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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**The Project**

The UNDP/GEF project on *Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) / Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration Project for Sub-Saharan Africa (PIMS 3362)* was a Medium-Sized Project carried out in the NEX modality. UNDP was the GEF Implementing Agency and the Executing Agency was the Botswana Department of Water Affairs (DWA). However, project implementation and management on the ground were entrusted to the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS) on behalf of DWA.

Funding for the project, as described in the Project Document, reached a total of US$12.795 million of which, US$975,000 was provided by the GEF. The ProDoc was signed in December 2008 but implementation only commenced in December 2009 and was planned to run for three years until December 2012. However, in practice there were delays and extensions were sought and granted with the project finally closing in April 2013.

The project, which addressed the severe water shortage in Botswana and the Southern Africa region, had the following scope:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT** | **SALIENT PRODUCTS TARGETED** |
| **MAIN PRODUCT** | **CONTRIBUTING PRODUCTS** |
| **Immediate Objective:** To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning | Efficient and equitable IWRM planning | * National processes
* Institutional mechanisms
* Regional knowledge management processes
 |
| **Outcome 1:** A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and transboundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources | Dynamic IWRM Plan | * National and transboundary water priorities
* Global objectives integrated
* Multiple uses balanced
 |
| **Outcome 2.** Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector, and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives | Increased awareness and capacity | * At National level
* And Regional level
* Engagement in IWRM
* Regional knowledge management
 |
| **Outcome 3:** Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Reuse and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation | Conjunctive use of grey-water … and harvested rainwater | * Water conservation
 |

**The Evaluation**

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the UNDP/GEF project on*Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) / Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration Project for Sub-Saharan Africa (PIMS 3362)*[[1]](#footnote-1) whichis carried out according to the policies of both UNDP and the GEF which require such an evaluation in the closing stages of a project. It is also in accordance with the monitoring and evaluation policy and principles of the GEF and UNEG and is carried out for the benefit of the key stakeholders including the GEF as the main source of funding, UNDP as the Implementing Agency and the Government as the prime beneficiary. The evaluation provides a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and serves as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints.

The methodology employed in this evaluation was planned and described in the Inception Report which was presented in the early stages of the mission. Two basic tools were used in the search for primary data and information – firstly documents review, secondly face-to-face consultations. Face-to-face meetings were the preferred method of consultation and were carried out with a wide catchment of stakeholders. Twenty-six persons were met and consulted in all. The scope of consultations ranged from UNDP and project management personnel (34%), Government (27%), beneficiaries at community level (27%), private sector (4%), and others (8%).

Following the gathering of data and information, the evaluation focused on analysis, discussion and drafting and a draft version of the report was delivered to UNDP to be released for comments. The draft was refined to reflect comments received, and this final report produced.

**Key Findings and Conclusions**

**Project design and relevance** The project went through a very long gestation period and there were at least two versions of the ProDoc which were significantly different. The implemented version of the ProDoc did not include consideration of risks, stakeholders and upscaling/replication which appeared in the earlier version. There was also little consideration of gender and other UNDP corporate goals. The LogFrame was also incomplete since it lacked Indicators for the Objective, Baselines, Targets and Risks. The project relied on partners to achieve its transboundary dimension and this turned out to be very risky. In the event, the project was delayed, and by the time it got going the co-financing was not available anymore and the important transboundary/regional element of the project suffered. However, even with these design flaws, the project was still extremely relevant to Botswana and the region where water is a scarce resource and IWRM provides a more intelligent approach to water management.

The project was also relevant to GEF and its International Waters goals since in Botswana, with minor exceptions, surface waters originate beyond the borders and are shared with neighbours. In other words, IWRM in Botswana is of direct relevance to the Okavango, Orange-Sengu, Limpopo and Zambesi River Basin countries

**Project implementation efficiency** The project governance structure and performance were excellent. They reflected the high level of ownership on the part of the Government, DWA in particular. The PSC, together with the TAG, performed well and effectively, the former at the policy level and the latter at the technical level, complementing each other. By getting KCS to execute the project and host the PMU, the Government placed the PMU virtually within the secretariat of the Botswana CWP, and right at the centre of the on-going water sector reforms. At the same time DWA remained fully engaged through its chairing of the PSC and the secondment of the Project Technical Coordinator to the PMU.

Project management suffered from the early resignation of the PM and although adequate hand-over notes were prepared, the project finished without an exit strategy or a terminal report. The project also came at a difficult time for the UNDP Country Office. Its performance, particularly its funds management and disbursements process, was described to the evaluator as “*chaotic*”. Delays in processing disbursement requests resulted in the loss of pledged co-finance and the negation of the transboundary dimension. The project was saved because KCS stepped into the breach with cash advances. Government co-financing was substantial (including a full-time secondment of the Technical Coordinator to the project, a project vehicle and its running costs, and some capital investments required at demonstration sites). In addition, valiant provision of bridging finance was made available by KCS to overcome the slow release of funds by UNDP. However, the evaluator does not have confidence in the management of co-financing – recording was not methodical so the delivered amounts are not known, co-financing was lost through the delays in project start-up, and PIR2012 considered reporting and management of co-financing as *a significant challenge*.

**Project results and effectiveness** The project Objective sought *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* through national processes, institutional mechanisms, and regional knowledge management processes. It is difficult to determine explicitly whether *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* had been obtained by the project, but an IWRM Plan has been produced and endorsed by the Minister and it serves as a strong foundation for the type of planning targeted by the Objective. In its work towards developing the Plan, the project did strengthen *national processes and institutional mechanisms* in Botswana and these played a crucial role in the development of the Plan. It is not easy to determine whether this has supported and contributed to *regional knowledge management processes* and from what has been presented to the evaluator this seems unlikely, at least at this stage.

At the Outcome level, in spite of difficulties and lack of collaboration between the national and international consultant, the prime target of Outcome 1, namely the IWRM Plan, has been achieved. Likewise for the products of Outcome 3 – the pilot projects on greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting have been carried out at school level, albeit with mixed success. However, it is not known whether the results have been assessed, refined and written up for replication.

Outcome 2 reflected the transboundary dimension of the project which was reliant to a high degree on co-financing partners. In the event, project delays caused the loss of the co-financing and activities which were to be carried out by the partners. The delays also meant that the opportunity for the project to make a “*significant contribution to the existing and on-going regional efforts to develop IWRM Plans ….. in the Sub-Saharan Africa region*” disappeared because other countries had moved on.

The project carried out numerous awareness raising and capacity enhancing activities involving many participants; but there has not been any assessment or measure of the results achieved and these remain unknown.

**Sustainability** The project has been successful in producing an IWRM Plan which has been accepted by the Government. But while the plan is a satisfactory result, it is not the impact sought – it is merely the foundation upon which Botswana is going to manage its precious and scarce water resources. In other words, the work is just beginning. Likewise, the project has piloted and demonstrated successful techniques for greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting. However, pilots and demonstrations are not results – results are obtained through the upscaling and replication of the pilots. This is why the sustainability of the project products, services and benefits beyond the life of the project, is so crucial. It is not known if an assessment and recording of what the project tested and produced has been carried out.

The project needed an effective exit strategy or sustainability plan to safeguard its achievements and see them transformed into impacts. Unfortunately, this project did not have an Exit Strategy in spite of one being explicitly required by the Memorandum of Agreement between KCS and DWA.

**Overall conclusion on the project** This has been a modest project which set about to establish a solid foundation for managing Botswana’s scarce water resources in a pilot/demonstration that was going to be presented for emulation by the regional neighbours. In the event, it was assailed by delays in start-up which caused it to lose some of its co-financing. It also rendered its demonstration function almost redundant because the neighbours had developed their own IWRM Plans by then. The project was also affected by the difficulties that seemed to face the UNDP Country Office at the time, particularly with disbursements, and it survived only as a result of the strong ownership by the DWA and the commitment of the KCS. There were times when the PMU had no GEF money to implement any activities and what kept up the momentum was the implementation of demonstration activities, awareness raising activities and the IWRM Road Show which were largely financed by the government.

Significant progress was made towards the Objective and two out of the three Outcomes were achieved satisfactorily. The other Outcome was only partly achieved and suffered from the loss of the co-financing partners and the reduced relevance to the region.

The project was unusual for a GEF International Waters project because it was very much a country project rather than a transboundary one. However, even with the reduction of its explicit transboundary and regional elements, the project was still very much within the goals and objectives of the GEF-IW theme. This is because in Botswana, with minor exceptions, all surface waters have a transboundary character and integrated water resources planning and management in Botswana is of great relevance to the countries that share the river basins of the Okavango, Orange-Sengu, Limpopo and Zambezi.

**Recommendations[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**7.1 Issue: Water conservation in schools**

The six school pilot projects have had mixed results and a strong influence appears to have been the lack of a central policy from the Ministry of Education which could provide guidance and incentives for schools to conserve water.

**Recommendation:**

That UNDP, in collaboration with DWA, explore how best the Ministry of Education can develop and implement a policy for water conservation (including wastewater treatment and reuse) in schools possibly incorporating renewable energy.

**7.2 Issue: Water information management across the region**

For a number of reasons, the project was not able to fully achieve its target of information management at the transboundary regional level. And yet this is essential because in a country like Botswana, the water resources of one transboundary river basin could be protected at the cost of another transboundary river basin. The need for this has already been identified by SADC which, in its Regional Strategic Action Plan (RSAP III) has listed a Water Information Sharing Hub as a programme activity.

**Recommendation:**

That DWA, with the assistance of UNDP if required, collaborate with SADC and its members, to build a metadatabase of Regional Water Information Management, based on its Programme 4.5 in its RSAP III. Such an information management system will not replace individual databases that may exist at country level or among the River Basin Organizations. On the contrary, these individual databases will be nurtured and supported and the Regional Water Information Management System will create access and sharing links between them.

**7.3 Issue: GEF IW Tracking Tool**

The current format of the GEF IW Tracking Tool template focuses heavily on transboundary agreements, institutional set up and regional level (multi-country) actions, and is not really relevant to a project like this in spite of its valuable transboundary benefits. With a number of NAPs being produced with GEF investment and with SAP/NAP implementation increasingly including IWRM Plan development and implementation, it would be more helpful for project monitoring and for terminal evaluations if the GEF IW Tracking Tool template can be revised to capture these national level actions that yield transboundary benefits.

**Recommendation:**

That UNDP make representations to the GEF to revise the IW Tracking Tool template to enable it to capture national level actions that yield transboundary benefits.

**1 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Purpose of the evaluation[[3]](#footnote-3)**

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility (UNDP/GEF) project on*Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) / Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration Project for Sub-Saharan Africa (PIMS 3362)[[4]](#footnote-4).*

The TE is carried out according to the policies of both UNDP and the GEF which require such an evaluation in the closing stages of a project. It is carried out for the benefit of the key stakeholders including the GEF as the main source of funding, UNDP as the Implementing Agency and the Government as the prime beneficiary.

The Terminal Evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and serves as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation set about attempting to provide answers to the following questions:

* Did the project identify and respond to a real need in Botswana and the region? Did it respond to the objectives of the GEF? (= relevance and design)
* Did it do it well? (= efficiency)
* Did it achieve the targeted results? (= effectiveness)
* Are the results sustainable? (= sustainability)

According to the ToRs (Annex 1), the objectives of the TE were to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

**1.2 Scope and methodology**

**1.2.1 The GEF monitoring and evaluation principles**

In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation policy of the GEF[[5]](#footnote-5), this evaluation has been guided by, and has applied, the following principles:

**Independence**  The Evaluator is independent and has not been engaged in the Project activities, nor was he responsible in the past for the design, implementation or supervision of the project.

**Impartiality** The Evaluator endeavoured to provide a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the project. The evaluation process has been impartial in all stages and has taken into account all the views received from stakeholders.

**Transparency** The Evaluator conveyed in as open a manner as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of the findings. This evaluation report aims to provide transparent information on its sources, methodologies and approach.

**Disclosure**  This report serves as a mechanism through which the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation are disseminated to policymakers, operational staff, beneficiaries, the general public and other stakeholders.

**Ethical** The Evaluator has respected the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and the sources of specific information and opinions in this report are not disclosed except where necessary and then only after confirmation with the consultee.

**Competencies and Capacities** The credentials of the Evaluator in terms of his expertise, seniority and experience as required by the terms of reference (Annex 1) are provided in Annex 2; and methodology for the assessment of results and performance is described below (section 1.3).

**Credibility** This evaluation has been based on data and observations which are considered reliable and dependable with reference to the quality of instruments and procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret information.

**Utility** The Evaluator strived to be as well-informed as possible and this ensuing report is considered as relevant, timely and as concise as possible. In an attempt to be of maximum benefit to stakeholders, the report presents in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings and issues, conclusions and recommendations.

Furthermore, the rights and confidentiality of informants have been protected to the extent possible as required by the UNEG Guidelines[[6]](#footnote-6).

**1.2.2 Evaluation dimensions**

The evaluation commenced in mid-September 2013, a full five months after project closure.

I travelled to Gaborone, and after a transit stop in Johannesburg to meet with the UNDP/GEF RTA and the past Project Manager, I arrived on 18 September 2013. In addition to Gaborone, I also visited project localities in Shoshong, Francistown and Letlhakane and met with project local stakeholders and beneficiaries.

I then consolidated my notes and data and prepared and delivered my Preliminary Findings on 27 September 2013. The mission ended the next day.

The draft report was delivered on 12 October and comments were invited until 31 October. Comments were received from four individuals and organizations and all were taken into account fully in the production of the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report which was delivered on 07 November 2013.

A detailed schedule and time line for the entire evaluation assignment is in Annex 3.

**1.2.3 Evaluation criteria, performance standards and questions**

The evaluation assessed project performance against the following criteria and standards and sought answers to the questions[[7]](#footnote-7) in the following table:

**Table 1. Evaluation scope and dimensions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **DESCRIPTORS** | **QUESTIONS** |
| Relevance | Project design as a tool to address identified threats and barriers | * Does the project reflect the needs of Botswana and the region?
 |
| Alignment of project with GEF global priorities | * Is the project in line with the relevant GEF Operational Programme and strategic priorities?
 |
| Efficiency | Managerial efficiency (execution) | * Has the project been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates?
* Have UNDP, DWA and other partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
* Did the project implementation place an undue burden on some partners?
* Have the Risks been avoided or mitigated?
 |
| Programmatic efficiency (implementation) | * Were the project resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?
* Was monitoring and backstopping by UNDP adequate?
 |
| Issues at implementation and corrective action | * What issues emerged during implementation?
* What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
 |
| Effectiveness and Impact | Progress towards the project Objective and Outcomes | * Did the project implementation across all its activities contribute to progress toward the stated Outcomes and Objective?
 |
| Sustainability  | Design for sustainability | * Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?
 |
| Sustainability strategy | * Have the heirs to the project been identified and prepared?
 |
| Up-scaling of pilot initiatives and replication | * Was a plan for up-scaling and replicating of pilot initiatives, if successful, prepared?
 |

According to GEF guidance[[8]](#footnote-8), when rating the project’s outcomes, *relevance* and *effectiveness* were considered as critical criteria – satisfactory performance on relevance and effectiveness was essential to satisfactory performance overall. This means that the overall project rating could not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness.

