3 Establish and train WASH management committees of at least 5 members, participation of women/girls ensured, to maintain community reservoirs;  |
| **Output 2.d:** At least 100 households provided with water storage and treatment systems for drinking water usage in times of prolonged dry-spells and drought in Kono, Kambia and Pujehun | 2.d.1 Assess the current condition of water storage and distribution mechanisms and investigate solutions (e.g. community systems pioneered by the Welthungerhilfe) and make recommendations on the up-scaling of the most appropriate water storage and distribution at community level.2.d.2 Provide water storage and treatment systems to at least 100 households; 2.d.3 Set-up WASH committees and training programme to support self-promotion of entrepreneurs who would be able to disseminate the climate resilient community water rainwater harvesting, supply and storage infrastructure. 2.d.4 Track successes and failures and adjust support programme to communities accordingly and in an adaptive manner to ensure long-term sustainability of the investments and climate resilience impacts.  |

## Project Implementation Arrangement

Project is being implemented by the UNDP under its National Execution (NEX) Modality. The executing agency in Sierra Leone is Ministry of Water Resources (MWR). Figure 1 below provides the details of the provisions made in the project document for implementation of the project.

**Project Manager**

MWR – Project coordinator

**Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiary:**

Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

**Executive:**

MWR

**Senior Supplier:**

UNDP

**Project Assurance**

UNDP

**Project Steering Committee** (EPA)

**Project Implementation Unit**

1 Project Coordinator

1 Chief Technical Advisor (Part time)

1 M&E expert

1 UNV covering 2 Districts

1 Finance & Admin staff

1 Driver

**Figure 1: Project Implementation Structure (Source: Project Document)**

As per the provisions made in the project document, the roles and responsibilities of the major actors were as follows;

* **Project Board:** Responsible for making management decisions for the project in particular when guidance is required by the Project Manager. The Project Board plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project or negotiates a solution to any problems with external bodies. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Manager and any delegation of its Project Assurance responsibilities. Based on the approved Annual Work Plan, the Project Board can also consider and approve the quarterly plans (if applicable) and also approve any essential deviations from the original plans. Potential members of the Project Board were to be reviewed and recommended for approval during the PAC meeting. Representatives of other stakeholders can be included in the Board as appropriate. The Board contains three distinct roles, including: (1) **An Executive**: the individual representing the project ownership to chair the group, which will be the MWR. (2) The **Senior Supplier**: individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding for specific cost sharing projects and/or technical expertise to the project. The Senior Supplier’s primary function within the Board is to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. In the case of this project this will be UNDP. (3) The **Senior Beneficiary**: individual or group of individuals representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Beneficiary’s primary function within the Board is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. This is the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, on behalf of the Government of Sierra Leone.
* **Project Assurance** role supports the Project Board Executive by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. The Project Manager and Project Assurance roles should never be held by the same individual for the same project. UNDP fulfils the Project Assurance role.
* **Project Steering Committee** fulfils the functions of a **Technical Support Mechanism.** The EPA will chair this committee. The Project Manager or the Technical Project Coordinator will serve as Secretary to the SC. The composition of the SC will be inclusive of public and private sector representatives, representatives of research institutions, University, NGOs and civil society, as well as interested donors; where appropriate members of the National Climate Change Committee will be part of the SC. As the management of the project is overseen by the Project Board, the functions of the SC will be mostly technical and management oriented.
* **Project Manager**: The Project Manager has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager’s prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost.
* **Project Support – Project Implementation Unit**: The Project Support role provides project administration, management and technical support to the Project Manager as required by the needs of the individual project or Project Manager. The project unit will be staffed by a project coordinator, Chief Technical Advisor and an M&E expert. UNDP may organise the support of one UNV, who would be supporting the district level project activities. A full-time Finance and Admin Manager will be hired, as well as a driver.

Against the provisions in the project design as detailed above, the actual provision of the project implementation arrangements, are not that elaborate. For example, there is no project board; there are only a few members (from a couple of government departments) in the steering committee; there is no Project Manager; the Project Implementation unit comprises of a lone person working as a project co-ordinator. There is no participation by UNDP (expect the project co-ordinator) in the steering committee (expect for the first SC meeting held in 2015 and the SC meeting help in January 2018). More details about the actual project implementation arrangements are provided in section 5.1.

## Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders for the project includes the national institutions, district level organisations and the community based organisations. Table 6 provides the summary of key stakeholders of the project.

Table 6: Key Stakeholders of the Project (as per Project Document)

| **Stakeholder**  | **Roles and Responsibilities** |
| --- | --- |
| Water Department, Ministry of Water Resources  | Overall Project Implementation. A Project Implementation Unit (PIU), attached to WD will be set up to coordinate and direct project execution in Freetown. District WASH coordination officers and support staff will be the key executers of the district and local level activities with relevant NGOs and individuals.  |
| Sierra Leone Environnent Protection Agency | Parts Component 1 coordination in partnership with Ministry of Water Resources, Resources GEF and UNFCCC Focal Point. Steering Committee Chair of Project Implementation. |
| National Climate Change Committee | Partnerships with EPA on various components, project beneficiaries in terms of knowledge and information portals created.  |
| Ministry of Economy, Planning and Cooperation | Aims to assist mainstreaming, climate considerations into relevant policies and other country key planning documents and also strengthen competency in resources mobilisation |
| Ministry of Finance  | Responsible for coordination of cooperation initiatives.  |
| Meteorological Department | Partner for EWS and information /knowledge generation activities under component 1.  |
| Local Government in Freetown, District Councils in Kambia, Kono and Pujehun | Contribution to the implementation of project activities at least at two villages per district; overall strategic guidance. Beneficiaries from capacity support activities, building district level capacities in dealing with climate change.  |
| Environmental Foundation for Africa (EFA)  | EFA has recently set up a environmental and sustainability learning centre near Lakka in Freetown. Modern and inspiring infrastructure is available for hosting trainings, demonstrations of technologies and political dialogues. Capacities for developing cutting edge learning approaches for a suite of stakeholders through a strategic partnership with the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication exists, which can support content development for modules. |
| Sierra Leone Business Forum (SBLF) | Platform for policy dialogues especially with the private sector under component 1 |
| Innovation training centres at Grafting and Kenema | Demonstrations of water supply and management innovations; pioneering for adaptation additions; training of replicators from the local communities in the three project districts  |
| Local NGOs and consulting services esp. At the district level  | Support to project implementation in all districts  |
| Communities at Pilot sites: Pujehun: Bandajuma Sowa,Gbondapi, Kono: Koeyor community Jaima Sewafe Chiefdom Kambia: Mambolo Chiefdom, Malambay | Primary beneficiaries and partners in local level testing and implementation of climate change resilient rainwater harvesting technologies, storage and management.  |
| Communities, Women and Youth Associations, CBOs | Beneficiaries of adaptation measures and contribution to the design and managing of small scale water supply systems. Form part of policy formulation.  |
| Private sector (the Guma Valley Water Company, Provincial Water Company (PROWACO), Small Water providers) | Support the establishment of framework for policies and supports in promoting investment and entrepreneurship development on adaptation, designing of climate resilient design, build climate resilient water harvesting schemes), Guma Valley Company to benefit from improved monitoring system |

# Findings: Design and formulation

## Appropriateness and relevance

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and implementation?**
* **Is the project country-driven?**
* **If the project progress is not good, what changes could have been made (if any) to the project design in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results during rest of the project implementation period?**
 |

The project is in line with the institutional and policy framework of Sierra Leone. Some of the specific policy and development initiatives at Sierra Leone with which the project is aligned are as follows:

* Vision for Sierra Leone 2025 (the long-term development plan of the country), aims to create a prosperous society that cares about the people and the environment. Among the facets towards improved quality of life is the provision of adequate healthcare, water and sanitation for all. This project falls within the domain of the vision in terms of it upgrading infrastructure and capacity through donor funding and private investment toward clean water supply to all areas of the country equitably.
* The Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS): Sierra Leone implemented the first Poverty Reduction Strategy, which focused on consolidating peace and security and economic growth. The country now has a second Poverty Reduction Strategy (‘Agenda for Change’). The second strategy’s fourth priority includes the increase of the population’s access to safe drinking water.
* County Development Plans: Two relevant development plans include the Financial Sector Development Plan, which alludes to the country’s inadequate water supplies as one major hindrance to the country’s progress; and the National Sustainable Agriculture Development Plan (2010-2030) which among its many actions, focuses on the development of a sustainable water management system and water conservation.
* National Adaptation Program of Action: Sierra Leone completed its NAPA in 2007 and the program sets out various priorities in terms of adaptation. The project addresses one of the priorities for adaptive action in the country namely institutional strengthening of the water resources sector. One of the other priorities on NAPA being addressed by the project is promotion of rain water harvesting and development of an integrated management system for fresh water bodies with the aim of increasing water availability for domestic and commercial use.
* Draft Rural Water Supply Strategy: The strategy document describes an approach for extending and sustaining rural water supply service delivery across Sierra Leone.
* Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Policy: The WASH Policy responds to the urgent need for integrated and cross-sectoral approaches to water management and development as well as the provision of safe and adequate drinking water facilities. It provides overall direction for addressing the challenges in the WASH sector, and covers five main thematic areas, namely water resources management, urban water supply and sewage, rural water supply, hygiene and sanitation, and the legal regulatory, and institutional framework.

The project design has recognised the fact that, in general, institutional capacity in Sierra Leone is quite weak due to a variety of reasons which include lack of qualified staff, lack of resources and lack of financing. Implementation of the WASH policy which is one of the major policies directly related to the project, falls under the remit of four government ministries namely the MWR, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), the Ministry of Health and Sanitation (MoHS) and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD); and the local councils. All of these four ministries has been taken on board at the design stage of the project. The project is country driven.

## Quality of design and project formulation (document, logical framework)

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Does the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated?**
* **Is the project logical framework and design still relevant in the light of project experience to date? If not, suggest an approach to propose changes from the project implementation perspective that propose changes to log frame in achieving the anticipated outputs.**
* **Whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, reasonable and time-bounded) to achieve desired project outcomes;**
 |

Details regarding the design of the project in terms of its objectives, the result framework and the indicators were presented in section 2.4 of this report (please see Table 4). Details regarding the targets for different indicators against different Outcomes and the objectives, were also provided in section 2.4. The baseline situation with regard to the is also provided in the Table for the ‘Results Framework’ (Table 4 in section 2.4).

The ‘Project Document’ is concise and encompasses the required details. The project addresses the issue of climate change impacts on the water sources through its two ‘Projected Outcomes’ and addresses the capacity strengthening needs into an appropriate list of expected outcomes. The project addresses the climate change induced problem of shortage of water in Sierra Leone in general and the city of Freetown and the three districts (where the pilot interventions are being carried out) in particular.

However, one of the issue with the project design is that the linkages between the two planned Outcomes of the project and the project objective are not that strong. Further, the indicator (there is only one indicator) to monitor the achievement of the project objectives and the indicator for Outcome 1 of the project is the same. It is not clear if one of the indicators of the Outcome 1 is sufficient to monitor the progress of the project objective, then what is is purpose of other indicators for the two Outcomes of the project.