**1.3 Approach and Methodology**

**1.3.1 The basis for evaluation**

The basis for a terminal evaluation is the ProDoc which is the signed contract for delivery of certain agreed results, products and services. Signatories bind themselves through the ProDoc and are accountable on that basis. As noted by GEF, “*the results framework included in the project appraisal document submitted to the GEF for approval/endorsement by the CEO establishes project outcome expectations. At the time of project completion, these ex-ante expectations generally form a yard stick for assessment of outcome achievements*.”[[9]](#footnote-9) In particular, the Logical Framework Matrix (LogFrame) or Strategic Results Framework captures the essence of the ProDoc and the project.

As discussed further below, the LogFrame for this project was weak and incomplete and in spite of attempts by the implementers to overcome this through the PIRs, the assessment of progress towards the Objective and Outcomes by this evaluation was challenging.

**1.3.2 The approach adopted**

The evaluation process comprised three phases. The first phase was one of data and information gathering. It started with a review of relevant documents made available electronically by UNDP and the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS). In addition, relevant websites were also visited and studied. Before I arrived in Botswana I was briefed by the UNDP/GEF RTA and the past Project Manager in Pretoria. Soon after my arrival in-country, I received extensive briefings and additional documentation. Following this, I embarked on a broad programme of consultations with key stakeholders including at the local level at representative project locations. The aim was to capture as broad a catchment of views and opinions as possible within the time available.

The second phase focused on analysis, discussion and drafting. This phase started with the presentation of Preliminary Findings to key stakeholders as available. Following the end of the mission, the work continued from home base and this phase concluded with the production of a draft version of the report which was forwarded to UNDP to be released for comments. It was distributed widely and four sets of submissions/comments were received.

The third and final phase refined the draft in the light of the comments received, and produced this final report. Information provided in the comments received was used substantially in revising the draft and where there was a difference of opinion between the comment and the original text, this has been acknowledged in a footnote.

Guidance provided by GEF and UNDP was adhered to in undertaking this terminal evaluation. Also, as noted in the Acknowledgements, the evaluator benefited greatly from the wide spectrum of views, opinions and advice that he received during the course of his work.

**1.3.3 Data collection**

Two basic tools were used in the search for primary data and information – firstly documents review, secondly face-to-face consultations. Face-to-face meetings were the preferred method of consultation and were carried out with a wide catchment of stakeholders. Triangulation was used to ensure that empirical evidence collected from one source, for example documentation such as reports, was validated from other sources, for example through interviews. If the information was not available in document form but only from consultations, the evaluator sought to corroborate opinions expressed and information given, by posing the same questions to more than one consultee. Anecdotal evidence was taken into account only if in the judgment of the evaluator the information was important and the source was considered reliable. In such cases, the possible limitations of this information have been noted.

The Terms of Reference provided the usual initial list of documents for review, and the response to the evaluator’s request for additional documents was in most cases swift by both UNDP and the KCS. References to documentation are noted in this report, in most cases in footnotes. The full list of documents reviewed and/or consulted is in Annex 5 which also contains a short list of the websites that were visited and reviewed.

Twenty-six persons were met and consulted in all. The scope of consultations ranged from UNDP and project management personnel (34%), Government (27%), beneficiaries at community level (27%), private sector (4%), and others (8%).

Interview protocols were described in the Evaluation Inception Report and most meetings followed the same pattern, namely, a brief introduction on the purpose of the mission followed by an identification of the relationship that the consultee had with the project, if any, and his/her views on the project. Particular emphasis was placed on whether the consultee felt that the project had achieved its Objectives, whether it had done this effectively and as required, and whether the project’s products and benefits were likely to be sustainable (= the basic evaluation questions). The evaluator gave an undertaking that the sources of information will not be disclosed unless this was important for the report and in such cases, only with the agreement of the source.

The approach adopted did not rely on sampling and all who could be interviewed and wished to be interviewed were interviewed. The methodology was confirmed as culturally sensitive and appropriate by UNDP and DWA and the reliability of the information received is not in question. The spread of interviewees, across genders and circumstances, served to enhance the validity of the information obtained.

A full list of persons met and consulted by the evaluator is to be found in Annex 6.

**1.3.4 Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation**

The approach normally adopted by the evaluator is participatory and inclusive, based on an effective dialogue with stakeholders particularly those who had implemented the project and those who had benefited from the project. This was not possible to the same extent as usual on this occasion because the project had ended some five months earlier and stakeholders had moved on. However, and in spite of this drawback, templates designed specifically by the evaluator were still provided to KCS and the past Project Manager, with guidance on how they were to be completed. They covered aspects such as budgets and financial management, monitoring and adaptive management, and self-assessment of progress towards the project Outcomes and targets. Past project personnel also accompanied the evaluator on visits to project localities and consultations but did not participate.

The above and other efforts aimed to make this a shared exercise rather than one imposed from outside the project. However, while the data gathering was carried out in a participatory manner, the analysis and the conclusions reached and the recommendations made, represent the independent views of the evaluator alone.

**1.3.5 Evaluation boundaries and limitations**

Some difficulties may have been created by the fact that the project had closed some five months prior to the evaluation, project staff had moved on and the stakeholders had started to dedicate their energies and attention to new and other interventions. Although the Project Manager kindly made himself available for consultation, he was now in another demanding position, in Pretoria, and therefore not as available as an incumbent Project Manager would be. Likewise, the PSC had ceased to exist after the formal closure of the project in April 2013, however, many of the PSC members were still able to be consulted.

While posing some challenges, particularly in assessing efficiencies in project implementation, these difficulties were overcome with the help and support of the KCS, DWA and UNDP and did not constitute limitations on the evaluation. The evaluator is confident that these did not influence in any significant way the ultimate information that was obtained, the analysis carried out and the findings obtained.

**1.3.6 Data analysis**

The information and data obtained were first recorded as they arose and then collated according to the major divisions of this report which reflect the evaluation questions. The discussion which followed encompassed the range of opinion obtained and the consensus recorded, if any. Conclusions were then drawn on factual evidence and/or the balance of opinion in the search for answers to the evaluation questions. Often, preliminary assessments were shared with stakeholders in an attempt to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The presentation of Preliminary Findings at the end of the mission normally serves as the best opportunity for such an exchange. However, in the current evaluation, the presentation of Preliminary Findings had limited attendance due to national holidays in Botswana.

The draft report was distributed by UNDP with an invitation for comments over a two week period. All the comments were analysed and a detailed audit trail has been kept. This final report was produced taking into account all the comments received.

**1.3.7 The rating system**

GEF guidance requires certain project aspects to be addressed by a terminal evaluation and a commentary, analysis and rating is required for each of:

Project concept and design

Stakeholder participation in project formulation

Implementation approach

Monitoring and evaluation

Stakeholder participation

Attainment of Outcomes and achievement of Objective

These aspects, which form the framework of the core sections of this report, are augmented as considered necessary to also address issues that arose during the evaluation.

Each of the aspects has been rated separately with brief justifications based on findings. In addition, various other project elements have also been rated, as has the project as a whole.

The standard GEF rating system was applied, namely:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings

**Unsatisfactory (U):** The project had major shortcomings

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings

The rating of various elements of the project is necessarily subjective but it is carried out according to GEF guidance and ethics, and based on the experience of the evaluator. A score of Highly Satisfactory is not common (around 4%)[[10]](#footnote-10) since it can only be applied in situations which are exceptional and where no improvement is possible. At the other end of the scale, a score of Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) is also not common (1%) and the greater part of projects and project elements are rated in the Satisfactory (S) to Moderately Satisfactory (MS) quartile (76%).

**1.4 Structure of this report**

The evaluator made an effort to keep this report brief, to the point and easy to understand. It is made up of four substantive parts guided by the structure and scope in the ToRs (Annex 1) which reflect GEF generic guidance[[11]](#footnote-11) and is according to the standards established by UNEG[[12]](#footnote-12).

Following the executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report, the first part provides the introduction and the background to the assignment. It starts with the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. This is followed by a brief introduction to the project.

The next part is the main substantive part of this report and comprises four inter-related sections. It presents the findings of the evaluation exercise in terms of the basic project concept and design, its implementation, administration and management, its achievements, results and impacts, and the potential for sustainability of the products and services that it produced. The findings are based on factual evidence obtained by the evaluator through document reviews and consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The third part is the conclusions section which gathers together a summary of the ratings given and conclusions that had been reached throughout the rest of the report and augments them to create a cohesive ending arising from the investigation. This section in turn leads to the final section comprising the recommendations.

A number of annexes provide supplementary information.

**2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

**2.1 The project that is being evaluated**

The UNDP/GEF *Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) / Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration Project for Sub-Saharan Africa (PIMS 3362)* was a Medium-Sized Project carried out in the NEX modality (now known as NIM – National Implementation Modality). UNDP was the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) and the Executing Agency (EA) was the Department of Water Affairs (DWA). However, project implementation and management on the ground were entrusted to the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS) on behalf of DWA. In accordance with UNDP operational and financial guidelines and procedures, DWA was accountable to UNDP for the delivery of agreed outputs as per agreed project work plans, for financial management, and for ensuring cost-effectiveness.

Funding for the project, as described in the Project Document, reached a total of US$12.795 million of which, US$975,000 was provided by the GEF. The ProDoc was signed in December 2008 but implementation only commenced in December 2009 and was planned to run for three years until December 2012. However, in practice there were delays and extensions were sought and granted as in the following table.

**Table 2. Milestones and status of the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MILESTONES** | **DATE** |
| Project Document signed | 22 December 2008 |
| Inception workshop | 16 June 2009 |
| First disbursement | 09 December 2009 |
| MoA between DWA and KCS signed | 19 December 2009 |
| Original planned project closure  | 12 December 2011 |
| Revised closure date (PIR2010) | 30 September 2013 |
| Revised closure according to PIR2011 | February 2013 |
| Revised closure according to PIR2012 | April 2013 |
| Revised closure according to PIR2013 | 31 March 2013 |
| Actual project closure | 20 April 2013 |
| First Terminal Evaluation | April/August 2013 |
| This Terminal Evaluation | Sept/Oct 2013 |

At the policy and strategic level the project was guided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) which monitored progress in project implementation, provided strategic and policy guidance, and reviewed and approved work plans and budgets. The PSC is discussed further in section 4.1.

A Project Management Unit (PMU), headed by the Project Manager (PM), was responsible for day-to-day management of project implementation – this is discussed in further detail in section 4.2.

**2.2 The project context and problems it sought to address**

Botswana’s climate is semi-arid with very low and highly variable rainfall. Because of the semi-arid climate, most of the rivers and streams are ephemeral. The only perennial rivers are the Okavango River and the Chobe River in the northern part of the country, both of which have their sources outside the country. Together with the Makgadikgadi Pans in the centre of the country they account for about 95% of the total surface water in Botswana. The majority of the population (some 80%) depends upon groundwater which is also facing serious threats from pollution and over-exploitation.

Botswana is classified as an upper middle-income country with an average per capita GDP of US$6,128[[13]](#footnote-13). According to the Central Statistics Office[[14]](#footnote-14) the country’s population is estimated (2006 survey) at just over 1.7 million with an annual growth rate of 2.4%. The level of urbanization is around 60% making it one of the most urbanized countries in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a close correlation between availability of water and population distribution, with the western regions dominated by the Kalahari Desert being sparsely populated while the majority of the country’s population lives in the northern and eastern regions on account of better climatic and soil conditions.

The economic development success enjoyed as a result of the discovery of diamonds immediately following independence has been successfully translated into effective service delivery, especially in the water sector. By 2001, 88% of the population had access to piped water, and only 3% met their primary water requirements from surface water sources such as rivers, streams, dams or pans.

At the time of project formulation the water management situation was characterized as follows:

1. Few sources of water supply existed in the country for further development, leading water development authorities to consider water demand management as a development option;
2. Despite its scarcity, water was used and managed inefficiently especially by institutional consumers, resulting in high water losses. The financial implication of such inefficiency was high revenue losses and the further need for expensive new investments;
3. Water quality in many existing supply sources, especially groundwater, had deteriorated due to pollution, while quantity had also been affected by unsustainable extraction;
4. Competition for water resources among the various uses and users continued to intensify while resource availability diminished.

There was also concern that these difficulties will be compounded by the anticipated effects of climate change.

This situation made it imperative for Botswana to adopt a holistic planning process for water development with the aim of meeting the needs of all sectors of its economy. In the late 2000s, Botswana concluded a review of its National Water Master Plan (NWMP) which had originally been produced in 1992. The objectives of the review were to assess and project water demands and potential sources over a thirty-year period, and to identify water resources development options that best meet the country’s economic efficiency, sustainability and poverty alleviation objectives. It also included a review of institutional, policy and legal aspects of water resources management and effective implementation of IWRM.

However, the Government recognized that it required assistance to facilitate the development of processes, procedures, methods and options for full integration of water resources management and development options across all sectors. In particular, support was needed to identify and develop water efficiency and conservation options to respond to the problem of increasing water scarcity and the ensuing need to balance the allocation and use of water resources among different users and uses. In addition, Botswana also needed assistance with incorporating specific environmental concerns such as the protection of the integrity of ecosystems, and the increasing problem of groundwater pollution in water resources management. These needs formed the basis for the project request and provided the reasoning for the selection of Botswana as a demonstration site for the project. It was to contribute to the existing and ongoing regional efforts to develop IWRM Plans through the sharing of knowledge and lessons learned, in particular on ways to ensure that global environmental benefits are included into the IWRM and Water Efficiency planning.

When the project was first mooted, several countries in the Southern Africa region including Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland and Zambia were in the early stages of developing national IWRM plans and methodologies for incorporating global environmental objectives into planning processes were lacking. The Project was expected to establish a regional knowledge management mechanism to support exchange of experience and lessons learned, and eventually derive best practice and guidance on IWRM planning for use in other countries. In the event, with the delays experienced by the Botswana demonstration project, many IWRM Plans in neighbouring countries were completed, thus negating some of the benefits that were to accrue from the Botswana project[[15]](#footnote-15).

It needs to be noted that as UNDP advised, the project was developed during a time when GEF was undergoing changes in leadership and consequent changes in funds management and pipelined projects. The project was subjected to an extensive pipeline review exercise by the GEF Secretariat at the beginning of GEF-4 in 2006, and this contributed to the delays at the preparatory stage. The change of leadership in GEF affected the project design as well – demonstration projects were required by the GEF Secretariat as a result of the pipeline review. This came at a very late stage of the project development and caused further delays.

**2.3 Expected results**

The ProDoc describes in some detail the expectations from each of the three project Outcomes –

*Outcome 1 of this project will demonstrate an approach to IWRM/Water Use Efficiency Planning in Botswana. The project will try to demonstrate how a government could go about preparing an IWRM/Water Use Efficiency Plan on the ground. Botswana is chosen as a demonstration country in Sub-Saharan Africa to replicate its practices and extract lessons learned in the region.*

*Outcome 2 of the project is targeted towards achieving regional impacts from the demonstration in Botswana. The experiences and lessons learned from activities under Outcome 1 will be documented and collated for dissemination across the region and beyond, and used to influence processes in countries which are initiating IWRM. The knowledge management efforts will be coordinated with those of existing regional and global networks such as the Global Water Partnership.*

*Outcome 3 of the project aims at presenting quantitative and measurable results through the implementation of pilot-scale water conservation programmes and actions at selected schools in Botswana. Through the implementation of the pilot project, necessary capacity of various local stakeholders to implement water conservation measures is identified and strengthened. Further, the pilot project will assist stakeholders to establish functional inter-sectoral coordination whose purpose is effectively monitor and evaluate the implementation of IWRM practices at a pilot scale. By capacitating and creating awareness about IWRM and WE amongst stakeholders, the pilot project will inform and contribute to the attainment of Outcome 1, while at the same time the documentation of lessons learnt and knowledge sharing will support and contribute directly to Outcome 2.*

More specifically, the results expected from the project can be gleaned from the original wording in the ProDoc for the Objective and Outcomes. This is shown in the following table which is further developed by the evaluator to show the salient products targeted.

**Table 3. Project results expected according to the original LogFrame**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT** | **SALIENT PRODUCTS TARGETED** |
| **MAIN PRODUCT** | **CONTRIBUTING PRODUCTS** |
| **Immediate Objective:** To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning | Efficient and equitable IWRM planning | * National processes
* Institutional mechanisms
* Regional knowledge management processes
 |
| **Outcome 1:** A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and transboundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources | Dynamic IWRM Plan | * National and transboundary water priorities
* Global objectives integrated
* Multiple uses balanced
 |
| **Outcome 2.** Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector, and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives | Increased awareness and capacity | * At National level
* And Regional level
* Engagement in IWRM
* Regional knowledge management
 |
| **Outcome 3:** Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Reuse and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation | Conjunctive use of grey-water … and harvested rainwater | * Water conservation
 |

**2.4 Baseline – departure points**

From the documentation reviewed, it would seem that the project did not have meaningful Baselines at the outset – none are shown in the LogFrame and none arose out of the Inception Workshop.

It is a GEF requirement that if major baseline indicators are not identified in project design, an alternative plan for addressing this is required within one year of the start of implementation. This is discussed further in section 4.5. The Inception Report refers to baselines but does not provide them explicitly and it is only in PIR2010 (the first PIR for the project) that an attempt is made at determining baselines. However, these are not very helpful because as noted in section 5.1 below, in the case of the Objective, the so-called Indicators put forward in the PIR are merely the Outcomes word for word and the baselines simply state the obvious. For example:

**Table 4. Example of Indicators, Baselines and Targets for the Objective, from PIR2010**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **EXAMPLE FROM PIR2010** |
| **INDICATOR**  | **BASELINE** | **TARGET** |
| To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning | A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrate global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources | A national IWRM Plan does not exist. Key national and transboundary issues to realize the IWRM approach are yet to be identified and addressed. National Water Master Plan (1992) exists but it does not embrace the IWRM principles. The Master Plan and its Review of 2006 both recommended that any future water resources development and planning be done in an integrated manner | A national IWRM Plan developed and operational. IWRM Action Plans at the national and district levels developed to support the implementation of the IWRM Plan. A National Water Resources Council established to lead the cross-sectoral coordination among government, NGOs, CBOs, and private sectors. Stakeholder Participation Framework in place. |

With their focus on a very specific product, Outcomes 1 and 3 do not suffer too much from not having Baselines and Targets – achievement, or the lack of it, is obvious. However, in the case of Outcome 2 where “Increased awareness and capacity” is being sought by the project, it is necessary to know what the *status quo* is so it can be determined whether an increase has been achieved. It is not enough to simply say that “the level of awareness is weak” (even if after consultation), the question is how weak, and how do you know, *i.e.* was there a survey? More importantly, how can you tell that awareness and capacity have increased, and by how much?

**2.5 Main stakeholders**

The signed version of the ProDoc (the official version) does not refer to stakeholders. On the other hand, the earlier version of the ProDoc, discussed stakeholders at some length and identified the following two groups of stakeholders among others:

* At the regional level – GWP-SA, Cap-Net/WaterNet, and SADC
* Members of the Botswana Country Water Partnership – Department of Water Affairs (Water Committees), Farmers Associations, Tourism, Mining Sector, Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Lands, Construction Companies, Local Authorities (Councils, Tribal and District Administration), Civil Society Organizations, Water Utilities Corporation, Ministry of Heath, Women’s Affairs Department, Ministry of Agriculture (Departments of Crops and Forestry, and Animal Health and Production), Meteorology Department, Department of Sanitation and Pollution Control, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Village Development Committees ,Hospitality Industry , Ministry of Education, the Media, Botswana Youth Water Action Team – (Out of School Youth), Fishing Syndicates, Botswana Defense Force, Department of Building and Electrical Services, Prisons, Botswana Bureau of Standards , Academics (University of Botswana and others), Department of Geological Survey, Botswana Confederation of Commerce Industry and Manpower (BOCCIM), Politicians, House of Chiefs

The Inception Report mentions stakeholders, but does not list them, and neither do the PIRs.

The earlier version of the ProDoc made a commitment that “*a detailed stakeholder involvement plan will be prepared during the Project Inception Phase*” – the evaluator has not seen such a plan.

In the absence of a formal list of stakeholders through the signed ProDoc, the evaluator has adopted the “approved” list of PSC and TAG members as the stakeholders for this project:

* Department of Water Affairs (DWA)
* Water Utilities Corporation (WUC)
* Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)
* Rural Industries Promotion Company (RIPCO)
* University of Botswana (UB)
* Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS)
* Debswana
* Department of Waste Management and Pollution Control (DWMPC)
* Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) – Policy and Planning Department
* Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA)
* BOCCIM
* UNDP
* HOORC
* Ministry of Education (MOE)
* Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) – Technical Services
* Centre of Applied Research (CAR)
* Somarelang Tikologo (ST)

As can be expected, the list is very extensive (even without local grassroots stakeholders such as farmers and schools where the project set up demonstrations). The evaluator was able to meet with representatives of nine of the above organizations.

**3 FINDINGS: PROJECT DESIGN – RELEVANCE**

**3.1 Project concept**

The project concept was straightforward and addressed the identified water resources management problems, their root causes and barriers in Southern Africa. In its efforts to address these, the project focused on one country (Botswana) as a demonstration of possible solutions which would be applicable in a transboundary manner on a regional basis.

The underlying concept was sound and uncomplicated and the budget appears adequate (especially with the co-financing pledged). However, the three-year timeframe was too short[[16]](#footnote-16) particularly after taking into account that the main product of the project (under Outcome 1) was “*A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented*”.

**3.2 Project design and the LogFrame/Results Framework**

A project is a planned and strategic attempt to progress from the existing situation (the baseline) to the targets (outcomes) as a contribution towards the Objective. This is done through an orderly deployment of Inputs (skills and know-how, finances and time) which carry out Activities and obtain Outputs. The Outputs are not the Targets; it is the Outcomes that are the Targets. In order for the project to be successful a number of pre-conditions and Assumptions must be fulfilled and the possibility that they may not be fulfilled constitutes a Risk. While it is easy to know when Outputs have been obtained (Outputs are tangible results), in the majority of cases, it is difficult to know whether Outcomes have been achieved and Indicators may be necessary.

All these elements – Baseline, Inputs, Outputs, Targets, Outcomes, Assumptions, Risks, and Indicators – comprise the project design and make up the Logical Framework Matrix (or Strategic Results Framework) – all the elements are essential.

While the project concept was sound, the design was not entirely so. There was inadequate provision in the design to address the “*regional knowledge management processes*” sought by Outcome 2. In fact, the project could not satisfy its international dimension and the extension of its benefits beyond the Botswana borders. While this was due in part to the passage of time with the delays experienced[[17]](#footnote-17), it was also a flaw in project design. There was a total reliance on partners (such as the GWP) to disseminate information and awareness products and this may have been risky; but in terms of addressing the need for information *management* the project design made no provisions at all.

Outcome 3 is not clearly “connected” with the structure or the Objective of the project although it could be claimed to be an illustration of the integration and collaboration that the project is seeking through IRWM. The design should have also comprised an assessment of whether the series of pilot projects have worked and provided for upscaling, replication and sustainability – this is a significant omission.

Some of the wording used in the Outcomes was somewhat extravagant and not appropriate for the timeframe and scale of the project. The aim to have the IWRM Plan *adopted and implemented* under Outcome 1 was over-ambitious since it was beyond the competence of the project to adopt and implement the Plan. To this can be added the project’s aim (under Outcome 2) of increasing the *capacity of regional stakeholders* which are noted as including *members of the public* – reaching members of the public beyond the borders of Botswana was just not feasible for the project.

Project design is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (US).**

The LogFrame for this project was incomplete. There are no Baselines and no Targets – there is much more on Means of Verification, than on what is being verified. There are no Indicators provided for the Objective and while they are provided for the Outcomes and Outputs, most are not Indicators but results which are being targeted rather than an indication of whether the respective Outcome has been achieved – they do not possess SMART qualities. In addition, it needs to be noted that if Outputs are selected effectively, there should be no need for Indicators since Outputs are meant to be tangible products which are easy to determine.

In cases where the LogFrame is deficient, it is usual for a thorough analysis and revision to be conducted during the Inception Workshop. This would then be followed by formal adoption of the revised LogFrame by the first meeting of the PSC. However, the Inception Workshop report merely reproduced the LogFrame as an annex and it is not known to what extent it was discussed, if at all. From the minutes of the PSC meetings that were available to the evaluator it would seem that the LogFrame did not come up for discussion at all[[18]](#footnote-18).

Apart from being a graphic and visual summary of the project, the LogFrame should also be an effective tool for project managers and those monitoring and evaluating its progress. A weak or incomplete LogFrame needs to be rectified. Even a fully functional LogFrame needs to remain as a “living” document and may need to change with changing circumstances and the passage of time. An evolving LogFrame provides the foundation for adaptive management. The conclusion drawn for this project is that it did not have a functional LogFrame and there are few if any signs of adaptive management – the rating is **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

**3.3 Relevance to Botswana and the region**

Relevance, according to the OECD[[19]](#footnote-19) is a measure of the extent to which the objective and outcomes of a project are consistent with “*beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.*” In other words, does the project address the identified threats and barriers? Is it bedded within the UNDP Country Programme? Does it contribute to the GEF global objectives?

The work carried out by the project was highly relevant to the needs of Botswana and the region. It is also in line with the UNDAF[[20]](#footnote-20) which was developed at the same time, particularly its Outcome 4: *By 2016, the rural poor, especially women, enjoy greater benefits from the environment and natural ecosystems*. Even more relevant is its foundation in the *UNDP Country Programme Outlines for Botswana (2003 – 2007)*[[21]](#footnote-21) which was current at the time of the project development, and which specifically mentions “*supporting the development of integrated water resources management*”.

The project is also seeking global benefits as targeted by the GEF which, under OP#9 sought the integration of sound land and water resource management strategies through changes in sectoral policies and activities that promote sustainable development.

It can be concluded that the project has been highly relevant to the needs of Botswana and the region, it fitted well within the UNDAF and UNDP CCF and it reflected the GEF global objectives. Relevance is rated as **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

**3.4 Stakeholder participation in project formulation**

The project was formulated during the mid to late 2000s during significant efforts in Botswana to reform and strengthen planning and management in the water sector. This major effort was in response to the dire situation that Botswana found itself in with regards to its water resources. Extensive and intensive efforts were made to inform and sensitise Botswana society at all levels such as with the nationwide roadshow campaign sponsored by GWP-SA in 2006 and which is claimed to have reached some 4,000 persons. The partnership also facilitated four workshops and a breakfast meeting for political leaders. The consultations were attended by politicians, local authority leaders, high-ranking government officials, civil society representatives, the private sector, members of diplomatic missions, youth and the general public. This was the context within which the project was formulated, with heightened awareness, wide-ranging consultations and a high degree of on-going stakeholder participation.

According to one report made available to the evaluator, the project formulation effort included district consultations in Kgatleng, South East, Palapye (Palapye sub-district), and Letlhakane (Boteti sub-district). Through the consultation process, stakeholders identified 11 issues that needed to be addressed.

The delays experienced by the project in becoming operational (only in late 2009) had at least one positive result – more time and opportunity was made available for stakeholder participation.

Stakeholder involvement in project formulation is rated as **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

**3.5 Assumptions and risks**

As David Hillson[[22]](#footnote-22) describes them, risks are future events which, if they occurred, would affect the achievement of project objectives and he continues *“effective risk management minimises threats, maximises opportunities and optimises the achievement of project objectives; the converse is also true”*.

The earlier version of the ProDoc did consider nine risks at various levels, namely, at Goal, Objective and Outcomes level. It rated them according to their occurrence likelihood and proposed mitigation measures. However, many of the so-called risks are merely the existing situation (problems, barriers) and the proposed mitigation is what the project is planning to do about the problem anyway.

Inexplicably, the signed version of the ProDoc does not discuss risks, although assumptions are listed in the LogFrame. This is in spite of the fact that risks are referred to specifically in the Project’s LPAC meeting minutes which stated –

*“The project risks were highlighted and found relevant. Additional risks and related mitigation measures will be discussed further during the inception period once the first annual work plan has been developed.”*

The Inception Report did indeed tabulate 12 risks. It classified them according to type, noted the date when they were identified (the majority were identified during project formulation), it described the risk, noted whether it was still current and identified the “Owner/Author”. However, it did not propose any mitigation measures. In other words, the project had no prepared response to any risks that might eventuate.

UNDP advised that critical risks were identified in the PIRs. However, the Critical Risks section in PIR2010 is blank; PIR2011 does not have a Critical Risks section, and neither does PIR2012; and the section labelled Risk Management in PIR2013 is blank.