The purpose and objectives of the project remain valid and relevant since the time of the project design. Actual implementation of the project got delayed due to outbreak of Ebola in the country. The project document was signed in June 2014 and the outbreak of Ebola happened almost at that time. The project was on a standstill for 16 months due to change in the priorities of the national government and that of the UN agencies (focused on tackling Ebola). Immediately after the Ebola epidemic was over, the President’s Recovery Priorities Programme was put in place. The recovery programme, focused on seven key priority areas, including; education, energy, health, private sector development, social protection, water and governance. Even after change in the priorities of the government post Ebola, water and WASH remains the focus areas for the government. The result framework of the project and design are still relevant in the light of project experience to date.

There are issues regarding the way the project is structured and the results framework. Some the issues are follows:

* The indicators used for the project objective and the two components / outcomes of the project are not in line with the project objective / Outcome. The apparent reason for this is that the project design has used the indicators provided in the GEF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). It need to be understood that the indicators provided in the AMAT are for the CC Adaptation tool and would not necessarily suit the needs of a given climate change adaptation project.
* The Outcome 1 of the project, wishes to achieve revision of the policies to incentivise the investment by the private sector. The apparent aim is to attract private sector investment in the water sector. However, the targets for this outcome do not reflect revision of policies. The targets only quantify the increased level of awareness (regarding climate change impacts and adaptation measures) of some of the government stakeholders. This view is further strengthened by having a look at the set of outputs and the corresponding activities (as specified in Table 5). Thus, Outcome 1 of the project and the corresponding Outputs (and the activities) are not aligned. PIR 2016 of the project has also identified this problem and has noted as detailed in Box 1.
* One of the issues with the project design is that, while the project document has provided a set of ‘Projected Outputs’ along with the corresponding set of activities for each of the two Outcomes of the project, the project design has failed to carry these Outputs (and the corresponding activities) to the results framework for the project. The indicators have been put at the Outcome level and do not necessarily reflect the Outputs (and the corresponding activities) mentioned in the ‘Project Document’.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 1: Quotes from the PIR 2016*** *“the target for the indicator on mainstreaming of adaptation concerns within at least the Guma Reservoir management process under Outcome one is limited to the establishment of a climate change resilience plan. As the presence of a plan does not necessarily result in mainstreaming, this target needs to be revised.”*
* *“Insufficient investment by the private sector could pose a risk for the longer-term sustainability of the project. Incentivisation of the private sector to invest in climate smart technologies will not only depend on increased awareness among key stakeholders of climate risks, but also on Government ability to adequately address barriers that may hamper private sector investment (e.g. tax-related issues), and the project presently does not adequately address this issue (see activities described under Output 1.d in pro doc). To mitigate this longer-term sustainability risk, it was therefore agreed with the MWR that the project will facilitate a consultancy aimed at obtaining insights in the current investment climate, recommend solutions for increased investment and present these to relevant stakeholders.”*
 |

Although, the performance measurement indicators and targets as provided in the results framework are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, reasonable and time-bounded), they do not necessarily reflect the progress or achievement of the project outcomes (particularly for the Outcome 1). The project document has recognised the need and importance of involving females in the interventions to provide safe and reliable source of water to the communities. Thus, the project design has provided for gender sensitive analysis and planning so that the water supply management is more climate resilient. The project design has emphasised on the need for integrating gender specific information elements into the training material meant for capacity building and awareness creation. Some of the specific provisions in this regard includes the following;

* Identification of gender-based capacities and resources for managing climate changes risk
* Development of climate risks tools and learning programme in which gender issues are appropriately highlighted in the training material
* Ensure gender balance among participants in the training programs and the use of participatory learning format allowing both men and women to interact, exchanges of experiences and develop common vision and understanding on climate risks management.
* Monitor of learning impacts and applications with the use of Gender-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation system to measures how trainings affected both women and men.

# Findings: Progress towards Results

As per the project document, the project start date is May 2014, and the project document got singed in June 2014. Actual implementation of the project started much later, due to outbreak of Ebola during Q2 2014, leading to changes in the priorities both for UNDP and the national counterparts. The project manager was appointed during October 2015. The inception of the project happened in December 2015 (as per PIRs however no inception report is available). There was further delay in actual implementation of the project due to time taken for approval of the work plan and the budget for the year 2016.

In Chapter 2 of the report, details regarding the results framework / log-frame of the project (as provided in the Project Document), highlighting the Outcomes has been provided (Table 4). Details regarding the set of Outputs (and the proposed activities) for each of two Outcomes of the project was also provided in Chapter 2 (Table 5). Also provided in the results frame work / log-frame (Table 4) is the set of indicators to determine the achievement of the project against the projected Outcomes. As was pointed out in Section 3.2, there are a couple of issues with some of the indicators. The assessment regarding the progress towards achievement of results has been carried out based on PIR for 2018 (draft), interviews with select stakeholders and the field visits.

## Progress towards attainment of Outcomes

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **How does the progress made compare with the end of the project targets in terms of the indicators of the log-frame for each of the component and outcome of the project?**
* **How do the indicators at Baseline compare with the ones completed right before the Midterm Review?**
 |

This section of the report provides an overview of the progress towards results for different Outcomes of the project. In the Tables below, the column with ‘Level at PIR’ is based on the PIR for the year 2018. As the implementation of the project started in December 2015, the first PIR of the project becomes due in 2016 (for the period up to June 2016). However, due to initial delays in implementation, there was not much progress at the time of preparation of the PIR for the year 2016.

In the Table for progress towards achievement of results for different Outcomes of the project, the target values are for the end of the project (as presented in the results framework given in the Project Document). As was mentioned in the previous chapter the indicators of Outcome 1 do not reflect the progress towards achievement / achievement of results for the Outcome. Due to this reason, the assessment of progress towards the achievement of results for Outcome one has been done in terms of progress made towards achievement of different Outputs of Outcome 1. However, it is to be noted that even the set of Outputs for Outcome 1 is not the true reflection of the achievements of Outcome 1 (Climate smart private sector investment in the water sector).

The progress towards achievement of different Outcomes of the project has been presented first, which is followed by the presentation regarding the progress towards achievement of the project objectives. This is because the progress towards achievements of the project objectives has been done both, in terms of the indicators (for project objectives as given in the results-framework) and in terms of the progress towards achievement for different projected Outcomes of the project.

As per the requirements, the assessment regarding progress towards attainment of the results has been carried out for the two individual Outcomes of the project as well. The assessment regarding the progress towards attainment of results has been carried out in terms of the indicators for the Outcomes.

### Progress towards attainment of Outcome 1

**Outcome 1: Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector**

As per the design of the project, different Outputs for Outcome 1 of the project are as follows:

Output 1.a: More than 50 officers from the Ministry of Water Resources, esp. the Water Policy Planning Coordinating Unit (WPPCU), the Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Districts leaders provided with relevant climate risks management guidelines/tools and trained on how the results of the climate risk/vulnerability assessments should be used to adjust regulations and policies governing the water sector at national (NWSP, RWSS) and local level (Districts development plans)

Output 1.b: Climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for the Guma Reservoir

Output 1.c: Regular dialogues established between parliamentarians, local council members, traditional authorities, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector (WASH committees) on the impacts of climate change on water supply in Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts

Output 1.d: At least two dialogues under the Sierra Leone Business Forum and WASH Donors Investment Platform initiated on managing climate change risks on water provision and usage

Output 1.e: Relevant experiences/lessons from community oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices (including gender differentiated issues) identified, and widely shared/disseminated to facilitate replication in other vulnerable areas

Indicative activities which were to be carried out under different Outputs of Outcome 1 (as per project document) were given in an earlier section of the report (Table 5). Out of the different activities which were proposed for achieving the Outputs of Outcome 1, some work has been carried out only for Output 1.a and Output 1.b. At the time of MTR, the status of activities carried out for achievement for different Outputs of Outcome 1 is as given in Table 7.

**Table 7: Activities carried out for Outputs of Outcome 1**

| **Output** | **Status at MTR[[5]](#footnote-6)** |
| --- | --- |
| 1.a: More than 50 officers from Ministry of Water Resources provided with relevant climate risks management guidelines/tools and trained on how the results of the climate risk/vulnerability assessments should be used to adjust regulations and policies governing the water sector | * A consultant (INTEGEMS) was hired to undertake a Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity assessment of MWR-EPA and District staffs and profile their professional updating needs. The consultant has submitted its report in July 2018. The consultant has carried out further work based on the activities specified for output 1.a (activities 1.a.1 to 1.a.4, please see Table 5).
* Training of the 6 engineers of the MWR on different aspects of Groundwater mapping was carried out at Hydro Nova, Italy
* Some of the activities for Outcome 1.a for which there is no action as yet includes adaptation of groundwater assessment tools to new aspects of climate change developments; establish of participatory roadmap to guide the adjustment of regulations and policies governing the water sector for the inclusion and the provision of climate smart finance; and monitor learning impacts and applications.
 |
| 1.b: Climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for Guma Reservoir | * Assessment regarding Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity of Guma reservoir has been carried out by the consultants (Planning Green Futures Limited). The consultant also prepared a climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for the Guma Reservoir.
* Based on the assessment and the suggested emergency plan by the consultant an action plan has been prepared.
* Some of the activities for Outcome 1.b (please see Table 5 for the list of activities) for which there is no action as yet includes training of GVWC staff to run the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan; establishment of processes for review, reassessment and evaluation of the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan.
 |
| 1.c: Regular dialogues established between parliamentarians, local council members, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector (WASH committees) on the impacts of climate change on water supply in 3 pilot districts | **Activities for this output are yet to be initiated** |
| 1.d: At least two dialogues under the Sierra Leone Business Forum and WASH Donors Investment Platform initiated on managing climate change risks on water provision and usage | **Activities for this output are yet to be initiated** |
| 1.e: Relevant experiences/lessons from community oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices (including gender differentiated issues) identified, and widely shared/disseminated to facilitate replication in other vulnerable areas | **Activities for this output are yet to be initiated** |

Table 8 provides an overview of progress towards results for Outcome 1 of the project against the set of indicators (as per results framework). The assessment regarding progress towards attainment of the Outcomes needs to be carried out keeping in mind the status of different activities of the project as given in Table 8.

**Table 8: Progress towards results: Outcome 1**

| **Indicators as per Results Framework** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Level at PIR-2018 (As reported by the project team in the PIR)** | **Status at MTR[[6]](#footnote-7)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation concerns and actions mainstreamed within at least the Guma Reservoir Management process | The overall risk that climate change may pose on the sustainability of water supply to the capital not well integrated into Guma Reservoir management | CC resilience plan for Guma reservoir established  | **PIR 2018 has reported as follows*** Climate change Change Resilience Plan for the Guma Water Reservoir was produced by the project in October 2016. Recommendations of the plan are now being integrated being implemented including capacity development activities of the Guma Reservoir Management staff.
 | **Achieved**(please see details provided after this Table) |
| Indicator 2.2.1: Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. | * Key decision-makers who are supposed to lead implementation of the policy have limited knowledge of climate change impacts or adaptation responses.
* Information, including inventory and mapping, is inadequate and staffs from MWR have limited expertise to internalize climate changes into existing local development plan
* Low interplay between public and private sector on adaptation strategies investment
* Existing coping strategies and adaptation action not documented at all, including for the water sector.
 | * 15% of staff from targeted institutions aware of predicted impacts of climate change and appropriate responses
* 60% of targeted stakeholders have access to relevant disseminated adaption experiences from the project
 | **PIR 2018 has reported as follows*** 12% of the targeted institutions mainly the Ministry of Water Resources, Guma Valley Water Company, Sierra Leone Water Company and the Local District Councils are now aware of the risks and predicted impacts of climate change as well as adaptation options for responding to these risks and impacts.
* The project had produced relevant materials on adaptation experiences and various other case studies on climate risk management. These have been shared with stakeholders in the targeted communities.
* Almost 50% of the targeted stakeholders especially communities now have access to relevant disseminated adaption experiences which they have received from the project.
 | **On the way to be Achieved**(please see details provided after this Table) |

**Indicator 1.1.1**

Assessment regarding Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity of Guma reservoir has been carried out by the consultants (Planning Green Futures Limited). The consultant also prepared a climate change resilience plan and emergency contingency plan for the Guma Reservoir. Based on the assessment and the suggested emergency plan by the consultant an action plan has been prepared. However, some of the activities for the list of activities) for which there is no action as yet includes training of GVWC staff to run the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan; establishment of processes for review, reassessment and evaluation of the climate resilience and emergency contingency plan.