The above is not an illustration of good or effective risk management. Risk management overall is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

**3.6 Linkages between the project and other interventions**

As noted above, this project arose at a time when the water sector in Botswana was the subject of intense activity and it was inextricably embedded in this positive surge. The early ProDoc noted that the project will benefit from programmes being implemented by various government entities, international organizations, civil society and NGOs. These included UNDP Botswana’s LANDCARE programme, and GEF International Waters initiatives such as support to the Okavango Basin (the EPSMO Project and the Biokavango Project) and the Limpopo Basin where the SADC Groundwater and Drought Management Pilot Project was being implemented. As also noted by the early ProDoc, the project was also expected to benefit from programmes of regional partners such as SADC, GWP-SA, WaterNet/Cap-Net, and regional training institutes such as the Institute of Water and Sanitation Development (IWSD). The signed ProDoc also mentions the gains for the project through its collaboration with these and other initiatives.

The Inception Report acknowledged the many initiatives which were on-going in the water sector and mentions in particular “*the network rehabilitation to curb incidences of water wastage for most villages in the country, cost over P1.9 billion; Water Recycling Projects at Ramotswa and Ghanzi District for potable use; Water Quality Project; Water Reuse for Agricultural Projects (where wastewater treatment ponds are available); and Installation of Technologies for Water Conservation and Evaporation Control in our water systems*” and it noted that “*these projects will complement each other in areas of water conservation and water demand management thus contributing directly to project outputs and outcomes*”.

**4 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION – EFFICIENCY**

**4.1 Project governance**

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) is recognized as the highest governance level for a project and must have the necessary authority and power. It plays a key role in setting policy for the project, monitoring project performance, providing guidance and directions to the PM and other project stakeholders, and supports UNDP which, as the GEF IA, has the ultimate accountability for delivery of project products and the administration of project funds.

This project had a functional PSC with the necessary standing. It met regularly at approximately quarterly intervals which is a significant commitment. As the Chair advised the evaluator, he was very pleased by the fact that most members attended personally and did not rely on stand-ins, and this ensured a good level of continuity. Membership was representative of the key stakeholders and attendance ranged from a high of 13 members to a low of 8 members. From the available minutes it appears that meetings were well structured and well run. Members of the PMU were always in attendance. The issues discussed by the PSC were pertinent and provided the necessary guidance to the PMU.

In October 2010, the project organized a two-day retreat in Maun for the PSC at which there were 28 participants. From the report available it appears to have been an extremely valuable exercise for the project. Among the salient issues to be discussed quite deeply were – the Logframe, stakeholders and priority activities. The LogFrame was noted as incomplete since it lacked Indicators but the project replied that Indicators were to be found in the ProDoc and unfortunately the opportunity to refine and strengthen the LogFrame was not taken. The stakeholder analysis was thorough and identified stakeholders by Outcome which was a useful and important exercise. But it needs to be said that October 2010 was a little bit late to be recognizing and analysing stakeholders for the project – ideally, this should have been done during the Inception Workshop. The “dissection” and identification of priority activities that need to be carried out so as to achieve the targeted results and Outcomes was excellent and must have provided the PMU with a strong measure of guidance for implementation. However, once again, this would have been even more valuable had it been carried out at the Inception Workshop.

The project also benefited from a Project Coordination Group (PCG). The evaluator only sighted minutes for the first four meetings of the PCG and it appears that it served as the Project Executive Group performing a useful function with a good relationship with the PSC.

While not strictly speaking part of the project governance structure, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was also set up which provided technical support and input to both the PMU and the PSC. Originally, the TAG was tasked with addressing Outcome 3 but a year or so after it was set up, it was reconstituted so it could address all three Outcomes.

It is noticeable that a number of individuals participated in two or even all three of the above governance groups. These individuals were not only the members of the PMU, but also included personnel from UNDP, KCS, DWA, and other arms of government. This indicates a significant commitment to the project.

Governance for the project is rated as **Highly Satisfactory (S)**.

**4.2 Management arrangements**

This evaluation is taking place some five months after project closure and while it was possible to interview the past PM as well as KCS who served as host for the PMU, they were not as available as when the PMU was still functional – it was not possible to explore at any depth project management and operations, relationships, difficulties and support. On the other hand, even though the PSC had ceased to function as a body, it was still possible for the evaluator to consult with a good number of members and gain some insights into the management of the project. Unfortunately, at the presentation of preliminary findings at the end of the mission, only the UNDP Programme Officer and the DWA official who had been seconded to the project as Project Technical Coordinator, attended. In other words, the project had gone cold, people had moved on. In fact, as KCS advised, project participants had satisfied their official mandate and were awaiting the next phase which involved the implementation of the IWRM/WE plan.

As discussed elsewhere, day-to-day management of the project was entrusted to the KCS which served as the host for the PMU. The PMU was comprised of a Project Manager, a Project Administrator, and a seconded Government Officer from DWA who served as Project Technical Coordinator. Various short-term consultants were also engaged in accordance with the specific component schedules prepared in the Inception Phase and detailed in annual work plans.

The allocation of project management duties to the KCS was a strategic move since a reputable NGO was more acceptable than a government institution both for the public as well as for the other government sectors. And, as KCS was the Botswana secretariat of the GWP-SA, the PMU and project management became an integral part of the water resources management framework in Botswana and right in the mainstream of the water sector reforms that were underway.

Project management worked well and efficiently, due to a large extent to the degree of ownership and support provided by KCS. However, the involvement and support shown by DWA was also instrumental in this success.

Regrettably, there are three concerns that tend to tarnish the otherwise successful project management – the delays experienced by the project, the ineffectual project closure, and the apparent lack of collaboration between the national and international consultants charged with the drafting of the IWRM Plan.

There were significant delays in project start-up and these were in part due to the delays in recruitment of a PM which, in turn, were due at least partly, to disbursement problems experienced by UNDP[[23]](#footnote-23). This was exacerbated further, when the appointed individual resigned after only a few months. However, the Project Technical Coordinator from DWA managed to maintain the project momentum and a new PM was in place after only three months. In fact, PSC-04 praised the PMU for faring well in the absence of a Project Manager – all the action items from the PSC previous meeting had been completed and the new Project Manager was not only on board in a relatively short time, but was also settled and performing his duties.

What was more significant was the resignation of the PM some four months before project closure. PSC meeting minutes from this time have not been available to the evaluator, so it is not known what discussions and decisions and actions surrounded this critical time for the project. What is known is that the project did not having an Exit Strategy or a Terminal Report although the outgoing PM did produce Hand-Over Notes which described the progress made and the situation for each Outcome[[24]](#footnote-24).

The minutes of PSC-13 reported that “*The meeting learnt that reports produced by the International Consultant were not of high quality as they were reportedly limited to the South African context. The PMU reported that it was struggling to get the best out of her*.” Likewise, the Hand-Over Notes of the outgoing PM stated that the PMU was “*not entirely happy with her input to the entire plan*.” The evaluator has learnt of the friction that developed between the national consultant and the international consultant and this may have affected the quality of the IWRM Plan. With the passage of time and without the benefit of a Terminal Report or minutes of PSC relevant meetings, it is not possible for the evaluator to reach a conclusion on this issue. However, PIR2013 noted that “*One of the lessons learned from the project is to have both the National and the International Consultants on board as the same time, or better still have the International Consultant on board so as to guide the National Consultant.*”

KCS further reported that “*a comprehensive matrix developed by the international consultant on deliverables/ outputs expected on both consultants was used to track and verify conformance to the TORs and ultimately meetings held with each consultant to account on where there were deficiencies and or finger pointing. A lot was achieved through this process and ultimately the PSC formed a small drafting team to work with the PMU to fill up the gaps. An independent consultant was also hired for structuring and editing the the document*”.

The conclusion on project management arrangements is that there has been a mixture of some excellent positive features and some not so positive ones – the overall rating is seen as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

**4.3 Stakeholder involvement and partnership arrangements**

**4.3.1 Stakeholder participation in project implementation**

According to the GEF stakeholder participation is “*Where stakeholders collaboratively engage in the identification of project concepts and objectives, selection of sites, design and implementation of activities, and monitoring and evaluation of project outcomes.”[[25]](#footnote-25)* Participation by stakeholders in the formulation of the project has already been discussed above and found to be Highly Satisfactory.

The earlier ProDoc made a commitment that “*a detailed stakeholder involvement plan will be prepared during the Project Inception Phase*” and included a Stakeholder Analysis Matrix table. There was no such commitment in the signed ProDoc which did not discuss stakeholder participation at all. The Inception Report did discuss stakeholder participation but it appeared to focus more on the situation after the project than on participation by stakeholders in project implementation. It did say that “*Participatory workshops and focused group discussions will be employed as appropriate to consult with stakeholders*,” however, the project did not have a Stakeholders Involvement Plan and involvement at some levels appeared to be restricted to the provision of information and capacity building. On the other hand, involvement at the senior officials level was very noticeable and illustrated best by the PSC and the TAG. Through these two bodies, the project brought in stakeholders in a meaningful and effective way and affirmed that the Government is clearly the owner of this project. This augurs well for the sustainability of the project’s benefits, products and services, at least upstream. Sustainability would have been much further enhanced had the same level of involvement and ownership been extended to the local community level.

**4.3.2 Partnerships**

The OECD[[26]](#footnote-26) considers partners as *“The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives”* and it adds that *“the concept of partnership connotes shared goals, common responsibility for outcomes, distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations”.*

Going by this definition, the Government can be seen as a true partner in the implementation of this project, and so can KCS. Both were fully involved in the search for the same goals and objectives as UNDP and the GEF; they shared the responsibility for achieving the project outcomes through officials (for the Government) and through contracted personnel (by KCS) at the policy, administration/management and at the technical levels; they shared accountability for delivering the project products; and in the main, both have satisfied their obligations to the project particularly through the availability of personnel to work on various aspects of the project from governance to implementation, as well as through substantial co-financing. Of particular note on the part of KCS was its advancing of the necessary funds to operationalize the project in the absence of timely disbursement from UNDP. Partnership by the Government was especially valuable in the achievements of Outcome 1 and their sustainability, and aspects of Outcome 3 through its provision of technical knowledge, hardware and co-financing.

In addition to the partnership arrangement with KCS for project management and administration, and with DWA for Outcome 3, the project was particularly reliant on partnerships for the achievement of Outcome 2 – awareness, capacity and knowledge management, especially for its regional dimension. This was recognized by the earlier ProDoc which stated that “*The Regional Knowledge component ….. will be managed by the Global Water Partnership-Southern Africa Chapter in collaboration with the Botswana Country Water Partnership (BCWP) ….. GWP-SA will carry the responsibility for the bulk of the work across all the three outcomes, including the generation of regional knowledge management products for dissemination to stakeholders at local level and decision makers both in-country and across the region.*”

The signed ProDoc affirms this collaboration with partners for Outcome 2 – “*The regional knowledge management initiatives, such as the annual partners’ workshops organized by GWP-SA, will be used to advance this component of the project ….. focus on the production of concrete knowledge management products ….. tool kits and guidance material ….. although the component will be managed by the PMU in Botswana, it will of necessity link up with and use the resources and capacity of existing regional networks and capacity building institutions as WaterNet, GWP-SA and IWSD for the specific activities. It will also link up with CapNet*.”

There is a subtle difference between the two ProDocs – the earlier ProDoc says that the component (Outcome 2) *will be managed by the Global Water Partnership-Southern Africa*; whereas the signed ProDoc says that *the component will be managed by the PMU*. Regardless of whether this different approach is significant, the delays experienced by the project deprived it of the full benefit of these partnerships.

Stakeholder participation in project implementation was moderate, ownership was very strong, and partnerships were moderate. The overall rating is seen as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

**4.4 Project finance**

**4.4.1 Budget planning, management and efficiency**

This is not a financial audit and the focus of this evaluation is on the planning and management of financial resources made available by the GEF. The departure point for such an assessment is the ProDoc which showed the following allocations –

**Table 5. Original budget allocation of GEF funds**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OUTCOME** | **ORIGINAL BUDGET** |
| **Outcome 1:** A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and transboundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources | 222,000 |
| **Outcome 2.** Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector, and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives | 309,000 |
| **Outcome 3:** Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Reuse and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation | 350,000 |
| **Project Administration and Management** | 94,000 |
| **TOTALS** | **975,000** |

The evaluator has been advised that there were no significant budget revisions, however, information on the actual expenditure on each Outcome and Project Management was still awaited at the time of writing.

According to the ProDoc, the disbursement process was to start with the KCS (as the *de facto* executing agency) submitting a budget call to the Government after approval of the annual budget. The DWA, on behalf of the Government, then authorized or instructed UNDP to allocate the approved funds to KCS for project implementation. However, this procedure was considered far too cumbersome and agreement was reached for KCS to approach UNDP directly. This is seen as a very positive move.

UNDP provided the GEF contribution on the basis of quarterly advances, following the request from the PM including a detailed work plan for the quarter and the planned expenses for the same period. Subsequent advances were only released upon submission of the financial report for the previous quarter which was expected within 15 days from the end of the quarter together with the Quarterly Project Progress Report. This is standard procedure for the release of funds for which UNDP is accountable.

However, its effectiveness is dependent on the efficiency of the UNDP system and, as noted elsewhere in this report, this was not always forthcoming[[27]](#footnote-27). Delays in the processing of requests and release of funds affected project start-up causing serious delays (which in turn led to the withdrawal of pledged co-financing). Virtually every PSC meeting for which minutes are available, pleaded with UNDP to improve its disbursement process.

The rating for overall financial management emerges as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**. This must not be taken as a reflection of the management of the project finances by KCS who made available bridging finance to overcome the slow release of funds by UNDP.

**4.4.2 Co-financing**

As required by the ToRs, this evaluation was to assess the situation regarding co-financing for the project and the evaluator sought the basic information first from the ProDoc and other key documents, and then from the project implementers by providing a template table to be filled in and returned.

There were three sources of co-financing for this project as can be seen in the table below, and according to the minutes of PCG-1, “*all co-financing should be managed by IWRM*” (the project). The same meeting noted that the project and DWA were expected to keep track of co-financing. It is not known whether co-financing was tracked and reported to the PSC as decided at PCG-2. Minutes of PSC meetings make little or no explicit reference to co-financing and the required reporting to the PSC does not seem to have taken place.

However, there was one exception – in September/October 2010 both PSC-5 and PCG-4 reported that the co-financing from GWP-SA (USD300,000) and from UNDP (USD920,000) were not available to the project any more. This unfortunate situation came about because of the delays of the project getting started. The funds had been made available as cash and as parallel projects and by the time the project got underway these funding sources had terminated. PCG-4 (in September 2010) reported that “*GWP currently don’t have funding because their funds were for the years 2006 to 2009. The project manager suggested the Project to help cover their costs especially in upcoming meetings like the PSC retreat ….. UNDP would be contacted by DWA/KCS through formal communication as a means of salvaging any remaining possible co-financing*”. This information and suggestions were repeated at PSC-5 (October 2010) which also noted that “*there are some negotiations ongoing with both organizations and so far GWP/SA have indicated that they will only provide services of their technical officer. The UNDP was still to respond and or commit to our request*”. As far as can be ascertained, neither the PCG nor the PSC discussed this matter again and the question arises regarding which project activities suffered without the pledged co-financing support.

The other source of co-financing for the project was the Government, primarily through the DWA. The contribution, which was estimated to be worth USD10.6 million, was through cash, cash equivalent and parallel funding. The following comment appeared in PIR2012 - “*There is a significant challenge with financial reporting on the use of co-financing that is directly administered by the executing agency. It is virtually impossible to get a clear picture of how much of the committed funds have been spent on activities outlined in the PRODOC. Though there are indications that a significant amount of money has indeed been spent by various government agencies on project-related initiatives, the accounting and financial reporting mechanisms and procedures do not lend themselves to easy scrutiny*.” The evaluator requested a detailed breakdown of the government co-financing contribution, and the report received gave the government co-financing total as USD336,000. This is far below the level indicated in the ProDoc and that expected by the evaluator and the evaluator does not have confidence in its accuracy.

The following table starts from information in the ProDoc and reflects the written pledges of co-financing made to the project. It was meant to end with figures of co-financing that materialized, however, this information was not available. References have been seen to new co-financing partners but confirmation of this information could not be obtained.

**Table 6. Co-financing pledged (as from the ProDoc) together with the amounts actually delivered as advised to the evaluator**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PARTNER** | **CLASSIFICATION** | **TYPE** | **AMOUNT PLEDGED** | **AMOUNT DELIVERED** |
| Department of Water Affairs | Government | Parallel funding and in-kind | 10,600,000 | 336,000 |
| Global Water Partnership – Southern Africa | International NGO |  | 300,000 | ???????? |
| UNDP | GEF IA | Parallel funding and cash | 920,000 | ???????? |
| **TOTAL** |  |  | **11,820,000** | **????????** |

The amount pledged in co-financing was at a ratio of 1:12, which is considerably higher than the GEF requirement. The amount delivered is unknown.

It is interesting to note that the project budget in the ProDoc (Section III (b), Project Total Budget and Work Plan (including co-financing)) carries an Outcome by Outcome allocation of funds, next to a listing of the key Activities for each Outcome, and these allocations include co-financing. The figures for co-financing are large and would benefit from an explanation as to how they may have been reached. It is acknowledged that some (such as Rental and Maintenance of Premises) could be estimates of the government contribution in-kind, however, others must require actual cash disbursements and these appear excessive.

For example, there is a total of USD650,000 shown as co-financing for Travel (the GEF allocation is USD51,000). This is almost USD20,000 of travelling expenses each month for the 36-month duration of the project – clearly requires an explanation.

USD880,000 is shown as co-financing for International Consultants (whereas USD65,000 was from GEF). This amount is enough to sustain 35 contracts, each of around USD25,000 which includes high fees for one month plus DSA and air fares. For a modest project running for 36 months, this sounds a bit extreme and brings the credibility of claimed co-financing amounts into question.

In conclusion it can be said that Government co-financing for this project is known to have been substantial and could merit a Satisfactory rating. However, this must be downgraded because co-financing was lost through the delays in project start-up, reporting on co-financing directly administered by the executing agency was seen by PIR2012 as *a significant challenge* and the evaluator has no confidence in the management of co-financing. The overall rating for co-financing and its overall management is **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**. Unfortunately this tends to mask the valiant provision of bridging finance made available by KCS to overcome the slow release of funds by UNDP. However, this is not exactly co-financing.

**4.5 Monitoring and evaluation**

**4.5.1 Monitoring plans at entry level**

The GEF requires that all projects must include *“a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Programme entry for full-sized projects”* [[28]](#footnote-28) and although this was not a full-sized project, a fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan was very desirable. In fact, the ProDoc makes a commitment that a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation work plan will be developed at inception. In the Preamble, the Inception Workshop Report claims that it contains a “*detailed Monitoring and Reporting Plan*” but this is not evident and instead the Report contains a Monitoring and Reporting Log. Among the tasks of the national Consultant, the Inception Report lists “*in association with the International consultant, develop national level products, including a monitoring and evaluation plan for the project, for feeding into regional information notes*”. It is not known if this was done.

The M&E Plan required by GEF is expected to comprise a number of minimum requirements as in the following table. The table also contains the KCS perspective on the requirements (in the absence of the PM), as well as the evaluator’s summary comments on the way that the project is seen as having satisfied these requirements.

**Table 7. GEF M&E minimum requirements**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF M&E REQUIREMENTS** | **KCS RESPONSE (in lieu of PM)** | **EVALUATOR’S COMMENTS** |
| SMART indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management | In developing the plan the Log- frame was developed and indicators clearly spelt out. The SMART indicator was developed to be a dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrate global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources. The project has been working with the Water Sector Reform Unit to consult with stakeholders on the National Water and Waste Policy and the establishment of the Water Resource Council. The project ensured that the policy was based on IWRM principles and that the Water Resources Council was charged with implementing and periodically reviewing the IWRM plan. The consultative process covered most stakeholders such as government, agriculture, local authorities, CSO's and the private sector. Workshops, meetings and focused group discussions were held with the different groups | The KCS response shows that the GEF requirement may not be fully understood. It is correct to state that Indicators were developed for project implementation, however, they do not satisfy the SMART criteria. It must also be noted that the LogFrame did not have any indicators for the Objective.  |
| SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators | Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders to engage in the IWRM. The project had identified the five areas at which demonstrations will be carried out in order to demonstrate water conservation and efficiency.Water conservation through conjunctive Use of Greywater Re-use and Harvested Rainwater in schools in Botswana | The KCS response does not address the GEF requirement. |
| A project baseline or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation  | The demonstration projects in the various parts of the country have saved a lot of water for the village networks thus ensuring that there is continued supply to other deserving uses. The reuse of water and rainwater harvesting has relived pressure from the village supply network. The demonstration projects have saved over 400 000litres of potable water per month from the villages of Shoshong, Mahalapye and Letlhakane in 2011 | The LogFrame in the ProDoc did not provide baselines and the project did not address this gap. |
| An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities | The mid term review that was scheduled did not materialize but the project was reported on quarterly basis to both PSC and to UNDP GEF. Also the Project Implementation Review (PIR) was filled and submitted to GEF n regular basis. The M&E was reviewed on quarterly basis by the PSC and corrective measure implemented by the PMU | The project did have a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan which comprised reviews and evaluations. It also showed those responsible, the timeframe and the indicative budget that was being set aside |
| An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation | In developing the Project document, a budget was set up for mid-term and project completion monitoring and evaluation. In terms of organisational set up, UNDP and GEF were set up so the monitoring and evaluation could be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures | The M&E Plan in the ProDoc did indicate that a budget of USD170,000 was set aside for M&E. However, in the main budget the only reference to M&E is the sum of USD15,000 which is earmarked for “terminal evaluation conducted by a local consultant” |

The effectiveness and accuracy of overall planning for Monitoring and Evaluation at entry level was mixed. While a plan was provided complete with budget and timeframes, there were no indicators for the Objective and those for Outcomes were not SMART. There were no baselines or targets and none of these shortcomings were addressed at the Inception Workshop. Rating for M&E at entry level was **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

**4.5.2 Monitoring tools**

A range of tools was employed by the project to monitor project progress and achievement – which tool was used depended on who was using it.

UNDP personnel used the “back-to-office” report following their visits to project locations. I examined two such reports and one “Project Monitoring Report”. Quality was variable and ranged from very useful to useless. They also focused exclusively on activities carried out under Outcome 3. Actions and recommendations were listed in each report but it is not known whether these reached intended recipients and whether they were implemented. While they could be claimed to provide a degree of oversight of the project activities, back-to-office and similar reports were not the most effective monitoring tools.

The Project Steering Committee meetings could be seen as a monitoring tool. The meetings were at regular intervals, and the PM reported on project progress. The basis for the PM’s reporting to the PSC was the latest project Quarterly Progress Report and through their regular frequency and format, QPRs served as an effective tool for monitoring project progress.

By far two of the most important monitoring tools are the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) and the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).

There were four PIRs prepared for this project with the first one being PIR2010. The CO sections are blank and so is the Critical Risks Section and the design of the GEF IW Results Template makes it difficult for any national/single country project to provide useful information. PIR2010 introduced Baselines and Targets and adopted Indicators for the Outcomes which are different from those in the LogFrame. UNDP advised that these arose from a joint attempt to strengthen that part of the LogFrame and it was meant to be tabled and discussed at the PSC for formal adoption – no such consideration was found by the evaluator in any of the PSC meeting minutes available and it would seem that these changes were not approved by anyone. In PIR2011 there is no Critical Risks section while the RTA section as well as the CO section is blank. It raises the issue of delays caused by problems in the disbursement process by UNDP but does not provide a solution. Likewise, the RTA rating for the project is MU, but there are no comments. PIR2012 has a blank Critical Risks section and so is the Template. PIR2013 was still under development at the time of writing. None of the PIRs discuss gender fully although its lack of attention by the project is noted.

More recent PIRs contain the GEF Tracking Tool for International Waters. However, a lot of the information sought is not applicable to this project because it is not really transboundary. As a result, most of the template is blank and not useful for the evaluation. The evaluator was also supplied with a separate copy of the Tracking Tool from 2013 and unfortunately it too is virtually blank[[29]](#footnote-29).

The MTE was not carried out and although it is not a requirement for MSPs, PIR2013 observed, “*The implications of not conducting the MTR are that challenges and issues that could have been addressed were never properly detected and addressed. Due to this lack of review of project progress, the opportunity to improve project focus and implementation were missed*.”

**4.5.3 Comprehensive assessment of M&E**

A more specific indication of a project’s compliance with the GEF M&E expectations is provided by the instrument of assessment used by the GEF itself which states that *– a project needs to be in compliance with all the critical parameters and needs to perform sufficiently well on all the parameters together. To be classified as compliant, projects are required to score at least a 2 (on a scale of 1 to 3, with 3 being the highest) on each of the critical parameters and to have an aggregate score of 26 out of a maximum of 39*.[[30]](#footnote-30)

**Table 8. Instrument for assessment of M&E Plans for the comprehensive project**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PARAMETERS** | **RAW RESPONSE AND POSSIBILITIES** | **PROJECT SCORE** |
| 1 Is there at least one specific indicator in the LogFrame for each of the project objectives and outcomes? | Yes 3No 1 | 1 |
| 2 Are the indicators in the LogFrame relevant to the chosen objectives and outcomes? | Yes 3Yes, but only some are relevant 2No 1 | 2 |
| 3 Are the indicators in the LogFrame sufficient to assess achievement of the objectives and outcomes? | Sufficient 3Largely Sufficient 2Some important indicators are missing 1 | 1 |
| 4 Are the indicators for project objectives and Outcomes quantifiable? | Yes 3Some of them are 2No, or else it has not been shown how the indicatorscould be quantified 1 | 1 |
| 5 Has the complete and relevant baseline information been provided? | Yes, complete baseline info provided 3Partial info but baseline survey in 1st year 2.5No info but baseline survey in 1st year 2Only partial baseline information 1.5No info provided 1 | 1 |
| 6 Has the methodology for determining the Baselinebeen explained? | Yes 3No 1 | 1 |
| 7 Has a separate budget been allocated to M&Eactivities? | Yes 3No 1 | 3 |
| 8 Have the responsibilities been clearly specified forthe M&E activities? | Yes, and clearly specified 3Yes, broadly specified 2No 1 | 3 |
| 9 Have the time frames been specified for the M&Eactivities? | Yes, for all the activities 3Yes, but only for major activities 2No 1 | 3 |
| 10 Have the performance standards (targets) beenspecified in the log frame for the project outputs? | Yes, for all the outputs 3Yes, but only for major outputs 2No 1 | 1 |
| 11 Have the targets been specified for the indicatorsfor project objectives and outcomes in the log frame? | Yes, for most 3Yes, but only for some indicators 2No 1 | 1 |
| 12 Are the specified targets for indicators of projectobjective and outcomes based on initial conditions? | Yes, for most 3Yes, but only for some of the indicators 2No 1 | 1 |
| 13 Does the project document mention having made aProvision for mid term and terminal evaluations? | Yes, both mid term and terminal evaluation 3Only terminal evaluation 2.5Only mid term evaluation 1.5No information provided 1 | 3 |
| **TOTAL** | **22** |

As a result of the lack of Baselines and weak Indicators, the first six items have scored below the required minimum and the GEF minimum M&E requirements are only partly satisfied. The aggregate score of 22 points is below the minimum aggregate score of 26 points.

The evaluator concludes that while the project did have an M&E Plan and did carry out some monitoring activities, the Plan could not be tied to the LogFrame which was faulty and there were some difficulties with the PIRs. While the design and planning of M&E was reasonable, implementation was weak and the overall rating for M&E is **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

**4.6 UNDP as Implementing Agency**

As Implementing Agency, UNDP is responsible to the GEF for the timely and cost-effective delivery of the agreed project outcomes. It achieves this through its understandings with the Government and its contractual arrangement with DWA as implementing partner. UNDP has an obligation to ensure accountability, and its efforts in this respect are spearheaded by the Country Office in Gaborone which has the legal responsibility for the GEF funds.

The UNDP senior management in Botswana may approve, following consultation and agreement with the UNDP/GEF Regional Office and the Government signatories to the project document, revisions or additions to any of the annexes of the ProDoc, revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, and mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or to take into account agency expenditure flexibility. The UNDP Resident Representative also chairs project reviews, coordinates inputs from the participating partners into the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) for submission to UNDP/GEF, ensures that project objectives are advanced and undertakes official transmission of reports to the GEF focal point.

The UNDP Country Office is also charged with monitoring project progress towards the Outcomes and Objective, and while it does this formally through the PIR, it gathers the necessary data and information through regular contact with the project, visits to project localities, participation in the PSC, and receipt of various progress reports.

As the entity responsible for the GEF funds, UNDP manages the disbursement process and while expenditure is approved at the PSC/PCG level, operational disbursement takes place at UNDP. It was at this level that the UNDP performance came in for significant criticism by stakeholders to the evaluator. There were inordinate delays in the release of approved funds and these delayed the start-up of the project and placed it in jeopardy if it were not for the advancement of funds by the KCS.

The role of UNDP also extended into co-financing and the ProDoc identified the sum of US$920,000 as the UNDP contribution to the project through parallel funding and cash. This commitment was confirmed by the Deputy Resident Representative as being available for 2008-2009. Unfortunately, as a result of the delays experienced by the project (which were in part due to UNDP inefficiency with disbursements), by the time it needed the funds, they were not available any more.