**Indicator 2.2.1**

A consultant (INTEGEMS) was hired to undertake a Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) capacity assessment of MWR-EPA and district staffs and profile their professional updating needs. The consultant has submitted its report in July 2018. The consultant has carried out further work which includes training of the staff based on the gaps in the capacity (as identified in the capacity assessment exercise). In the absence of any dedicated efforts under the project, towards increasing the capacity it is not possible to say that there is any increase in capacity amongst the stakeholders, regarding the awareness level, regarding the risks and predicted impacts of climate change as well as adaptation options for responding to these risks and impacts. Against the claims made in PIR 2018, the project is yet to produce any dissemination and communication material on adaptation experiences (as there are no real adaptation experiences from the project till the time of MTR).

As is evident from the above paragraphs, there is some progress towards achievement of the target value of the indicators for Outcome 1, the progress towards achievement of results for Outcome 1 is not that good. This is considering that for a number of Outputs for Outcome 1 (please see Table 7) are yet to be carried out. Also, in case of Outcome 1 the indicators provided in the results framework don’t reflect the achievements of the Outcome. Accordingly, **the progress towards results for Outcome 1 of the project at MTR[[7]](#footnote-8) is rated as Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

### Progress towards attainment of Outcome 2

**Outcome 2: Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Puhejun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks**

As per the design of the project different Outputs for Outcome 2 of the project are as follows:

Output 2.a: Pilot demonstrations of innovative climate resilient rainwater collection in at least 3 public buildings with reservoirs established to support the bottleneck of drink water supply in the dry season

Output 2.b: Spring water improvement designed, tested and demonstrated in high density area in Freetown (benefiting at least 200 households)

Output 2.c: Sustainable community reservoirs with 9 stand alone roof-top rainwater harvesting systems (in 3 hospitals and 6 schools), as well as 5 resilient gravity fed water distribution systems designed and pioneered in Kono, Kambia and Pujehun

Output 2.d: At least 100 households provided with water storage and treatment systems for drinking water usage in times of prolonged dry-spells and drought in Kono, Kambia and Pujehun

Different activities (as per project document) which were to be carried out under different Outputs of Outcome 2 were provided in an earlier chapter (Table 5). Outcome 2 of the project is largely related to establishment of pilots for four different type of water systems (rainwater collection, spring box, rainwater harvesting, and bore wells) at the four pilot locations. The pilot interventions under the project is being carried out at 31 sites. The status of implementation of the pilot interventions at the time of MTR (August 2018) is as given in Table 9.

**Table 9: Status of Pilot projects at the Time of MTR (August 2018)**

| **Sl. No.** | **Name of Community** | **Facility** | **Beneficiaries** | **People served (Nos.)** | **Number of stand post** | **WASH Committee formed** | **Status / Reasons for non-operation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Kambia District** |
| 1 | Bamoi Luma | Borehole | International Market Place/ Community | 5,000 | 10 | Yes | Functional but problem with the submersible pump |
| 2 | Kargboto | Borehole | Community |   | 7 | Yes | Fully Functional |
| 3 | Gbalanthalan | Borehole | Health Center & Community | 350 | 7 | Yes | Fully Functional |
| 4 | Rogberay | Spring Box | Community | 1,300 | 8 | Yes | NEW- Under construction |
| 5 | Kolenten Sec School | Borehole | School | 600 | 8 | No | NEW- Under construction |
| 6 | Kychum | Borehole | Community | 1000 | 10 | Yes | NEW- Under construction |
|   |  Kono District |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 | Fuero | Borehole | Community | 800 | 7 | Yes | Completed, but problem with the solar pump |
| 8 | Kombayendeh | Borehole | Community | 1,200 | 8 | Yes | Partially Functional |
| 9 | KDEC Primary School | Borehole | School | 750 | 8 | No | Not functional, Stolen solar panels and submersible pump |
| 10 | Boroma | Borehole | Community | 1000 | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 11 | Njagbema Fiama | Spring Box | Community | 2,000 | 8 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 12 | Model Sec School | Borehole | School | 700 | 8 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
|   | **Pujehun District** |
| 13 | Kuranko Community, Kpaka Chiefdom | Borehole | Community | 750 | 7 | Yes | Non functional due to breakdown of the solar panel/ pump |
| 14 | Nyandehun Galliness | Borehole | Community | 479 | 6 | No | Functional |
| 15 | Koroma Laa New Market | Borehole | Community | 1000 | 10 | No | Not functional, Stolen solar panels and submersible pump |
| 16 | Taninahun Malen | Borehole | Community | 2000 | 10 | Not Yet | Non functional due to breakdown of the solar panel/ pump |
| 17 | Nyandehun Malen | Borehole | Community | 935 | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 18 | Jendema | Borehole | Community | 4500 | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 19 | Fullawahun | Borehole | Community | 450 | 6  | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 20 | Sarhun Kpaka | Borehole | Community | 1200 | 8  | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 21 | Massam Kpaka | Rainwater Harvesting | School | 550 | 6  | No | NEW- Under construction |
| 22 | Kortumahun | Spring Box | Community | 390 | 6  | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
|   | **Freetown** |
| 23 | Baoma | Borehole | Community | 3,000 and above | 10 | Yes | Fully Functional |
| 24 | Mayenkineh | Borehole | Community | 3,000 and above | 10 | Yes | Fully Functional |
| 25 | PCMH | Rainwater Harvesting | Children's Hospital | Moving Population | 5  | No | NEW- Under construction |
| 26 | Bishop Johnson Memorial School | Rainwater Harvesting | School | 1,360 | 8  | No | NEW- Under construction |
| 27 | Water Directorate | Rainwater Harvesting | Staff of MWR |   | Supply to Office Building | No | NEW- Under construction |
| 28 | Bio-Energy Training Centre  | Rainwater Harvesting  | Institution | Moving Population | Supply to Office Building | NA | NEW- Under construction |
| 28 | Funimah, Goderich | Borehole | Community | 2500 and above | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 29 | Calaba Town | Borehole | Community | 3,000 and above | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 30 | U.M.C Primary School | Borehole | School/Community | 1,000 | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |
| 31 | B&S Junction, Hill Top-Hill Station | Borehole | Community | 3,000 and above | 10 | Not Yet | NEW- Under construction |

As can be seen from the Table 9, at the time of MTR only 12 pilot projects (out of total 31) had been completed, and out of these 12 only 5 are working satisfactorily. During the discussions, the project team mentioned that, it is planned to take actions and operationalise the pilot units which are not working due a variety of reasons mentioned in the Table 9. However, it is not clear how these actions to operationalise the non-working unit would be achieved as there are no budgetary provisions for such corrective actions.

For the pilot facilities under construction, during the mission it was felt, that at the pilots for making the water available to the communities, there are technical issues due to which the operational efficiency of the systems will get hampered. It is recommended (please see recommendation 7) that an independent consultant (or a team of consultants) may be appointed to carryout technical due diligence to identify the technical issues and suggest corrective measures. The issues which may be examined by the consultant (apart for other issues) may include the following:

* Orientation of the solar panels (angle and direction and shading from the surrounding trees)
* Depth of the bore hole (may be restricted to as recorded)
* Adequacy of the control system provided for the operation of the pumping system (provision of the start-up capacitor of adequate rating etc.)
* Rated capacity of the submersible pump (including motor) and the solar panels
* Adequacy of the civil structure (construction as per approved drawings, angle of the roof of the control room etc.)
* Layout of the piping network for supplying the water

Visits to the sites of the pilot projects and the discussions with the water engineers, project team and the contractors revealed that some of the problems with the pilot projects can be addressed by minor modifications in the specifications and design of the facilities. It is recommended (please see recommendation 9) that a review of the installation design of the equipment be carried out to make them robust, so that the panels / water tanks do not get blown away and also the theft of the solar panel and the pump system is prevented. This can for example, be achieved by welding the frame of the solar panel to the structure (provided to support the solar panels). For preventing the blowing off of the solar panels / water tanks the space below the solar panels can be covered by brick work.

Table 10 provides an overview of progress towards results for Outcome 2 of the project against the set of indicators (as per results framework). The assessment regarding progress towards attainment of the Outcomes needs to be carried out keeping in mind the status of different activities of the project as given in Table 10.

**Table 10: Progress towards results: Outcome 2**

| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Level at PIR-2018 (As reported by the project team in the PIR)** | **Status at MTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator 1.2.3: Number of additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services given existing and projected climate change | * Type and level: 0 (aside already existing local coping mechanism)
 | * 5000 at intervention sites in Freetown and three districts
 | **The PIR 2018 states as follows:*** About 12,000 additional people will now have access to safe drinking water as a result of the interventions of the project
* A total number of 12 boreholes have been provided and 12 more are presently under construction.;
* 5 rain water facilities and 5 spring boxes are currently under construction and expected to be completed within the next one month.
 | * Establishment of the some of the pilots has been completed. However, only 5 (out of 12 pilots completed) are working satisfactorily providing water to about 8000 additional people
* Work for establishment of other pilots is underway, at are different stages of completion.
* For the pilots under construction there are some visible technical issues and problems
 |

Considering the status of implementation of the pilot projects and the performance of the pilots already implemented, the **progress towards achievement of the results for Outcome 2 of the project has been rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS**). This is considering the fact that in-spite of the partial operational performance of the pilots the target value of the indicator provided in the results frame-work is expected to be achieved.

###  Progress towards attainment of Project Objectives

**Project Objective: Enhance the adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources.**

Table 11 provides an overview of progress towards results for Project Objectives against the set of indicators (as per results framework). The assessment regarding progress towards attainment of the Outcomes needs to be carried out keeping in mind the status of the progress towards results of indicators / targets as well as keeping in mind the progress towards results for the two Outcomes of the project. However, as mentioned before, one of the issue with the project design is that the linkages between the two planned Outcomes of the project and the project objective are not that strong. Further, the only indicator (Indicator 2.2.1) to monitor the achievement of the project objectives is one of the indicators for Outcome 1 of the project.