The work of the UNDP Country Office is supported by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Office, which also provides coordination within the whole UNDP/GEF portfolio of projects for the region. More specifically, the UNDP/GEF Regional Office provides technical support to the UNDP Country Office and the Government GEF Operational Focal Point, assists the executing agency with the recruitment of senior project personnel, approves the project inception report and terminal reports, reviews budget revisions prior to signature, follows up closely on implementation progress, assures the eligibility of project interventions in light of GEF policy guidance and approved project design, represents UNDP/GEF on the PSC, and approves annual Project Implementation Reports, including performance ratings, for submission to GEF. To fulfil these responsibilities, the Regional Technical Advisor responsible for the project remains fully engaged in the project implementation and in close communication with UNDP CO, the Implementing Partner and the PMU.

UNDP performance as Implementing Agency for this project is rated as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

**4.7 Executing Agency performance**

**4.7.1 Department of Water Affairs**

The Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources, and specifically its Department of Water Affairs (DWA) was designated as the Executing Agency for the project by the Botswana Government. And as noted in project documentation, “*The Department of Water Affairs, as the lead government department, will be responsible for co-ordination of all concerned government departments as well for chairing the Project Steering Committee*.” This was a truly auspicious appointment for the project because the DWA made it part of its core function. Evidence of this is its strong ownership of the IWRM Plan prepared through the project, its technical and financial support of the demonstration pilot projects on greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting in selected schools, and its secondment of a senior official as Project Technical Coordinator within the PMU. Through this strong level of involvement and collaboration, the DWA confirmed the incremental nature of the GEF support. The performance of DWA has been truly exemplary.

In an effort to remove all possible barriers to the collaboration between sectors that is fundamental to IWRM, DWA divested itself of the day-to-day project management responsibilities of an executing agency, and entered into an arrangement with the Kalahari Conservation Society to perform this function (see below). As described by a consultee to the evaluator, this turned out to be a very strategic move since an NGO was more acceptable than a government institution both for the public as well as for the other government sectors. Having passed on the project management responsibilities to the KCS, DWA retained the responsibility of chairing the PSC and committed itself to supporting the project management structure, through the allocation of resources for IWRM planning in their budget. As a result, the PMU became an integral part of the water resources management framework in Botswana and the water sector reforms that were underway.

**4.7.2 Kalahari Conservation Society**

The project was one of only a few Government initiatives in Botswana to be facilitated by a non-governmental organization – the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS). The project was formally executed by DWA but through KCS as per a Memorandum of Agreement between the two Parties[[31]](#footnote-31). The KCS was chosen as it was the Secretariat of the Botswana Country Water Partnership and, in effect, KCS served as the executing agency for the project.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) was hosted by KSC and this allowed for greater efficiencies in terms of time for the project implementation. This strategic location of the PMU, hosted in the same institution as the CWP, allowed for “*great ease (thus, reduce transaction costs) to ensure participation of all concerned stakeholders*”. The PMU consisted of a Project Manager and a Project Administrator. A full-time designated staff member of DWA was also seconded to the PMU as Project Technical Coordinator to assist integrating and institutionalizing IWRM within the work of the department.

According to its agreement, KCS was expected to keep separate, proper and accurate books of accounts and records of all transactions relating to funds or operation / implementation of the project. To this effect, a separate account for the project was created and KCS produced regular financial reports to the Government and UNDP on project disbursement in accordance with UNDP, GEF and Government financial rules and regulations.

KCS coordinated inputs and activities both at national level with the stakeholders and partners in Botswana, and at regional level with the main co-operating partners GWP-SA and Cap-Net/WaterNet.

KCS performed its role as executing agency for the project exceedingly well – it managed the project, carried out project activities, monitored project progress, reported regularly to the PSC and UNDP, recruited and managed project personnel (including consultants), and managed project funds. In fact, it exceeded expectations for example when it stepped into the breach created by the tardy UNDP disbursement process, advancing the necessary funds to keep the project going.

The performance of DWA and KCS, executing agencies for the project, has been **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

**5 FINDINGS: RESULTS ACHIEVED – EFFECTIVENESS**

**5.1 Achievement of the overall Objective**

The original project Objective from the ProDoc was –

*To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning*

and the primary target of the Objective was – *Efficient and equitable IWRM planning*

which was to be obtained through –

* National processes
* Institutional mechanisms
* Regional knowledge management processes

While it can easily be ascertained whether a plan has been produced, it is not as simple to determine whether efficient and equitable planning has taken place. It is therefore necessary to employ Indicators which serve as a proxy and can assist with the determination. The LogFrame did not provide Indicators for the Objective.

This omission was not noted during the Inception Workshop but it must have been considered serious enough by UNDP because PIR2010 (the first PIR) provided three Indicators for the Objective – or at least, these three appear under the column heading of “Description of Indicator”. In fact they are nothing more than the three Outcomes, word for word. In an attempt to remain impartial, the three so-called Indicators provided by PIR2010 are critiqued in the following table, bearing in mind that what needed to be determined was whether *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* had been obtained by the project; whether this had been brought about through “*national processes and institutional mechanisms*” developed by the project; and whether this was likely to support and contribute to “*regional knowledge management processes*”.

**Table 9. Critique of the indicators selected for the Objective**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **INDICATORS FOR THE OBJECTIVE (from PIR2010)** | **CRITIQUE BY THE EVALUATOR** |
| 1 A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrate global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources | As noted above these are not Indicators through which it can be determined whether the Objective has been achieved. If they were Indicators, they would be too wordy and would not satisfy the SMART criteria. “Indicators” 1 and 2 could be said to be partly **Specific** to the Objective, but “Indicator” 3 is not. None is quantifiably **Measurable** and while they may be **Achievable** it would be difficult to determine “increased” awareness and capacity without a Baseline to start from. All can be **Attributed** to the project and could be claimed to be **Relevant** to the Objective. But all would be difficult to **Track** in the absence of Baselines and Targets. |
| 2 Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives |
| 3 Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Re-use and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation |

However, and in spite of the unhelpful so-called Indicators, the evaluator is aware of significant progress towards the Objective. While it may be difficult to determine explicitly whether *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* had been obtained by the project, an IWRM Plan has been produced and it serves as a strong foundation for the planning targeted by the Objective. In its work towards developing the Plan, the project did strengthen *national processes and institutional mechanisms* and these played a crucial role in the development of the Plan. Whether this was likely to support and contribute to *regional knowledge management processes* is not as easy to determine and from what has been presented to the evaluator this seems unlikely, at least at this stage.

Significant progress can be claimed to have been made towards the project Objective, and the effort overall has been commendable and merits a rating of **Satisfactory (S)**.

**5.2 Project Outcomes**

The project targeted three Outcomes which were expected to contribute to the Objective through a “*dynamic IWRM Plan*”, “*increased awareness and capacity*” and the “*conjunctive use of grey-water … and harvested rainwater*”, the latter as a pilot demonstration activity.

The evaluator interpreted these Outcomes as a series of questions and posed them to KCS (as the host for the disbanded PMU) and the past PM. The answers received to these questions make up the core of the following table which starts by a critique of the Indicators selected by the project in the LogFrame and those selected by PIR2010 – they are not the same. The final column of the table comprises the discussion and rating by the evaluator.

**Table 10. Analysis of the project Outcomes and progress achieved**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INDICATORS**  | **CRITIQUE OF THE INDICATORS**  | **QUESTIONS ARISING FROM OUTCOME, POSED BY EVALUATOR AND RESPONSES BY THE KCS and PM (verbatim)** | **EVALUATOR’S COMMENTS AND RATINGS** |
| **Outcome 1:** A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and transboundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources |
| **From LogFrame:**1.1 Plan formally adopted by GoB1.2 Plan effectively implemented through institutional mechanisms created1.3 Transboundary priorities addressed1.4 Global environmental objectives integrated and pursued1.5 Multiples uses of water balanced**From PIR2010:**1.1 An assessment of issues and the status of water resources management conducted and Situation Analysis Report produced1.2 Water resources management issues and actions identified, prioritized and strategized, and the IWRM Action Plan produced1.3 Cross-sectoral institutional coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms for integrated water resources planning and management developed and established; Stakeholder participation framework developed1.4 A dynamic IWRM Plan prepared and implemented | Whether the Plan was adopted and implemented was easy to determine, however, the scope of the plan may have required Indicators.The two sets of Indicators focus on what was done rather than on what was achieved. Rather than repeat the wording of the Outcome, the Indicators would have been more helpful had they helped assess whether the Plan addressed transboundary priorities, or integrated global environmental objectives, or balanced multiple uses of water.As presented, neither set of Indicators is helpful and they do not possess SMART qualities. In fact, they are not really Indicators. They are only partly **Specific** to the Outcome. Apart from LogFrame 1.1 and PIR 1.4 they are not **Measurable.** Somemay be **Achievable** but not LogFrame 1.2 because it is beyond the lifetime of the project. It is not easy to **Attribute** them to the project. Some are partly **Relevant** to the Outcome and they are easy to **Track** because most are tangible outputs.  | ***Has an IWRM Plan been adopted and implemented?*****KCS** The plan has been completed and adopted by the PSC on behalf of the Government. It was a recommendation from the Revised NWMP of 2006 by the Government of Botswana. It will be launched by the Minister of MEWR in October 2013.The implementation has started with activities covered in the Revised NDP10.**PM** An IWRM Plan has been developed within the country and handed over to the MMEWR to take for adoption and finally implementation. Given the time of the project (3yrs) it was not practically possible to develop the plan, adopt and start the implementation of the plan. However a number of activities were taken from the plan (during development) by the DWA and included into the National Development Plan during the mid-term review of the NDP. Thus a number of activities have been included in the revised NDP and will be financed through the government financing mechanisms. | The Botswana IWRM Plan, produced through the collaboration of the project with DWA and other stakeholders has been recently adopted by the Government, albeit after project closure.Although implementation is a target of the Outcome, it is beyond the competence of a project such as this and could not be expected. In spite of this, as explained by KCS and the PM, some implementation can already be rightly claimed through the incorporation of elements of the Plan into the NDP. |
| ***Does it address national and transboundary priorities?*****KCS** Yes. Some of the priority activities in the IWRM plan are included in the revised National Development Plan. All river basin priorities that share border with Botswana have been assessed and been made part of the IWRM Plan for the Botswana side of the basins. Blue, we can also mention other related activities where the PSC members participated, i.e. the recent NAP workshops and lets see how we can link this to the IWRM/WE objectives.[[32]](#footnote-32)**PM** The Plan addresses the national and transboundary priorities as nationally it was developed through extensive national consultative process starting at district level. At the transboundary level, the development process included inputs from the International Waters Unit which is in charge of transboundary issues in Botswana. Thus the IWU served as a mechanism of taking issues from the transboundary level and feeding them into the national IWRM Plan. The project (Project Manager and Seconded officer) also sat in a number of institutions which enabled them to feedback into the planning process. Sat in the ORASECOM Task teams, Okavango NAP Development team and the bilateral committee between Botswana and South Africa that sought to address issues of the farmers in the LIMPOPO basin. | The IWRM Plan was developed within an extensive context of water sector reform and it does address national priorities.It also reflects transboundary priorities quite specifically. For example Objective 4b seeks the harmonization of policies with other RBO member states; Objective 6 is all about shared water resources; and, Annex 3 is an excellent summary with a focus on RBOs in Southern Africa of which Botswana is a member. |
| ***Does it balance multiple uses of water resources?*****KCS** Yes. Conjunctive use of surface and ground water and reuse /recycling of water has been made part of the plan. This included the water use for ecological use a part of the plan. On the other hand the concurrent sector reforms covered institutional reorganization, legislative and policy formulations**PM** The plan addresses multiple uses of water resources and even proposes ways in which water allocation can be carried out in Botswana so as to ensure a balance and equitable use of water in Botswana. | The IRWM Plan does not explicitly embrace multiple use of water resources, however, the philosophy is embedded throughout the plan. In particular, the Objectives of Strategic Areas 1 and 2 promote multiple use. |
| In spite of the unhelpful Indicators, the evaluator confirms that Outcome 1 has been achieved and is rated as **Satisfactory (S)** |
| **Outcome 2:** Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector, and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives |
| **From LogFrame:**2.1 Knowledge management platforms in place and informing national and regional IWRM planning processes2.2 Guidance material accessed by IWRM practitioners**From PIR2010:**2.1 Consistent and practical guidance for IWRM developed and made available (IWRM Guidelines)2.2 Capacities to participate in the IWRM Plan implemention at the local level strengthened2.3 Knowledge management products produced, knowledge and awareness about IWRM created, and information disseminated, bat local, national and regional levels (Publications/Publicity documents, workshops, conferences held)2.4 Bi-directional mechanisms to incorporate national and trans-boundary concerns, agreements and processes into respective water resources planning and management arrangements established (Platform for exchanges for information includes, among others, regional conferences organized and/or hosted by SADC related to the revised shared water protocol, etc.) | Once again, these so-called Indicators focus on what has been done rather than on what has been achieved. They do not help answer the question on whether awareness and capacity have been increased. In fact, they are not Indicators of results (Outcome) but Activities and Outputs which can be expected to lead to results.They are not SMART. They are **Specific** to awareness and/or capacity so also to the Outcome. But few are **Measurable** and difficult to know if they have been **Achieved.** Since they are project Activities, they are **Attributable** to the project. All are partly **Relevant** to the Outcome but awareness and capacity are notoriously difficult to **Track.** Indicators based on a baseline of the level of awareness and working towards targets, measured through repeat surveys, would have been much more helpful. | ***Has awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders increased?*****KCS**  Yes. Several national and regional training have been undertaken during the project. Please lets mention a few of those examples, the TE would like to document such in his report (i.e. did we have any participants/facilitators from neighbouring regional countries?**PM** The project has been able to increase awareness of the stakeholders at both national and regional level through various initiatives;Regional level:- SADC Multistakeholder Water Dialogue: The project made presentations and distributed information materials on the IWRM project, demonstration project and lessons learnt.- Exchange visits with the Lake Victoria Basin community members on the development of the IWRM plan. Done at the request of the SIWI.- Stockholm World Water Week: Participated at and had a side event during the world water week at which the draft plan, lessons learnt were shared with the rest of the world.- Participated, exhibited at the GEF IW Conference in Australia and Dubrovnik, Croatia.At national level;- Participated, presented and exhibited during National water week commemorations, World Environment Day, World Meteorology Day, Tourism commemorations, Sanitation conferences, Water Pitso, WUC Water Resource Management Conference, teacher training workshops- Together with SIWI and DWA organised and run capacity building workshops on IWRM and related courses for stakeholders in Botswana. This is an ongoing program and will end in 2014 (ask Kealeboga Kolagano, kkolagano@gov.bw at DWA to provide the program document). This also presented a co-financing opportunity for the project as SIWI, CapNet co-financed this training exercise.  | This Outcome was to deliver the transboundary element of the project. It sought an increase in awareness and capacity nationally and regionally and the Indicators are not helpful. KCS and the PM reported on what the project has done towards awareness and capacity, but there is no measure of whether the Outcome has been achieved – it is not known whether awareness and capacity have been increased. However, even without a measure, it can be assumed that both awareness and capacity have been increased at least at the national level (even if not solely through the efforts of the project). At the regional level it is difficult to see an increase in awareness and capacity and even more difficult to attribute this to this project, without a clear baseline and set, quantifiable targets.Various Guidelines produced by the project definitely help, but only at national level |
| ***How do you know?*****KCS** The project leveraged from the reforms process and the development of the Water policy to enhance capacity and knowledge on IWRM as joint activities were held across the country. Project memorabilia on IWRM has also been distributed across the country to various structures in decision making processes. Through GWP –SA and SIWI, the regional capacities have also increased e.g through sponsorship of USD 1,320,000 - DWA/SIWI trained over 60 participants in IWRM and Corporate and change management from the water environment, health, agriculture and CSO sectors in last 2 years. As a sign of capacity building stakeholders have started to roll out and implement some projects in their institutions e.g. (Botsalo the brigade in NE)**PM** Same as above… | Memorabilia are not awareness (the message could be missed completely) – they may lead to awareness, but to be sure, you must measure. Likewise, training is not capacity although it can lead to capacity – but without measurement (e.g. through survey) we will never know if the Outcome has been achieved. |
| ***Was this through regional knowledge management initiatives?*****KCS** Yes - Through GWP –SA and SIWI, the regional capacities have also increased | Regional knowledge may have been “distributed” but it is not known how “managed” it has been |
| The project has worked hard on awareness raising and enhancing capacity but there is no measure of how successful it has been and it is uncertain whether Outcome 2 has been achieved. In recognition of its efforts, the rating for Outcome 2 is **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**. |
| **Outcome 3:** Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Reuse and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation |
| **From LogFrame:**3.1 Pilot project adopted as a national initiative3.2 Project institutionalized and used as a basis for setting water allocation and pricing processes**Prom PIR2010:**3.1 Water conservation measures implemented and demonstrated at selected schools as part of IWRM and WE Plan in Botswana and lessons documented and disseminated across the region3.2 Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (Government, private sector and members of the public) to roll out water conservation and management programmes and actions at public/private institutions throughout Botswana and beyond | The Outcome sought a pilot (a trial or testing) of a methodology to achieve water conservation. The Indicators should have been able to determine whether, and to what extent, water conservation has been achieved. Also, since this was a pilot, Indicators should have been available to help determine how successful the pilot was.Neither of the two sets is SMART. 3.2 in each set is not **Specific** to the Outcome. None are easily **Measurable** or **Achievable** except maybe 3.1 from each set. All can be **Attributed** to the project. All are at least partly **Relevant** to the Outcome. All but PIR 3.2 should be comparatively easy to **Track.** | ***Has the demo project conserved water?*****KCS** Yes- Shoshong Snr Secondary School and Motsumi Jnr School. In Madiba Secondary School the portable water which was being used to flush school toilets have been relieved during rainy season as the collected/harvested rainwater is used to flush the school toilets. In Motsumi School the water water from the kitchen and bathrooms is cleaned by a constructed wetland and the water is then reused to water the school garden. This reduced the pressure on the fresh water available. This was minimal in Madiba Sec School as the water has not found consistent usage. The lady project benefits are also still under monitoring’s was one of the last to be completed.**PM** A number of demo projects have been developed and implemented;- Shoshong, Our Lady of the Desert (Francistown) Projects: Rainwater harvesting projects- Motsumi (Letlhakane), Mbiroba Camp (Okavango Panhandle) & Madiba (Mahalapye): Conjuctive use of grey water and rainwater.With the exception of the Madiba project, all other projects have been able to either conserve potable water resources, minimise pollution of the water resources such as the Okavango delta. In the case of Shoshong project has been able to provide much needed water to the school in order to provide basic water supplies to the school especially during the times when there was no water within the village of Shoshong. | Where the pilot has worked as intended, water has been conserved. In Motsumi Junior Secondary School, the evaluator was informed that the project has resulted in a 50% reduction in water consumption costs and that they were donating vegetables to 20 households. In Shoshong the project has allowed the school to remain open even when there is no mains water. The reporting by KCS and PM has been confirmed by the evaluator. |
| ***Was this through conjunctive use of grey-water and rainwater?*****KCS** Yes in Motsumi and Shoshong**PM** Yes | “Conjunctive” use of greywater and rainwater presupposes both. But the evaluator was able to see rainwater harvesting in Shoshong and greywater recycling in Motsumi, not both. |
| ***Could this be said to be piloting the IWRM Plan?*****KCS** This could be taken as piloting the IWRM plan as the pilot projects started with stakeholder integration and eventually pilot sites were selected where the lessons learned/ best practices could be used to inform policy. It fits the description as it’s a water demand strategy and Botswana being water scarce country.**PM** Yes since it was able to create awareness on the alternatives sources of water and how such sources can be used by different sectors to meet their water requirements… | The evaluator sees this as a pilot for water recycling and rainwater harvesting – the IWRM Plan is much broader than this. It would be closer to Plan implementation when the Ministry of Education issues a requirement (with incentives) for schools to capture and use rainwater, and recycle their greywater. |
| As a pilot/trial/test, Outcome 3 has been achieved, but its full impact will only be achieved when the results are analysed, evaluated and refined before being rolled out. Rated as **Satisfactory (S)**. |
| **Overall conclusions and rating:** The achievement of the project Objective has been rated as Satisfactory (S) and so are two of the three Outcomes targeted by the project. Although one Outcome is rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS), the overall rating for effectiveness in reaching the project targets is **Satisfactory (S)**. |

**5.3 Mainstreaming of UNDP corporate goals**

“Mainstreaming” is not something that you achieve; it is a process through which something that would otherwise be marginal is brought into the core business and main decision-making process of an organization. UNDP has adopted a number of corporate goals, mostly reflecting the Millennium Declaration, and there is a commitment that these should become mainstreamed into all its functions and interventions. It is therefore incumbent on an evaluator of a UNDP project to assess the extent to which the project took on board these UNDP goals.

The most relevant UNDP corporate goals for a project such as this are gender equality, alleviation of poverty and safeguarding human rights.

In its discussion of threats, barriers and root causes, the earlier ProDoc noted that “*consideration of important social cross-cutting concerns relating to different forms of social inequality and vulnerability, notably gender and HIV/AIDS, but including also poverty ….. and human rights is an important aspect of IWRM. Data on such issues need to be collected, managed and mainstreamed into IWRM planning.*” It also noted that “*it is of particular importance to take assertive action to achieve gender balance in stakeholder forums and IWRM organizations*”. These sentiments did not carry through to the signed version of the ProDoc and it is not known whether and to what extent they were observed by the project.

From what can be seen, the project did not have an overt **gender** perspective. Neither the signed ProDoc nor the Inception Report, mention gender at all. Only in the PIRs is it mentioned but with little discussion. For example, PIR2011 states that “*IWRM promotes the participation of women in water resource management issues hence all the capacity building initiatives are being extended to institutions like the Department of Women Affairs and including other stakeholders who are targeted to promote gender activities. These institutions have been influential in creating a balanced representations[[33]](#footnote-33) to meetings and workshops.*” And, in PIR2012, just a few months before project closure, it was observed that “*Since this project focuses on a sector and a resource that is intimately tied to gender and issues affecting women, it could have made significant contributions towards the involvement of women in co-management activities. This is largely a missed opportunity. This issue has been discussed with the project team and deliberate plans will be made in the remainder of the project to involve women in project activities. In particular future training activities will deliberately target a specific number of women as beneficiaries*.” It is not known to what extent, if any, this commitment was followed up.

It is not clear if there was any effort to consider the different implications of the project for women and men; there are no disaggregated data on a gender basis; there is no strategy to address the different needs of women and men; and no effort was evident to address gender differences in any planned action.

As with the case of gender, **poverty** and **human rights** are discussed by the earlier ProDoc in its situation analysis, but this does not carry through to the signed version of the ProDoc. The project did not recognize the level of poverty among the ultimate beneficiaries of IWRM, neither did it recognize that availability of water is a basic human right.

**5.4 Impacts**

The achievements of Outputs which lead to Outcomes are assessed by LogFrame analysis which is mainly carried out by the Project M&E System, and confirmed by the TE with reliance on good Indicators. The conversion of Outcomes to Impacts often requires an Intermediate stage and this is assessed mainly by TE methodology. It is predicated by Assumptions, and is dependent on Impact Drivers which include Relevance, Sustainability and Catalytic effects.

**5.4.1 Impacts at the national level**

The project achieved the majority of its Outputs and Outcomes and the results achieved by the project have led to Intermediate Impacts as planned. These include institutional frameworks, tools and methods, capacity, awareness and demonstrations – national impacts have already taken place, at the upstream level and on a more restricted scale, at the local level. The next step to achieve truly national level impacts is dependent on the extent of implementation of the IWRM Plan and the replication of other project benefits, products and services. This will depend on a number of external assumptions being realized.

At the pilot/demonstration localities visited by the evaluator, the project has brought potentially significant savings in water use and related costs, if the facilities are utilized fully and if there is sustainability. The project has also raised awareness of the benefits that can accrue through wise water use; it has also enhanced the capacity of central and local officials dealing with water management. Even in information management, where it has not been entirely successful, the project has raised awareness and sensitivity to the values and vulnerabilities of the scarce water resources and this is a valuable impact at community level.

**5.4.2 Regional impacts**

In Southern Africa, water is a scarce natural resource and the gains made by Botswana through the project are applicable across its borders to its neighbours. It is now up to these neighbours and the relevant river commissions to build on what has been achieved by the project in Botswana for the benefit of the region. For this to happen, there must be an effective, cooperation framework on a regional basis, and this is not entirely evident in spite of the work of bodies such as the Global Water Partnership Southern Africa.

The project has set the scene for a regional information management system for water resources but it has stopped short of setting up such a system. The mechanism which could bring together the various transboundary river commissions has yet to be developed although according to UNDP there used to be an annual RBO workshop facilitated by SADC and GiZ. The regional level impacts of the project have yet to materialize.

**5.4.3 Global environmental impacts**

The project addressed the GEF Operational Programme #9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Programme, with a focus on the wise use and management of water resources and sound management strategies as a result of changes in sectoral policies and activities that promote sustainable development. Through its development of the IWRM Plan and elements which should facilitate its implementation, the project has addressed the key barriers to effective water resources management, namely, the uncoordinated approach and weak institutional basis.

The project set up a system which should lead to cooperation among the transboundary river commissions for the wise management of scarce water resources on a sustainable basis. This fits well within the outcomes expected by OP#9 which include the long-term commitment on the part of governments, IAs, donors, and the GEF to leverage the intended sectoral changes to address the root causes of complex environmental problems.

**5.5 Sustainability**

The project has piloted and demonstrated successfully techniques for greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting. However, pilots and demonstrations are not results – results are obtained through the upscaling and replication of the pilots, and this is why sustainability of the project products, services and benefits beyond the life of the project, is so crucial. According to the minutes of the LPAC meeting, “*The issue of sustainability of the demonstration project … was highlighted as a critical area. Members of LPAC stressed the importance of not looking at this demonstration project as a one-off initiative … the PMU should consistently document the selected options and demonstrate the savings that can be accrued both in financial and water resources management*.”

**5.5.1 The exit strategy and Project Terminal Report**

An effective exit strategy is necessary to safeguard the results, benefits and services of a project. Elements that comprise such a strategy include:

* a structured close-down of the project
* a managed handing-over of responsibilities
* a rational allocation of assets with recognition and receipts
* an exchange of appreciation and commitment letters
* a financial sustainability strategy
* an effective knowledge management system

These and similar actions will enhance the prospects for sustainability of the valuable products of the project. Unfortunately, this project did not have an Exit Strategy and although it had the hand-over notes of the PM who resigned a few months before project closure, neither did it have a Terminal Report. This is in spite of one being explicitly required by article 9.4 of the Memorandum of Agreement between KCS and DWA.

**5.5.2 Institutional and social sustainability**

The project has strived to build institutional capacity and raise awareness of the philosophy and approach of IWRM. It has taken the opportunities presented by the momentum of the water sector reforms thus achieving an impressive multiplier effect. Key government organizations have been actively involved technically, and in an administrative and supportive role throughout project execution. As a result, there has been a high level of acceptance at senior levels of Government. As one consultee said to the evaluator, “*the most valuable product of the project was the building blocks of collaboration, relationships and cooperation – even if the project has finished and the PSC has disbanded, the network will survive and collaboration on water will remain*”.

The project has laid a strong foundation for replication and upscaling, and in the absence of an exit strategy, the DWA has accepted the responsibility for building on the project products and services and ensuring their sustainability at the national level. There is a strong sense of ownership of the project products by the DWA and this augurs well for their sustainability. Unfortunately, the degree of ownership at the schools level is mixed. It appears that the Ministry of Education has still to be brought on board and without its buy-in sustainability is in jeopardy. The level of interest and ownership in individual schools that have been involved in the pilot project and visited by the evaluator, depend on a champion among the staff – they do not all have one, and even if they do, there is the risk that the individual may be reassigned to another position. As a result, sustainability is not assured in the long term. In addition, one consultee told the evaluator, “*the less than enthusiastic reaction by some schools is due to a concern about reusing wastewater,*” and DWA will need to work hard to dispel this view.

In the regional, transboundary context, the project has taken few initiatives, if any, and it has relied on existing institutions such as SADC and GWP-SA. It is not possible to assess sustainability at the transboundary level without assessing these and similar regional institutions and this is beyond the boundaries of this evaluation.

The institutional and social sustainability of project activities, together with their products, services and other benefits, are seen as **Moderately Likely (ML)** at the national level, and are unknown at the transboundary level.

**5.5.3 Financial sustainability**

Many of the plans, arrangements and other assumptions for handing over project components to inheriting institutions, depend on the availability of financial resources. And it was heartening for the evaluator to note the commitment by DWA that they see project interventions to be part of their core function and that they will continue these through their institutional budgetary resources and through existing donor funding. This will no doubt be the case regarding the IWRM Plan.

It is also possible that DWA will continue funding greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting in schools, at least on a demonstration scale and for the short term. However, the long term sustainability of these initiatives will require a paradigm shift on the part of the Ministry of Education to recognize the net financial benefits of such initiatives.

Similarly as for institutional sustainability above, the financial sustainability prospects for project products at transboundary level are unknown.

In the current context, financial sustainability is seen as **Likely (L)**, at least in the short term, but this could jump to Highly Likely if the Ministry of Education could be brought on board at the institutional level.

**5.5.4 Environmental sustainability**

This was an “environmental” project and the security of environmental sustainability should be a foregone conclusion. Wise management of scarce water resources, including multiple use, according to efficiency principles and while recognizing ecosystem requirements, is according to the best environmental codes – these sentiments form the foundation for the IWRM Plan.