**Table 11: Progress Towards Results – Project Objectives**

| **Indicators**  | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Level at PIR - 2018 (As reported by the project team in the PIR)** | **Status at MTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator 2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. | * Technocrats from MWR and EPA in Freetown, but particularly regional technical staffs have extremely limited opportunity for professional updating, and usually find it difficult to address newly emerging technical issues and practices into their ongoing work.
* One of the major limitations is the lack of capacity to deal with climate risks and understandings of managing these risks in the water sector.
 | * At least capacities of 2 line ministries and 2 Districts Council to mainstream adaptation concerns within water policies and local development plans are strengthened
* Capacities of two research /training centre to deliver relevant trainings on climate change issues are strengthened
 | **The PIR 2018 mentions;*** Technical staffs (10 staff) from MWR and three District Councils (1 staff) have increased their understanding of climate risks and issues how to integrate those risks and impacts. with relevant climate risks management, guidelines and tools that affect water supply in Freetown and the rural communities. They were exposed to lectures, case study, group work, presentations, etc. on tools and guideline on climate risk management.
* Action Plans were also developed by the participants during the trainings and workshops.
 | The work plan for the year 2017 provided for the training of the officials of MWR under Outcome 1.a.Accordingly, a training manual was created and the required training imparted by the consultant (INTEGEMS) . |

The progress towards achievement of the targets for the indicators for project objective is not that good. Also the progress towards results for the two Outcomes of the project is also not that good. Accordingly, the **progress towards achievement of the ‘Project Objectives’ is rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

## Project effectiveness

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Are there any barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?**
* **How the benefits of the project can be further expanded?**
 |

The project is not on track to achieve its objectives. This is due to the gaps in the performance against both the Outcomes of the project. Also, the linkage between the project objective and the two planned Outcomes of the project is not very strong. Indicator 2.2.1 (of Outcome 1) and the indictor for the project objective is the same.

The two Outcomes of the projects are not supporting each other and the project objective. For example, Outcome 2 of the project was to demonstrate the technologies, while the Outcome 1 was to create conducive conditions to attract the private sector investment in the water sector. The Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 put together should have lead to the replication (due to results dissemination, case studies promotions etc.) to achieve the project objective of provision of water to the communities during the prolonged dry seasons and shortage of water due to the impacts climate change.

As the project is not on track, coupled with the fact that there are problems with the project design, the barriers towards achievement of the project objectives, which were identified at the time of ‘Project Design’ still remain. Summary of the barriers is given below;

* Difficulty to react to uncertainty of climate risk
* Absence of reliable/up to date information on climate impacts on key sectors, including gender specificities
* Weak national and local knowledge base on climate impacts, risks and opportunities and insufficient sharing and learning mechanisms on climate change
* Current policies, strategies and regulatory mechanism have limited or no consideration of climate change issues
* Public financing shortfalls lead to overall infrastructure challenges and insufficient coverage of climate resilient water supply
* Limited technical capacities and limited innovations, especially to react to impeding climate risks

Given below are some of the suggestions to remove some of the barriers and expand the benefits of the project.

As mentioned before, there are problems with the project design. Some of these problems can be taken care by redefining the indicators and the corresponding targets. The projected outputs (for the two outcomes) and the corresponding indicative activities provided in the project document may be effectively used to do so. Some of the ways to increase the effectiveness of the projects are as follows (please see the recommendations as well);

* Strengthen the project implementation team, in terms of the skill sets and the number of resources. The reasons for not that good results of the project at the MTR, includes lack of institutional capacity, inadequate staffing of the project implementation team. It is recommended that a project manager is taken on board, who will focus on the work planning, monitoring and ensure timely implementation of different activities. One of the other recommendations is to broad base the structure of the Steering Committee by including members from the local government (from the locations where the pilots are being implemented), NGOs, academic institutions, donor agencies etc.
* At some of the pilot locations there is a possibility of availability of spare capacity of solar panels. This may be examined on a case to case basis and wherever feasible a couple of lighting points and a community television may be provided. A couple of lighting points in the community centre will enable the children to study at night. This will also help the community members to charge their mobile phones. Presently the community members travel and also pay for getting the mobile phones charged.
* From sustainability point of view, it is important to have availability of skilled and trained resources to carry out maintenance and repair of the solar pumping system. The project may facilitate establishment of short duration curriculum in one of the technical training institutes / university to impart training on operation, repairs and maintenance of the solar water pumping systems.
* During the mission it was felt, that at the pilots for making the water available to the communities, there are technical issues due to which the operational efficiency of the systems will get hampered. It is recommended that an independent consultant (or a team of consultants) may be appointed to carryout technical due diligence to identify the technical issues and suggest corrective measures.
* Review of technical specifications / design of the pilot projects to make them robust, so that the panels / water tanks do not get blown away and also the theft of the solar panel and the pump system is prevented. This can for example, be achieved by welding the frame of the solar panel to the structure (provided to support the solar panels). For preventing the blowing off of the solar panels / water tanks the space below the solar panels can be covered by brick work.
* The project has successfully demonstrated of the the use of technology of solar PV pumping for meeting the water requirements. The community members where the pilots were carried out are contributing money on a monthly basis to take care of any possible need of expenses to carry out repair and maintenance of the system. It is considered that it may be possible to replicate the interventions by involving either private sector investment or by forming the community groups which borrow the funds from commercial banks. It is recommended that proper feasibility study be carried out to examine the replication of the business model wherein the ‘Capital Expenditure’ is provided by the private sector / commercial bank and the revenues comes from a monthly subscription.
* In case of involving the private sector, it would be necessary to a regulation and regulatory mechanism to determine the charges which can be collected from the households for the water supplied. The project may support development of the regulations (and the mechanism) for getting the private sector investment to implement solar pumping systems for water needs of the communities.

# Findings: implementation and adaptive management

This Chapter describes the appropriateness and functioning of project management and administration, work planning and monitoring and evaluation. The second section reviews relations with stakeholders, while the Chapter ends with an overview of planned and realised budget expenditures.

## Implementation and efficiency:

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * + **Adaptive management framework:**
		- **Are the project management arrangements adequate?**
		- **How effectively is the project managed at all levels? Is it results-based and innovative?**
		- **How about the changes made to project implementation arrangement during the project implementation, if applicable? Have they impacted the project in a positive way?**
		- **How does the Project Management Unit (PMU) and The Executing Agency work with its partners especially stakeholders in the country? If there were problems:**
			* **identify those along with their causes**
			* **how do those affect the performance of activities at the national level against the delivery of target outputs?**
			* **What are the plans of the PMU in stimulating the interest and cooperation of its target partners?**
		- **Recommendations from the MTR Team of how to address those during rest of project implementation period.**
		- **Is technical assistance and support received from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely?**
		- **How is the committed co-financing for the project being used by PMU? Report the co-financing details in the format as suggested in the ToR;**
		- **Whether the use of consultants has been successful in achieving component outputs**
		- **Assess the use of the project logical framework and work plans as management tools and in meeting with UNDP-GEF requirements in planning and reporting.**
		- **How does the APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?**
		- **How do the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operating as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making?**
		- **Assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project.**
* **Project positioning and leveraging:**
* **Asses how project partners, stakeholders and co-financing institutions are involved in the Project’s adaptive management framework.**
* **Identify opportunities for stronger collaboration and substantive partnerships to enhance the project’s achievement of results and outcomes.**
* **Are the project information and progress of activities disseminated to project partners and stakeholders? Are there areas to improve in the collaboration and partnership mechanisms?**
 |

### Project management arrangements

The Ministry of Water Resources, Sierra Leone is the implementing partner for the project. On the ground execution of the pilot project is being led by the WASH engineers (reporting to the Ministry of Water Resources) of the respective districts. As per the provisions made in the project document, the project board / steering committee (SC) is **r**esponsible for making management decisions for the project. SC is supposed to play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. However, in actual practise this is not happening as planned. In this regard it is important to note some of the minutes of the project steering committee meetings as given in Box 2 below;

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 2: Nothings in the SC meeting minutes****Noting in the minutes of SC meeting for 2016*** SC members requested that updates be provided on a month basis to them and not just at SC meetings
* that minutes of SC meetings be shared with them in advance of meetings
* the meeting suggested for SC members to be involved in monitoring of project interventions
* that SC members part-take in the review of AWPs
* All TORs prepared for consultancy should be sent to SC members for a review and approval.

**Nothings in the minutes of the SC meeting for 2017*** SC members requested once again that updates be provided on a month basis to them and not just at SC meetings
* that minutes of SC meetings be shared with them in advance of meetings
* Emphasis was made by members that they should be involved in monitoring of project interventions.
 |

The actual provision of the project implementation arrangements, are not in line with the provisions in the project design. For example, there are only a few members (from a couple of government departments) in the steering committee; there is no Project Manager; the Project Implementation unit comprises of a lone person working as a project co-ordinator. There is no participation by UNDP (expect the project co-ordinator) in the steering committee (expect for the first SC meeting held in 2015 and the SC meeting help in January 2018).

The reasons for not good results of the project at the MTR, includes lack of institutional capacity and inadequate staffing of the project implementation team. It is recommended that a project manager is taken on board, who will focus on the work planning, monitoring and ensure timely implementation of different activities. One of the other recommendations is to broad base the structure of the Steering Committee by including members from the local government (from the locations where the pilots are being implemented), NGOs, academic institutions, donor agencies etc. Please see recommendations 3 as well. Considering that appointment of the resources may be a time consuming process, the option of bringing on board a couple of UNVs may be explored

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the project is being implemented by the UNDP under its National Execution (NEX) Modality. The executing agency in Sierra Leone is Ministry of Water Resources (MWR).

Being the GEF implementation partner, UNDP has the role of senior supplier in the Project Board. The Senior Supplier’s primary function within the Board is to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. UNDP CO also has the role of ‘Project Assurance’, In the case of this project, there is hardly any participation by UNDP (expect the project co-ordinator) in the steering committee (expect for the first SC meeting held in 2015 and the SC meeting held in January 2018). The PMU constituted by UNDP is not adequately staffed.

On the ground implementation by the executing agency (Ministry of Water Resources) and the project team has not been effective. This is evident from the fact that out of 12 pilot projects implemented till date, only five were working satisfactorily.

As was mentioned in Chapter 2 the actual provision for project implementation by UNDP and MWR is not as per the provisions made in the project design. Activities of both UNDP and MWR in this case were not focused on the results of the project, provision of technical support by UNDP was not there, there were not much efforts towards management of project risks. Reporting in the PIR did not clearly reflect the actual situation of project implementation and results.

Clearly the present project management arrangements are not adequate and they are required to be strengthened. The changes made to project implementation arrangement during the project implementation, has impacted the project in a negative manner. The Project Management Unit (comprising of a single member working as the project co-ordinator) works with the Executing Agency (MWR), particularly for implementation of the pilot projects on the ground. However, the results of implementation of the pilot projects has not been that good. The PMU needs to be strengthened both in terms of the number of resources and the skill sets.

### Strategic partnerships and stakeholder engagement

In section 2.6 a brief about the main stakeholders of the project along with their respective roles was provided. The project was to coordinates closely with public, private and community based stakeholders, however, this is not happening in actual practise. Except with the MWR and district level WASH engineers (from MWR) and the communities where the pilots are being implemented, there is no involvement of other stakeholders.

### Work planning

The work planning is carried out on an annual basis. The work plans are prepared based on the outputs (for the two outcomes of the project) and the corresponding set of indicative activities mentioned in the project document. As was mentioned in an earlier section of the report (please see Section 3.2, Issue 1), the project document has provided a set of ‘Projected Outputs’ along with the corresponding set of activities for each of the two Outcomes of the project. However, the project design has failed to carry these Outputs (and the corresponding activities) to the results framework for the project. The indicators have been put at the Outcome level and do not necessarily reflect the Outputs (and the corresponding activities) mentioned in the ‘Project Document’.

Due to this the project is in a situation where the work planning is being done as per the provisions made in different outputs of the project, whereas the monitoring of the progress is being done as per the projected Outcomes (and the corresponding set of indicators) as in the results framework, in spite of the fact that the indictors in the results framework are not in line with the ‘projected outputs’ of the project. One of the other operational issues is the time lag (of about three months) between the start of the year and the receipt of funds to carry out the activities as per the approved work plan for the year.

### Monitoring and Evaluation System

The project design has made adequate provision for monitoring of the project. Budgetary provisions have been made for the monitoring and evaluation activities. The M&E framework set out in the Project Results Framework in the project document is aligned with UNDP M&E frameworks. The M&E provisions made includes an Inception Workshop, Quarterly reports, Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR), Audit (in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules), Periodic Monitoring through site visits by UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU, MTR, Terminal Evaluation.

As explained further in the subsequent section of the report, the monitoring and evaluation activities are being carried out as per the requirements set out in the project document, except for the fact that, audit activities are restricted to the audit of UNDP at an aggregate level. No separate audit for the project has been carried out.

### Reporting

The project start date is October 2015 (after about 15 months from the date of signature on the project document, due to Ebola outbreak). However, actual implementation of the project started much later (during April 2016), due to the time taken for approval of the work plan and allocation of funds. As per the M&E plan provided in the project document the reporting requirements of the project includes: inception report, project implementation reviews (PIRs) and quarterly reviews.

Formal inception of the project happened in November 2015. The first meeting of the steering committee took place in November 2015. Based on the Quarterly reports shared during MTR, it is evident that the Quarterly reports, were produced almost regularly.

As per the standard practice for all UNDP implemented projects, Project Implementation Reports (PIR) were required to be prepared for every year. The reporting cycle for PIRs is 30th June to 1st July of the next year. The PIRs for the years 2016 and 2017 (30th June 2017 to 1st July 2017) were prepared. Draft PIR for the year 2018 was also made available during MTR.

As there was not much progress in the year 2015 the PIR for 2015 was not prepared. As per the requirements, the PIRs for 2016 and 2017 includes reporting on the progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative). The project has also prepared the Annual Progress Reports (APR) for the year 2017 (January to December). While the progress in the PIRs is done in terms of the indicators of the results framework, the reporting regarding progress in the APRs has been done in terms of the annual work plans. As was pointed out earlier the work plans are based on the Outputs of the project, which are not necessarily reflected in the results framework.

In accordance with the provisions made in the project document, UNDP CO and the regional office makes visits to some of the pilot project sites to assess first hand project progress. In accordance with the provisions in the project monitoring plan, it is undergoing a mid-term review.

As such the project has not been able to use the results framework of the project and the work plans as management tools, firstly due to the problems with the results framework itself and secondly because not much progress could be made towards actual implementation of the project. PIRs have not been very effective, as PIRs reports are in terms of the indicators, while the work planning is done in terms of the Outputs and the indicative activities for the Outputs.

### Communications

Communication is one of the aspects where the project is clearly lacking. The project management needs to establish formal or informal communication channels (e.g. project specific Facebook Page, Blog Site etc.) either for internal or external communications.

The project design has failed to provide for any communication, outreach and dissemination activity as a part of the project. The results framework of the project doesn’t have provision for knowledge dissemination and communication. **The project implementation and adaptive management has been rated as Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU).**

## Financial plan with budget allocation

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.**
* **Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.**
* **Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?**
* **Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project?**
* **Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?**
 |

The project is funded through GEF and was to have significant funds contribution by the government and UNDP as co-finance.

The Project is being implemented under the Nationally Implementation Modality. Funds are transferred to the Implementation partner, which are spent under government procedures based on agreed work plans and the corresponding budget. The total budget and the sources of funds for the project are as given in Table 12.

**Table 12: Budget and Sources of Funds[[8]](#footnote-9) for the Project (Figures in USD)**

| **Source of Fund** | **Outcome 1** | **Outcome 2** | **Project Management** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GEF / LDCF  | 700,000 | 2,058,000 | 182,000 | 2,940,000 |
| UNDP (Cash) |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |
| **Total** | **700,000** | **2,208,000** | **182,000** | **3,090,000** |

Table 13 provides details of the requirements of the funds for different years of the project implementation.

Table 13: Summary of phased funding of the project (as per Project Document) (figures in USD)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **Total** |
| GEF/LDCF (Cash)  | 88,861  | 332,601  | 1,049,981  | 790,822  | 677,735  | 2,940,000  |
| UNDP (Cash)  | 2,300  | 63,420  | 31,540  | 20,700  | 32,040  | 150,000  |
| UNDP (In kind –Grant)  | -  | 400,000  | 300,000  | 150,000  | 150,000  | 1,000,000  |
| MWR (Grants)[[9]](#footnote-10)  | 360,000  | 1,350,000  | 3,060,000  | 2,430,000  | 1,800,000  | 9,000,000  |
| **Total** | **451,161**  | **2,146,021**  | **4,441,521**  | **3,391,522**  | **2,659,775**  | **13,090,000**  |

The budget utilization (GEF contribution) till the end of June 2018[[10]](#footnote-11) has been about USD 1,541,194, which is about 52% of the approved funding which is in line with the planned expenditure. The contribution by the government has been in kinds by provision of services of the WASH engineers at the district level and provision of other infrastructure facilities for implementation of the project. As was mentioned in section 1.3 (limitations of MTR), some of the documents required for review of the financial aspects, e.g. audit reports, CDRs (CDRs could be made available only for Q1, Q4 of 2016 and for Q2 of 2017), documents for extension of project timelines could not be made available during the MTR. Also, the co-financing table was not available at the time of MTR. Due to non-availability of CDRs and financial data from other sources (e.g. audit reports) the outcome / component wise expenditure could not be analyzed. The project doesn’t have the required reporting of the financial matters.

There has been delays of about 3 months in the actual annual funds flow due to time taken in the approval of the annual work plans and the corresponding budgets. Although, there is a provision for audit of the project, the audits did not happen. The co-financing of the project is restricted to some in kind contribution by the MWR by way of provision of services of its engineers for implementation of the pilot projects. The project did not leverage any additional co-financing.

# Findings: Sustainability

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Validate whether the risks originally identified in the project document and, currently in the PIRs are reasonable? And their risk rating in terms of most critical is reasonable?**
* **Describe additional risks identified during the review, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.**
* **Is the project implementation and achievement of results proceeding well and in according to plan, or are there any outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. on the implementation of demonstration projects, government or private sector affecting the successful implementation of demonstration projects and achievement of project results?**
* **Lessons learned, if any, in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success**
 |

## Project risks

At the design stage, a thorough risk analysis was carried out and appropriate risk mitigation strategies were worked out. Internal risks are project-inherent or can be controlled by the project management, while external risks are of policy-economy-international nature. Table 14 provides the risks identified at the project design stage.

 **Table 14: Project risks identified at the time of project design**

| **#** | **Description** | **Countermeasures** | **Comments at MTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Social resistance hinder the adoption of new resilient practices | One of the first activities is the full development of the implementation plan and stakeholder involvement plan. In addition, the project will enter into strategic partnerships at the local level, not just with local government, but in particular with local NGOs and community based organisations on the choice of technologies, specifically for women. Furthermore, local governments and technical services will have a key role in supporting this adoption.  | This risk is not valid. The society is generally receptive of the adoption of the resilient practices |
| 2 | Duplication and lack of coordination with other initiatives, resulting in inefficient use of resources, and a loss of opportunity for building climate change resilience in Sierra Leone | At the government level, the MWR is the national executing agency, and as the key water player in Sierra Leone is part of all initiatives. In addition, detailed delivery strategy will clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of specific institutions for the overall management of the project. Better programmatic coordination with development partners (UNDP, DFID, EU, etc) will be ensured through coordination mechanisms established by the UN Joint vision and by giving periodically information about project progress and tools.  | This risk is not valid as the efforts in the water sector in Sierra Leone are centred in the MWR, thus offering the opportunity to avoid duplication of work |
| 3 | Limited capacity of local and national institutions  | Government capacity is not likely to represent a risk for the project because there is a strong policy will behind the project. While capacities are weak, efforts will be made to develop the capacities of key institutions to participate fully in the project implementation. The risk of non compliance will be mitigated by mobilising the capacity of different actors, projects, programmes and bilateral agencies to work intensively with government and transfer skills to government counterparts.  | This risk is quite valid. The project implementation has suffered due to this risk. For example, only 5 (out of total 12 implemented till MTR) pilot facilities for water are working satisfactorily.One of the ways to take care of the risk of lack of capacity is to bring on board external experts as consultants. The capacity of district WASH Engineers, Local Government institutions could be boosted through the use of external consultants who work closely with them rather than in isolation. Apart from the lack of capacity the risk of lack of interest /ownership amongst different national institutions also arises due to mutually conflicting interest of different institutions. |
| 4 | Reluctance of key stakeholders to endorse and participate in project activities | The risk of reluctance of stakeholders is low. Nevertheless it will be addressed by local participation in project formulation and implementation. In particular, existing areas where income has been generated from adaptation activities will be demonstrated to other communities and replicated where possible.  | This risk is not valid |
| 5 | Too many different/divergent stakeholder interests in target sites may prevent efficient consensual decision-making | During the PPG, efforts were focused on the identification of appropriate government agencies – a PIU will be set up within the Water Department of the MWR to execute the project. A project steering committee will oversee the project. | This risk is not valid as not many stakeholders has been taken on board |
| 6 | Stakeholder relations | The PPG phase suggested that the project be implemented under a partnership arrangement between government, UNDP and competent NGOs/institutions/ individual experts (national and international). This established commitment to a partnership approach to implementation should build the foundation for a good success for project implementation.  | This risk is not valid |
| 5 | Natural disaster: Unusual and catastrophic climatic events during project implementation | Unusually difficult climatic circumstances could threaten the demonstration projects and set up of infrastructure – the rehabilitation and construction should take into account resilience during construction and rehabilitation.  | This risk is valid. Already at a couple of locations the pilot projects are suffering due to normal climate events (like wind leading to blowing up of the solar panels / tanks). Catastrophic events will make the situation worse. This can be taken care of by making the technical specifications / design of the pilot projects to make them robust, so that the panels / water tanks do not get blown away. This can for example, be achieved by welding the frame of the solar panel to the structure (provided to support the solar panels). For preventing the blowing off of the solar panels / water tanks the space below the solar panels may be covered by brick work.. |

Apart from the risks identified at the project design stage, there are certain risks which have been identified while implementation of the project. Some of such risks which has been mentioned in the PIRs are as follows:

* Substantial delays in project implementation due to the impacts of the Ebola crisis.
* Delayed endorsement of the 2016 Annual Work Plan, resulting in 1-year delay of construction of innovative water harvesting technologies due to rainy season.
* Insufficient support and investment by private sector[[11]](#footnote-12) could hamper sustainability of project interventions. Project will implement consultancy to further identify barriers to private sector investments and recommend longer-term solutions.
* Insufficient capacity available within key partners for quality and timely delivery.
* Delayed endorsement of the 2017 Annual Work Plan. Resulting in the delay in commencement of construction of innovative water harvesting technologies.
* Insufficient capacity available within key partners for quality and timely delivery.
* Theft of equipment in the communities is a problem. Specifically, submersible pumps and solar panels have been stolen. However, a new approach has been designed to prevent the future occurrence of such events.
* Poor performance of some contractors. Some contractors could not deliver on-time leading to delays. Also, there was a problem with previous contractors procuring non-standard solar pumps and panels which created a big problem for the functionality of the boreholes. This has now been resolved the procurement and installation of submersible solar pumps are now being handled by specialized firms with very clear understanding of the requirements to purchase the specified equipment.

Many risks identified during the project design stage and during project implementation are quite valid. However, considering that most of these risks are manageable and the project team has taken steps to mitigate the risks, the **sustainability of the results of the project from the view point of project risks is considered as likely.**

## Financial risks

One of the risks to sustainability of the impacts created under the project is the availability of funds to carry out the repairs and maintenance of the adaptive actions (pilot projects) carried out under the project. For example, maintenance of the solar pumps, solar panels, the control system and the submersible pumps is a continuous requirement. Also, there is always a possibility of break downs requiring the repairs. While, the project will create one-time impact by construction of the water facilities at the selected locations, it will not be able to make their maintenance a continuous process.

Wherever, the pilot interventions have been carried out in the communities and the pilot projects are working successfully, WASH committees have formed amongst the community members to take care of the operations and maintenance of the water infrastructure facilities created. Typically, such WASH committees have six to eight members, with more representation by the women. The members of the WASH committees have been provided some basic training about different aspects of climate change, operations of the water facilities, administrative matters etc. The WASH committee collects a minor user charge from the members of the community for using the water facilities, to create a fund to take care of the regular repair and maintenance requirements of the water facilities. The project team may facilitate continuation of the collection of user charges and also ensure implementation of such a practice in all the pilot projects. In cases of break downs requiring major repairs the funds are required to be made available by the MWR through the WASH engineers at the district level.

**The sustainability of the project results from the view point of financial risks is considered to be moderately likely.**

## Socio-economic risks

Wherever, adaptive actions have been implemented on the ground, they are expected to create a positive impact not only in terms of availability of water but also in terms of co-benefits like improved health (no water based diseases), savings of time, general hygiene. Due to these reasons there is high level of ownership amongst the communities of the newly created water facilities. There are no socio economic issues associated with the project. **From the view point of socio-economic risks, the sustainability of the project is rated as likely.**

## Institutional and governance risk

There is no institutional and governance risk to sustainability of the project results except for the fact that the institutional framework within the country for implementation of climate change adaptive actions and sustaining them is weak. From the view point of institutional framework and governance risks, the sustainability of the project is **Moderately Likely.**

## Environmental risk

There are practically no negative environmental impacts of the project, other than the minor possibility and impacts due to over exploitation of the ground water resources at some of the locations. **From the view point of environmental risk, sustainability of the project is Likely.**

**At an aggregate level the sustainability of the results of the projects are rated as Moderately Likely.**

# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Summary of results and conclusions

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities to date, is the Project likely to achieve its Immediate Purpose and Development Objectives?**
* **Are there critical issues relating to achievement of project results that have been pending as on date and need immediate attention immediately after MTR?**
* **A commentary is required on the “Expected Situation at the end of the Project” as envisioned at the MTR and recommendations, if any required, for accelerating the pace of work.**
 |

At the time of MTR, the position regarding progress towards results is not good. One of the reasons for not that good situation is the lack of focus, which partly originates from the fact that the PMU is not adequately staffed. PMU needs to be strengthened both in terms of the skill sets and the number of persons. One of the other reasons for not that performance is the problems with the projects results framework. The results framework of the project needs to be modified by including the indicators, targets and activities which are reflective of the intention, title and the objective of the project. For example, the project title and objective clearly indicate the intention to attract private sector investment in the water sector, by a combination of;

* Demonstration by the pilots followed by case studies and dissemination of the results
* Creation of conducive policy and regulatory environment to attract private sector investment

But there are no Outputs / activities for creation of the the conducive policy and regulatory environment to attract private sector investment. Outcome 1 has been restricted to the capacity building of the government officials. Outcome 2 of the project has been restricted to establishment of pilot projects at some of the locations, without any activity to capture the results and its dissemination.

The issue of the need to do corrections in the results framework was raised in the PSC meetings as well, however, the corrective action in this regard is still pending. It is considered that some of the critical actions like correction in the results framework and strengthening of the PMU would be necessary to ensure achievement of the results by the end of the project. The project may include more members in the steering committee to get the required guidance for a variety of stakeholders to ensure achievement of the results of the project in an effective manner.

### Progress towards achievement of the objective and Overall results and ratings

The following Table provides a summary of the ratings for:

a) Progress towards Results

b) Project Objectives

c) Implementation and Adaptive Management

d) Sustainability

**Table 15:** **Mid-term review ratings and achievements summary d out under the project in the e to be reviewed and revised.ures for the yields of differetn rrid out under the project in the e**

| **Main criteria** | **Rating[[12]](#footnote-13)** | **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **NA** | The project, is expected to address climate change induced, impacts on the water sector in Sierra Leone. Due to the impacts of climate change the availability of water (particularly during summer) is reduced.The project has a focus on capacity building for climate resilient decision-making in the water sector and pilot intervention on the ground at the four locations. The project aims to support infrastructure and capacity building both, in the urban setting (Freetown and Guma Valley Reservoir) and in the rural setting (Southern, Northern and Eastern regions). The idea of the project is to attract private sector investment for creation of climate resilient technology based infrastructure facilities for making the water available to the communities. This is to be achieved by creating conducive policy and regulations on one part, while on the other demonstrate the climate resilient technologies at pilot locations. Accordingly, the project is structured around two Outcomes. The first Outcome is focused on the policy and regulatory aspects and the second Outcome is focused on implementation of the pilots at the selected locations. Replication of the pilot projects is to be facilitated by dissemination of the results of the pilots by way of case studies etc. |
| **Progress towards results** |  |  The project objective is to “enhance the adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources”. The indicator provided in the results framework to monitor the progress and achievement of the project objective is “number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability’. Project design has provision to increase the capacity by way of training and other capacity building measures. The work plan for the year 2017 provided for the training of the officials of MWR. Accordingly, the training has been delivered by hiring a consultant.As can be seen from the discussion regarding different Outcomes in the following rows of this Table, the progress towards achievement of the targets for the indicators for project objective is not good. Also, the progress towards results for the two Outcomes of the project is not good. The project team is taking adaptive action (corrective measures to make the non-working pilot projects, work) to overcome the technical challenges coming on the way to achieve the results of Outcome 2. Once the results of the two Outcomes of the project are achieved, the Objectives of the project would also be achieved. |
| **Project Objective** | **MS** |
| **Outcome 1** | **MU** | This Outcome of the project is, “Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector”. Somehow different Outputs (for Outcome 1) and the activities provided in the project design does not support the statement of the Outcome. Also, the indicators for the Outcome 1 as provided in the results framework does not reflect the achievement of the Outcome. Although, there is some progress towards achievement of the target value of the indicators for Outcome 1, the progress towards achievement of results for Outcome 1 is not good. This is considering that for a number of Outputs for Outcome 1 (e.g. dialogues between parliamentarians, local council members, NGOs/CBOs, and private sector on the impacts of climate change on water supply; dialogues under the Sierra Leone Business Forum and WASH Donors Investment Platform; sharing of relevant experiences/lessons from community-oriented climate resilient water infrastructure and management practices) are yet to be carried out.  |
| **Outcome 2** | **MS** | Outcome 2 of the project is, “Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks”. This is to be achieved by implementation of about 31 pilot projects for different technologies (Bore Well, Spring Box, Rainwater Harvesting) to make water available to the communities. For all the pilots / technologies used varies in terms of the source of water (bore well, spring box, rainwater harvesting), but all the pilots invariably involve water pumping to an overhead tank using solar pumps and gravity flow of water from the overhead tank to the taps. Establishment of 12 pilots (out of total 31 planned) has been completed. However, only 5 (out of 12 pilots completed) are working satisfactorily. There are problems, with the rest of the completed pilot projects. The problems include theft of solar panels / pumps, blowing of the solar panels, technical problems with the solar panels / submersible pumps, inadequate water in the bore wells. Work for establishment of other pilots is underway and is at different stages of completion. However, even for the pilots under construction there are visible technical issues and problems.In spite of all these problems with the pilot project, the performance against this Outcome of the project, in terms of the target value of the indicator (5000 additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services) is good. This is largely due to the lower set value of the target (5000/31 = about 160 persons per pilot project). |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** | **MU** | As per the provisions made in the project document, the project board / steering committee is responsible for making management decisions for the project. SC is supposed to play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. These provisions in the project design (as detailed out in the Project Document are not being followed. In actual practise the management of the project is not happening as planned. In this regard it is important to note some of the minutes of the project steering committee meetings as given below;* SC members requested that updates be provided on a monthly basis to them and not just at SC meetings
* that minutes of SC meetings be shared with them in advance of meetings
* the meeting suggested for SC members to be involved in monitoring of project interventions
* that SC members part-take in the review of AWPs
* All TORs prepared for consultancy should be sent to SC members for a review and approval.

The actual project implementation arrangements, are not in line with the provisions in the project design. For example, there are only a few members (from a couple of government departments) in the steering committee. UNDP is supposed to be represented in the SC as the senior supplier, representing the interests of the parties which provide funding (GEF in the present case). However, there is no participation by UNDP (expect the project co-ordinator, which is a project appointee) in the steering committee (expect for the first SC meeting held in 2015 and the SC meeting in 2017). The project was to coordinate closely with public, private and community based stakeholders, however, this is not happening in actual practise. Except with the MWR and district level WASH engineers (from MWR) and the communities where the pilots are being implemented, there is no involvement of other stakeholders.The work planning is carried out on an annual basis. The work plans are prepared based on the outputs (for the two outcomes of the project) and the corresponding set of indicative activities mentioned in the project document. The project document has provided a set of ‘Projected Outputs’ along with the corresponding set of activities for each of the two Outcomes of the project. However, the project design has failed to carry these Outputs (and the corresponding activities) to the results framework for the project. The indicators have been put at the Outcome level and do not necessarily reflect the Outputs (and the corresponding activities) mentioned in the ‘Project Document’. Due to this the project is in a situation where the work planning is being done as per the provisions made in different outputs of the project and the monitoring of the progress is being done as per the projected Outcomes (and the corresponding set of indicators) as in the results framework, in spite of the fact that the indictors in the results framework are not in line with the ‘projected outputs’ of the project. Formal inception of the project happened in November 2015. As per the standard practice for all UNDP implemented projects, Project Implementation Reports (PIR) were required to be prepared for every year. The PIRs for the years 2016 and 2017 (30th June 2017 to 1st July 2017) were prepared. Draft PIR for the year 2018 was also made available during MTR. As there was not much progress in the year 2015, the PIR for 2015 was not prepared. In accordance with the provisions made in the project document, UNDP CO and the regional office makes visits to some of the pilot project sites to assess first hand project progress. The project has not been able to use the results framework of the project and the work plans as management tools, firstly due to the problems with the results framework itself and secondly because not much progress has been made towards actual implementation of the project. Communication is one of the aspects where the project is clearly lacking. The project design has failed to provide for any communication, outreach and dissemination activity as a part of the project.  |
| **Sustainability** | **ML** | There are a number of risks to the achievement of the project results. Such risks include lack of capacity of local and national institutions. The project has already suffered due to some of these risks. However, most of these risks are manageable and the project team has taken steps to mitigate the risks. Wherever the pilot interventions have been carried out in the communities and the pilot projects are working successfully, WASH committees has been formed amongst the community members to take care of the operations and maintenance of the water infrastructure facilities created. As confirmed by the stakeholders during the visits to the pilot projects, the WASH committee collects a minor user charge from the members of the community for using the water facilities, to create a fund to take care of the regular repair and maintenance requirements of the water facilities. The project team may facilitate continuation of the collection of user charges and also ensure implementation of such a practice in all the pilot projects. In cases of break downs requiring major repairs the funds are required to be made available by the MWR through the WASH engineers at the district level.Wherever, adaptive actions (pilot projects to make water available to the communities) have been implemented on the ground, they are expected to create a positive impact not only in terms of availability of water but also in terms of co-benefits like improved health (no water based diseases), savings of time, general hygiene. Due to these reasons there is high level of ownership amongst the communities of the newly created water facilities. There are no socio economic issues associated with the project. As such there is no institutional and governance risk to sustainability of the project results (in terms of the benefits of the pilot projects which has been implemented with positive results). However, at an aggregate level the institutional framework within the country for implementation of climate change adaptive actions and sustaining them is weak. There are practically no negative environmental impacts of the project, other than the minor possibility and impacts due to over exploitation of the ground water resources at some of the locations.  |

### Conclusions

Subsequent to the singing of project document, substantial delays in the start of the project implementation were caused by the protracted impacts of the Ebola crisis. The project team in consultation with the Steering Committee, adjusted the annual work plans by linking the project to ongoing interventions implemented by other partners as part of the Presidential Priorities for Post-Ebola Recovery to maximize delivery and impact of the project.

At the time of MTR, the project is not on track. The reasons include, problems with the results framework of the project and lack of human resources within the PMU, which oversees the implementation of the project.

In order to ensure achievement of the results of the projects, a number of recommendations are being made, which are detailed below.

## Recommendations

**Mid-term review questions (see Annex B)**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Do the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated**
* **Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project; including Specific recommendations on how to expediently mobilize and facilitate the planned activities not completed as on date and activities to be completed during rest of the project implementation period**
 |

**Table 16: Recommendations**

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **Description** | **Responsible Party** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Implement decision of Steering Committee to engage a M&E expert to revise and strengthen the results framework. | As was noted by the project team in the first PIR (PIR for 2016) the log-frame of the project is not able to adequately capture cumulative progress towards reaching the intended objective and outcomes of the project. For instance, the target for the indicator on mainstreaming of adaptation concerns within at least the Guma Reservoir management process under Outcome 1 is limited to the establishment of a climate change resilience plan. As the presence of a plan does not necessarily result in mainstreaming, this target needs to be revised. This issue got discussed during the Project Steering Committee meeting in April 2016 with a decision was taken, that a M&E expert be engaged to revise and strengthen the results framework. Somehow, this decision could not be implemented as yet. It is recommended that this decision of the Steering Committee be implemented and a M&E expert be hired to have a re-look at the result framework, the indicators and the targets. It may be noted that it is possible to make indicator level changes (as well as introduce new indictors) in the Outcomes, with the approval of RTA. However, procedurally it is not possible to change the project objectives and the Outcomes of the projects during the implementation of the project. | UNDP Project Team,UNDP CO,UNDP RTA |
| 2 | Facilitate a consultancy aimed at obtaining insights in the current investment climate, recommend solutions for increased investment and present these to relevant stakeholders | The PIR 2016 of the project pointed out that insufficient investment by the private sector could pose a risk for the longer-term sustainability of the project. The PIR also pointed out that the incentives of the private sector to invest in climate smart technologies will not only depend on increased awareness among key stakeholders of climate risks, but also on Government’s ability to adequately address barriers that may hamper private sector investment (e.g. tax-related issues). The project presently does not adequately address this issue. The PIR 2016 of the project suggested that to mitigate this sustainability risk, the project should facilitate a consultancy aimed at obtaining insights in the current investment climate, recommend solutions for increased investment and present these to relevant stakeholders.” It is recommended that this suggestion contained in PIR 2016 be implemented. | UNDP Project Team |
| 3 | Strengthen capacity of PMU and Steering Committee | The reasons for not good results of the project at the MTR, includes lack of institutional capacity, inadequate staffing of the project implementation team. For management of the project, the project design (as per project document) has provided for a project manager and a ‘project Implementation Unit’(comprising of a project coordinator, technical advisor, M&E expert and volunteers). Against this in actual practice the project is being managed by a lone project coordinator. It is recommended that a project manager is taken on board, who will focus on the work planning, monitoring and ensure timely implementation of different activities. One of the other recommendations is to broad base the structure of the Steering Committee by including members from the local government, NGOs, academic institutions, donor agencies etc. Considering that appointment of the resources may be a time consuming process, the option of bringing on board the UNVs (as provided in the project document) may be explored. | UNDP CO |
| 4 | Customise the design of the pilot project based on the need (population) of the communities | The project design has provided for more or less a uniform design of the water system (borehole size, size of solar panels, pump capacity etc.) for all the locations, accept for the size of the tank, the capacity of the tank depends on the yield of the source as for example for bore holes 20,000 litres tanks are provided. Due to this reason, at some of the locations, where the number of people being served is high, there is a possibility that the water system provided underserves the requirements. There should be some flexibility to allow for a bit of customization in the design to meet the site specific requirements. | UNDP CO |
| 5 | Wherever feasible provide additional facilities like lighting points and community television using the spare capacity of the solar panels and a small storage battery | At some of the pilot locations there is a possibility of availability of spare capacity of solar panels. This may be examined on a case to case basis and wherever feasible, a couple of lighting points and a community television may be provided. A couple of lighting points in the community centre will enable the children to study at night. This will also help the community members to charge their mobile phones. Presently, the community members travel long distances and also pay for getting the mobile phones charged. | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |
| 6 | Facilitate establishment of short term curriculum to ensure availability of trained human resources | From sustainability point of view, it is important to have availability of skilled and trained resources to carry out maintenance and repair of the solar pumping system. The project may facilitate establishment of a short duration curriculum at one of the technical training institutes / university to impart training on operation, repairs and maintenance of the solar water pumping systems. | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |
| 7 | Carry out technical due diligence to identify technical issues and suggest corrective measures at the pilot projects | During the mission it was felt, that at the pilots for making the water available to the communities, there are technical issues due to which the operational efficiency of the systems will get hampered. It is recommended that an independent consultant (or a team of consultants) may be appointed to carryout technical due diligence to identify the technical issues and suggest corrective measures. The issues which may be examined by the consultant (apart for other issues) may include the following:* Orientation of the solar panels (angle and direction and shading from the surrounding trees/ structures)
* Depth of the bore hole (may be restricted to as recorded at the time of drilling of the hole)
* Adequacy of the control system provided for the operation of the pumping system (provision of the start-up capacitor of adequate rating etc.)
* Rated capacity of the submersible pump (including motor) and the solar panels
* Adequacy of the civil structure (construction as per approved drawings, angle of the roof of the control room etc.)
* Layout of the piping network for supplying the water
 | Project Implementation Team |
| 8 | Vendors supplying the water system be made responsible for maintaining the system for initial two years | In case of the problems with the systems, it would not be possible for the communities to get the systems repaired, firstly due to the cost involved and secondly due to lack of availability of the skilled human resources. It is recommended that the vendor responsible for the supply and operationalization of the water system be made responsible for maintaining the system for two years. This can be achieved either by way of a separate maintenance contract or by way of provisions in the original contract of the vendor. | UNDP Project Team |
| 9 | Robust installation of equipment | Review of installation design of the equipment to make it more robust, so that the panels / water tanks do not get blown away and also the theft of the solar panel and the pump system is prevented. This can for example, be achieved by welding the frame of the solar panel to the structure (provided to support the solar panels). For preventing the blowing off of the solar panels / water tanks the space below the solar panels may be covered by brick work. | Project Implementation Team |
| 10 | Carry out the feasibility study to examine the replication using private sector funding | The project has successfully demonstrated the use of technology of solar PV pumping for meeting the water requirements. The community members where, the pilots were carried out are contributing money on a monthly basis to take care of any possible need of expenses to carry out repair and maintenance of the system. It is considered that it may be possible to replicate the interventions by involving either private sector investment or by forming the community groups, which borrow the funds from commercial banks. It is recommended that proper feasibility study be carried out to examine the replication of the business model wherein the ‘Capital Cost’ is provided by the private sector / commercial bank as loan and the revenues comes from a monthly subscription. | Project Implementation Team |
| 11 | Support creation of regulations and regulatory mechanism to have private sector investment in the water sector | In order to ensure smooth operations with the private sector investment in the water sector, it would be necessary to have the regulations (including a regulatory mechanism to determine the charges which can be collected from the households for the water supplied). The project may support development of the regulations (and the mechanism) for getting the private sector investment to implement solar pumping systems for water needs of the communities. | Project Implementation Team, Ministry of Water Resources |
| 12 | Promote private sector investment in the water sector | The project is weak in terms of private sector participation and attracting investment by the private sector. Other than a mention in the project title and at a number of other places in the ‘Project Document’, there is hardly any provision to take the private sector on board. It is recommended that the project include the activities to attract private sector investment in the water sector. | Project Implementation Team |
| 13 | Strengthen the monitoring and reporting activities | The work planning, monitoring and reporting part of the project implementation has gaps and needs to be strengthened. PIR was made available only for the year 2017. It is recommended that the requirements of regular monitoring of the project be complied with | Project Implementation Team, UNDP CO |

# Annex A. Terms of References

**BACKGROUND**

|  |
| --- |
| This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector Participation to manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change (PIMS #4613),* implemented through the Ministry of Water Resources, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the October 2015 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document; *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.  |

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

|  |
| --- |
| **Scope of Work of the MTR**The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions. **1. Project Strategy** *Project Design:* * Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
* Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities
* Review decision-making processes

*Results Framework/ Log-frame:** Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log-frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

**2. Progress Towards Results** * Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** Using the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress: * Management Arrangements
* Work Planning
* Finance and co-finance
* Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
* Stakeholder Engagement
* Reporting
* Communications

**4. Sustainability** * Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:
* Financial risks to sustainability
* Socio-economic risks to sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability

**Conclusions and Recommendations**The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total. **Ratings**The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief description of the associated achievements in a MTR Rating and Achievement Summery Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. |

**D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

|  |
| --- |
| The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit: * MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission.
* Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the commissioning unit
* Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission
* Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the UNDP/EAD within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft

\*The final MTR report must be in English.  |

**Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor**

|  |
| --- |
| **Education**:* A Masters degree in Environment or other closely related field

**Experience*** Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Adaptation
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations
* Experience working in West Africa
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change vulnerability and adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis
* Excellent communication skills
* Demonstrable analytical skills
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
 |

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Completed Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
2. Personal CV or a P11 Personal History form, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. |

# Annex B. Mid term review criteria and questions

| **Contents** | **Review scope (based on the ToR): items and main questions** |
| --- | --- |
| Title pageExecutive SummaryTable of Contents |  |
| 1. **Introduction**
* Problems the projects seek to address
* Short description of the project (objectives, project participants, objectives and outcomes, duration)
* Purpose and approach of the mid-term review; structure of the review report
 |
| 1. **Context**
* Climate Change Impacts and Resilience in Sierra Leone
* UNDP programme in Sierra Leone
 |
| 3. **Findings:** Design and formulation* + Appropriateness and relevance
	+ Quality of design and project formulation (document, logical framework)
 | * Does the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated?
* Is the project logical framework and design still relevant in the light of project experience to date? If not, suggest an approach to propose changes from the project implementation perspective than propose changes to log frame in achieving the anticipated outputs.
* Whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are specific, measurable, achievable, reasonable and time-bounded to achieve desired project outcomes;
 |
| **Findings**: *Progress towards Results*[[13]](#footnote-14),* Outputs

Progress against each outcome, output, activity (including sub-activities) and impact indicators listed in the project document;* Project effectiveness
	+ - Attainment and quality of results;
		- Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results
 | * How does, the progress made compare with the end of the project targets in terms of the indicators of the log-frame for each of the component and outcome of the project.
* How does the the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline compare with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Are there any barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?
* How the benefits of the project can be further expanded
 |
| **Findings:** *implementation and adaptive management* | * + Adaptive management framework:
		- Are the project management arrangements adequate?
 |
| * Implementation and efficiency:
	+ Project *management arrangements*
	+ Strategic partnerships and *stakeholder engagement*
	+ *Work planning*
	+ *Reporting*
	+ *Communications*
	+ Financial plan with budget allocation, timeliness of disbursements, procurement; table of planned and realized GEF *finance and co-financing*;
 | * + - How effectively is the project managed at all levels? Is it results-based and innovative?
		- How about the changes made to project implementation arrangement during the project implementation, if applicable? Have they impacted the project in a positive way?
		- How does the Project Management Unit (PMU) and The Executing Agency work with its partners especially stakeholders in the country? If there were problems:
			* identify those along with their causes
			* how do those affect the performance of activities at the national level against the delivery of target outputs?
			* What are the plans of the PMU in stimulating the interest and cooperation of its target partners?
		- Recommendations from the MTR Team of how to address those during rest of project implementation period.
		- Is technical assistance and support received from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely?
		- How is the committed co-financing for the project being used by PMU? Report the co-financing details in the format as suggested in the ToR;
		- Whether the use of consultants has been successful in achieving component outputs
		- Assess the use of the project logical framework and work plans as management tools and in meeting with UNDP-GEF requirements in planning and reporting.
		- How does the APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?
		- How does the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operating as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making?
		- Assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project.
* Project positioning and leveraging:
* Asses how project partners, stakeholders and co-financing institutions are involved in the Project’s adaptive management framework.
* Identify opportunities for stronger collaboration and substantive partnerships to enhance the project’s achievement of results and outcomes.
* Are the project information and progress of activities disseminated to project partners and stakeholders? Are there areas to improve in the collaboration and partnership mechanisms?
 |
| * **Findings:** *Sustainability*
	+ Financial risks
	+ Socio-economic risks
	+ Institutional and governance
	+ Environmental
 | * Validate whether the risks originally identified in the project document and, currently in the APR/PIRs are reasonable? And their risk rating in terms of most critical is reasonable?
* Describe additional risks identified during the review, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
* Is the project implementation and achievement of results proceeding well and according to plan, or are there any outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. on the implementation of demonstration projects, government or private sector or the captive power industry as a whole affecting the successful implementation and achievement of project results?
 |
| **4 Conclusions*** Conclusions
	+ Progress towards achievement of the objective
	+ Overall results and ratings
* Lessons learned
 | * Progress towards achievement of results
	+ Given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities to date, is the Project likely to achieve its Immediate Purpose and Development Objectives?
	+ Are there critical issues relating to achievement of project results that have been pending as on date and need immediate attention immediately after MTR?
	+ A commentary is required on the “Expected Situation at the end of the Project” as envisioned at the MTR and recommendations, if any required, for accelerating the pace of work;
* Lessons learned, if any, in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5. Recommendations*** Strategic recommendations to achieve the result’s target
* Actions for follow-up
 | * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives:
	+ Do the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated
* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project; including Specific recommendations on how to expediently mobilize and facilitate the planned activities not completed as on date and activities to be completed during rest of the project implementation period
 |

# Annex C. Documents ReVIEWED

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 Project Document |  |
|  | Council Approval |
|  | CEO Endorsement |
|  | Environment and Social Screening |
|  | Final Project Document |
|  | Signed Project Document |
|  | Project Inception Report |
| 02 PIRs and Annual Reports |
|  | 2016 PIR |
|  | 2017 PIR |
|  | 2018 PIR |
|  | Annual Progress Report 2017 |
| 03 Work Plans |  |
|  | AWP 2015 |
|  | AWP 2016 |
|  | AWP 2017 |
|  | AWP 2018 |
|  | Work Plan July 2018 to Dec 2019 |
| 04 Quarterly Reports |  |
|  | Q1 2016 |
|  | Q2 2016 |
|  | Q3 2016 |
|  | Q1 2017  |
|  | Q2 2017  |
|  | Q3 2017  |
|  | Q4 2017  |
|  | Q2 2018  |
| 05 SC Minutes |  |
|  | 01 Minute of the Steering Committee Meeting 2015 |
|  | 02 Minute of the Second Steering Committee Meeting March 2016 |
|  | 03 Minute of the Steering Committee Meeting held in September 2017 |
|  | 04 Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting help in January 2018 |
| 06 Outcome 1 related |  |
|  | FINAL REPORT hydrology Italy |
|  | INCEPTION REPORT Hydro NovaLL |
|  | Output 1.a Capacity Assessment Report- INTEGEM- 27July 2018 |
|  | Output 1.a INTEGEMS INCEPTION REPORT - Final v02 13DEC 2017 |
|  | Output 1.a UNDP INTEGEMS CCRM Contract |
|  | Output 1.a INTEGEMS Validation Workshop Report |
|  | Output 1.a INTEGEMS Report in Climate Change Risk Management |
|  | Output 1.a INTEGEMS Climate Change Risk Management for the Water Sector |
|  | Output 1.a INTEGEMS Training Manual in Climate Change Risk Management |
|  | Output 1.b CC Adaptation GUMA Action Plan |
|  | Output 1.b Guma Climate Change and Emergency Plan Final Report |
| 07 Outcome 2 related |  |
|  | Status of Pilots 17 Aug 2018 |
|  | WASH Community Training Report |
| 08 CDRs |  |
|  | CDR Q4 2016 |
|  | CDR Yr. 2016 |
|  | Q2 CDR 2017 |
| 09 Back to Office Report |  |
|  | BTOR Kambia Kono Pujehun visit to borehole sites April |
|  | BTOR Kambia-Kono-Pujehun visit to borehole sites in May Month |
|  | Kambia-Kono-Pujehun visit to borehole sites April |
|  | Mission BTOR Kambia-Kono- visit to borehole sites with MTR Consultants |
|  | Mission BTOR Kambia-Kono-Pujehun visit to borehole sites |
|  | Mission BTOR Kambia-Kono-Pujehun visit to borehole sites sept'17 |
|  | Mission First BTOR Kambia-Kono- visit to borehole sites with REGIONAL Officers |

# Annex D. List of persons interviewed, mission agenda and itinerary

| **Date** | **Visits / Persons Meet** |
| --- | --- |
| 23/07/2018 | Ms. Tanzila Sankoh, Programme Specialist- Environment Cluster, United Nations Development Programme, Sierra Leone |
|  | Mr. Samuel G Doe, Country Director, UNDP, Sierra Leone |
|  |   |
| 24/07/2018 | Mr. Sam Goba, Project Coordinator, UNDP Water Project |
|  | Mr. Muyeye Chambwera, Technical Specialist, UNDP Regional Office, Ethiopia |
|   | Mrs. Ranita Koroma, (SUNITA, Consultant for Training of WASH Committees) |
|   | Samuel Kamara (EPA - Member of the Steering Committee) |
|  |   |
| 25/07/2018 | Travel to Kambia |
|   | Ing Sallu Bundu, WASH District Engineer, Kambia |
| 26/07/2018 |   |
|  | Visit to under construction Bore well at Kolenten, Sr. Sec School, Kambia |
|   | Visit to Bore Well based Pilot project and meeting with communities at Chiefdom Tonko Limbe Section Bubuya community KARGBOTO, Kambia |
|   | Visit to Masungbalah Community Gbalanthalan, Medical Centre based pilot project, Kambia |
|   | Pilot project at Bomoi Lumah Community, Kambia |
|  |   |
| 27/07/2018 | Travel to Kona district |
|  |   |
| 28/07/2018 | Visit to under construction Bore well at Ghesseh Chiefdom, Moindeseh Section, Town Borona, Kono district |
|   | Visit to a non-functional Bore well based pilot project at School (panels and pump Slolen) |
|   | Meeting with WASH engineer (Mr. Umaru Turay), Kono District |
|   | Meeting with the Civil Contractor (Mr. Harold Gollay) carrying out the work at Aodel Secondary School, Kaidu City, Kono District |
| ,  | Meeting with the School Principal , Aodel Secondary School, Kaidu City, Kono District |
|   |   |
| 29/ 07/2018 | Travel to Panjum District |
|   | Visit to the Bore well based under construction pilot project at the market place |
|   | Visit to non-working bore well based pilot project at Koramko Town |
|   |   |
| 30/07/2018 | Visit to Spring Box Based under construction pilot project |
|   | Visit to rain water harvesting based pilot project in the school |
|   |   |
| 31/07/2018 | Travel Back to Freetown |
|   |   |
| 01/08/2018 | Meeting with the Vendor supplying Solar Systems  |
|   |   |
| 02/08/18 | Data Analysis, Preparation of Presentation of Initial Findings |
|   |   |
| 03/08/18 | Presentation of Initial Findings |

# Annex F. Rating Scale Definitions

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/out come can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation &Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

# Annex G. Consultants Code of Conduct Form

Evaluators/reviewers:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation/reviewer Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Dinesh Aggarwal

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Noida, India



21st November 2018

# Annex H. Audit Trail (Annexed in a Separate File)

| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR team response and actions taken** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Audit Trail is being submitted as a separate file

# Annex I. Signed MTR Report Clearance form’

 (to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-G

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. HS: Highly Satisfactory, S: Satisfactory, MS: Moderately Satisfactory, MU: Marginally Unsatisfactory, U: Unsatisfactory, HU: Highly Unsatisfactory, L: Likely, ML: Moderately Likely, MU: Moderately Unlikely, U: Unlikely [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Project-Level Monitoring: Guidance for Conducting Mid-term Reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects (UNDP, 2014), Also taking into account elements of the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects (UNDP, 2012) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Based on the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. As per project document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Indicator Assessment Key:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= Ongoing activities | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Indicator Assessment Key:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. HS= Highly satisfactory, S= Satisfactory, MS= Moderately Satisfactory, MU= Marginally Unsatisfactory, U= Unsatisfactory, HU= Highly Unsatisfactory [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Periodic CDRs for the projectn USD).uirements of the funds for differetn Complied from the data in the project documentdocument from the data in the projec n the communication activities. ject. n utputs (and the activities) as mentioned in he proj [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. This is marked as grants in the project document, but the discussions with the project team reveled that it is the regular budget provisions of the MWR [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Based on the PIR for the year 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. It is important to note that although the project team has identified this as one of the risks, the project design has not provided for any private sector investment and any efforts to attract the private sector investment. Thus, this is not a not risk towards implementation of the project and the results of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. HS: Highly Satisfactory, S: Satisfactory, MS: Moderately Satisfactory, MU: Marginally Unsatisfactory, U: Unsatisfactory, HU: Highly Unsatisfactory, L: Likely, ML: Moderately Likely, MU: Moderately Unlikely, U: Unlikely [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. The underlined items in this table refer to the UNDP review **criteria** of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results, Sustainability; The items in *italics* refer to the main areas of focus, as mentioned in the UNDP (2014) mid-term review guide. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)