However, environmental sustainability needs to take into account the changing climate which is expected to exacerbate an already serious water shortage situation in Botswana. Research is required to devise strategies to overcome the negative impacts of climate change and capitalize on any positive impacts.

Overall, environmental sustainability is seen as **Likely (L)**.

**6 CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY RATINGS AND LESSONS**

**6.1 Conclusions**

**6.1.1 Project design and relevance**

The project went through a very long gestation period and there were at least two versions of the ProDoc which were significantly different. The earlier version of March 2007 depicted a more robust project design than the later, signed version of December 2008, which was the one implemented. The implemented version of the ProDoc did not include consideration of risks, stakeholders and upscaling/replication which appeared in the earlier version. There was also little consideration of gender and other UNDP corporate goals. The LogFrame was also incomplete since it lacked Indicators for the Objective, Baselines, Targets and Risks. The last version of the CEO Endorsement Request (the one approved) did include information on risks, risk mitigation measures, replicability and sustainability and it can therefore be said that these elements at least were taken into account during project development.

The project relied on partners to achieve its transboundary dimension and this turned out to be very risky. In the event, the project was delayed, and by the time it got going the co-financing was not available anymore and the important transboundary/regional element of the project suffered.

However, even with these design flaws, the project was still extremely relevant to Botswana and the region where water is a scarce resource and IWRM provides a more intelligent approach to water management.

The project was also relevant to GEF and its International Waters goals since in Botswana, with minor exceptions, surface waters originate beyond the borders and are shared with neighbours. In other words, IWRM in Botswana is of direct relevance to the Okavango, Orange-Sengu, Limpopo and Zambesi River Basin countries

**6.1.2 Project implementation efficiency**

The project governance structure and performance were excellent. They reflected the high level of ownership on the part of the Government, DWA in particular. The PSC, together with the TAG, performed well and effectively, the former at the policy level and the latter at the technical level, complementing each other.

It was a smart move on the part of the Government to get KCS to execute the project and host the PMU, while at the same time allowing DWA to remain fully engaged through its chairing of the PSC and the secondment of the Project Technical Coordinator to the PMU. By doing so, the PMU was placed virtually within the secretariat of the Botswana CWP, and right at the centre of the on-going water sector reforms.

Project management suffered from the early resignation of the PM and although adequate hand-over notes were prepared, the project finished without an exit strategy or a terminal report.

The project came at a difficult time for the UNDP Country Office. Its performance, particularly its funds management and disbursements process, was described to the evaluator as “*chaotic*”. Delays in processing disbursement requests resulted in the loss of pledged co-finance and the negation of the transboundary dimension. The project was saved because KCS stepped into the breach with cash advances. Furthermore, the change in personnel at the UNDP Country Office created a hiatus of a few months which had a serious impact on the project.

Government co-financing was substantial (including a full-time secondment of the Technical Coordinator to the project, a project vehicle and its running costs, and some capital investments required at demonstration sites) and valiant provision of bridging finance was made available by KCS to overcome the slow release of funds by UNDP. However, the evaluator does not have confidence in the management of co-financing – recording was not methodical so the delivered amounts are not known, co-financing was lost through the delays in project start-up, and PIR2012 considered reporting and management of co-financing as *a significant challenge*.

**6.1.3 Project results and effectiveness**

The project Objective sought *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* through national processes, institutional mechanisms, and regional knowledge management processes. It is difficult to determine explicitly whether *efficient and equitable IWRM planning* had been obtained by the project, but an IWRM Plan has been produced and endorsed by the Minister and it serves as a strong foundation for the type of planning targeted by the Objective. In its work towards developing the Plan, the project did strengthen *national processes and institutional mechanisms* in Botswana and these played a crucial role in the development of the Plan. It is not easy to determine whether this has supported and contributed to *regional knowledge management processes* and from what has been presented to the evaluator this seems unlikely, at least at this stage.

At the Outcome level, in spite of difficulties and lack of collaboration between the national and international consultant, the prime target of Outcome 1, namely the IWRM Plan, has been achieved. Likewise for the products of Outcome 3 – the pilot projects on greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting have been carried out at school level, albeit with mixed success. However, it is not known whether the results have been assessed, refined and written up for replication.

Outcome 2 reflected the transboundary dimension of the project which, as noted above, was reliant to a high degree on co-financing partners. In the event, project delays caused the loss of the co-financing and activities which were to be carried out by the partners. The delays also meant that the opportunity for the project to make a “*significant contribution to the existing and on-going regional efforts to develop IWRM Plans ….. in the Sub-Saharan Africa region*” disappeared because other countries had moved on.

The project carried out numerous awareness raising and capacity enhancing activities involving many participants; but there has not been any assessment or measure of the results achieved and these remain unknown.

**6.1.4 Sustainability**

The project has been successful in producing an IWRM Plan which has been accepted by the Government. But while the plan is a satisfactory result, it is not the impact sought – it is merely the foundation upon which Botswana is going to manage its precious and scarce water resources. In other words, the work is just beginning.

Likewise, the project has piloted and demonstrated successfully techniques for greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting. However, pilots and demonstrations are not results – results are obtained through the upscaling and replication of the pilots.

This is why the sustainability of the project products, services and benefits beyond the life of the project, is so crucial. The LPAC meeting, “*stressed the importance of not looking at this demonstration project as a one-off initiative … the PMU should consistently document the selected options and demonstrate the savings that can be accrued both in financial and water resources management*.” It is not known if this assessment and recording of what the project tested and produced has been carried out.

The project needed an effective exit strategy or sustainability plan to safeguard its achievements and see them transformed into impacts. Unfortunately, this project did not have an Exit Strategy in spite of one being explicitly required by the Memorandum of Agreement between KCS and DWA.

**6.1.5 Overall conclusion on the project**

This has been a modest project which set about to establish a solid foundation for managing Botswana’s scarce water resources in a pilot/demonstration that was going to be presented for emulation by the regional neighbours.

In the event, it was assailed by delays in start-up which caused it to lose some of its co-financing. It also rendered its demonstration function almost redundant because the neighbours had developed their own IWRM Plans by then.

The project was also affected by the difficulties that seemed to face the UNDP Country Office at the time, particularly with disbursements, and it survived only as a result of the strong ownership by the DWA and the commitment of the KCS. There were times when the PMU had no GEF money to implement any activities and what kept up the momentum was the implementation of demonstration activities, awareness raising activities and the IWRM Road Show which were largely financed by the government.

Significant progress was made towards the Objective and two out of the three Outcomes were achieved satisfactorily. The other Outcome was only partly achieved and suffered from the loss of the co-financing partners and the reduced relevance to the region.

The project was unusual for a GEF International Waters project because it was very much a country project rather than a transboundary one. However, even with the reduction of its explicit transboundary and regional elements, the project was still very much within the goals and objectives of the GEF-IW theme. This is because in Botswana, with minor exceptions, all surface waters have a transboundary character and integrated water resources planning and management in Botswana is of great relevance to the countries that share the river basins of the Okavango, Orange-Senqu, Limpopo and Zambezi[[34]](#footnote-34).

**6.2 Summary of assessments made and ratings awarded**

The following summary focuses on the key elements of the project, including all those that were required to be rated. They arise from the analyses made of the data and information obtained according to the evaluation matrix in Annex 4.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERION** | **SUMMARY COMMENTS** | **RATING** |
| **PROJECT FORMULATION** |
| Project concept and design | The project concept was straightforward and addressed the identified water resources management problems, their root causes and barriers in Southern Africa. But the design was flawed, over-ambitious, with no provision for replication and upscaling of pilots, reliance on co-financing partners and without a risk management strategy. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| Relevance | Highly relevant to the needs of Botswana and the region; fitted well within the UNDAF and UNDP CCF and it reflected the GEF global objectives. | **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** |
| Stakeholder participation in formulation | Context within which the project was formulated comprised heightened awareness, wide-ranging consultations and a high degree of on-going stakeholder participation. | **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** |
| **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION** |
| Project Governance | PSC was functional and with the necessary standing; complemented by TAG with a number of individuals participating in both groups = significant commitment to the project. | **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** |
| Project Administration and Management | Three concerns tarnish the otherwise successful project management – the delays experienced by the project, the ineffectual project closure, and the apparent lack of collaboration between the national and international consultants charged with the drafting of the IWRM Plan. | **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** |
| **Implementation Approach** |
| Stakeholder participation in implementation and partnerships | Stakeholder participation in project implementation was moderate, ownership was very strong, and partnerships were moderate. | **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** |
| Risk management | ProDoc had no prepared response to any risks that might eventuate, not even those identified. And, although a risk table was included in the CEO Endorsement Request, and while critical risks were identified in the PIRs, there is no sign of risk management. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| **Project finances** |
| Financial planning and management | Delays in the processing of requests and release of funds affected project start-up causing serious delays (which in turn led to the withdrawal of pledged co-financing). Virtually every PSC meeting for which minutes are available, has pleaded with UNDP to improve its disbursement process. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| Co-financing | Some co-financing was lost because of the delays in project start-up. And while Government co-financing is known to have been substantial and could merit a Satisfactory rating, this is downgraded because reporting on co-financing directly administered by the executing agency was seen as *a significant challenge* and the evaluator has no confidence in the management of co-financing. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** |
| M&E Design, Plan and Budget | The effectiveness and accuracy of planning for M&E at entry level was mixed. A plan was provided complete with budget and timeframes, but there were no indicators for the Objective and those for Outcomes were not SMART; there were no baselines or targets and none of these shortcomings were addressed at the Inception Workshop. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| Use of LogFrame and Adaptive Management | LogFrame incomplete – no Baselines or Targets, no Indicators for the Objective. LogFrame not functional and there are few if any signs of adaptive management. | **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** |
| **Role and performance of IA and EAs** |
| UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency | Operational disbursement by UNDP came in for significant criticism by stakeholders. There were inordinate delays in the release of approved funds and these delayed the start-up of the project and placed it in jeopardy if it were not for the advancement of funds by the KCS. | **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** |
| Executing Agencies – DWA and KCS | DWA displayed strong ownership of the IWRM Plan; it provided technical and financial support of the demonstration pilot projects; it seconded a senior official as Project Technical Coordinator within the PMU. Through this strong level of involvement and collaboration, the DWA has confirmed the incremental nature of the GEF support. The performance of DWA has been truly exemplary.KCS performed its role as executing agency for the project exceedingly well – it managed the project, carried out project activities, monitored project progress, reported regularly to the PSC and UNDP, recruited and managed project personnel (including consultants), and managed project funds. It exceeded expectations when it stepped into the breach and advanced the necessary funds to keep the project going. | **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** |
| **PROJECT RESULTS**  |
| **Attainment of Objective and Outcomes** |
| **Objective:** *To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning* | Significant progress has been made towards the Objective - an IWRM Plan has been produced and it serves as a strong foundation for the planning targeted by the Objective. The project did strengthen *national processes and institutional mechanisms* and these played a crucial role in the development of the Plan. Whether this was likely to support and contribute to *regional knowledge management processes* is not as easy to determine and from what has been presented to the evaluator this seems unlikely, at least at this stage. The effort overall has been commendable. | **Satisfactory (S)** |
| **Outcome 1:** *A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and transboundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources* | The IWRM Plan developed by the project has been adopted by the Government, however, implementation is beyond the competence of a project such as this. Plan was developed within an extensive context of water sector reform and it does address national priorities. And while it does not really address transboundary priorities, it also reflects them quite specifically (Objective 4b, Objective 6, and Annex 3). The IRWM Plan does not explicitly embrace multiple use of water resources, however, the philosophy is embedded throughout the plan. In particular, the Objectives of Strategic Areas 1 and 2 promote multiple use. | **Satisfactory (S)** |
| **Outcome 2:** *Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector, and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives* | The project has carried out numerous activities towards awareness and capacity, but there is no measure of whether the Outcome has been achieved – it is not known whether awareness and capacity have been increased. However, even without a measure, it can be assumed that both awareness and capacity have been increased at least at the national level. At the regional level it is difficult to see an increase in awareness and capacity and even more difficult to attribute it to this project, without a clear baseline and quantifiable targets. Memorabilia are not awareness – they may lead to awareness, but to be sure, you must measure. Likewise, training is not capacity although it can lead to capacity – but without measurement (e.g. through survey) we will never know if the Outcome has been achieved. | **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** |
| **Outcome 3:** *Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Reuse and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation* | Where the pilot has worked as intended, water has been conserved. In Motsumi Junior Secondary School, the project has resulted in a 50% reduction in water consumption costs. In Shoshong the project has allowed the school to remain open even when there is no mains water. The evaluator sees this as a pilot for water recycling and rainwater harvesting – the IWRM Plan is much broader than this. It would be closer to Plan implementation when the Min of Education issues a requirement (with incentives) for schools to capture and use rainwater, and recycle their greywater. | **Satisfactory (S)** |
| **Sustainability** |
| Institutional and social sustainability | The project has laid a strong foundation for replication and upscaling, and in the absence of an exit strategy, the DWA has accepted the responsibility for building on the project products and services and ensuring their sustainability at the national level. There is a strong sense of ownership of the project products by the DWA and this augurs well for their sustainability. In the transboundary context, the project has relied on existing institutions such as SADC and GWP-SA. It is not possible to assess sustainability at the transboundary level without assessing these institutions and this is beyond the boundaries of this evaluation. | **Moderately Likely (ML)** |
| Financial sustainability | DWA see project interventions as part of their core function and will continue these through their institutional budgetary resources and through existing donor funding. This will no doubt be the case regarding the IWRM Plan. It is also possible that DWA will continue funding greywater reuse and rainwater harvesting in schools, at least on a demonstration scale and for the short term. Long term sustainability will require a paradigm shift on the part of the Ministry of Education to recognize the net financial benefits of such initiatives. Financial sustainability prospects for project products at transboundary level are unknown. | **Likely (L)** |
| Environmental sustainability | Wise management of scarce water resources, including multiple use, according to efficiency principles and while recognizing ecosystem requirements, is according to the best environmental codes – these sentiments form the foundation for the IWRM Plan. | **Likely (L)** |
| **OVERALL PROJECT RATING** | This has been a modest project which set about to establish a solid foundation for managing Botswana’s scarce water resources in a pilot/demonstration that was going to be presented for emulation by the regional neighbours.  In the event, it was assailed by delays in start-up which caused it to lose some of its co-financing. It also rendered its demonstration function almost redundant because the neighbours had developed their own IWRM Plans by then. The project was also affected by the difficulties that seemed to face the UNDP Country Office at the time, particularly with disbursements and it survived only as a result of the strong ownership by the DWA and the commitment of the KCS.  Significant progress was made towards the Objective and two out of the three Outcomes were achieved satisfactorily. The other Outcome was only partly achieved and suffered from the loss of the co-financing partners and the reduced relevance to the region. The project was unusual for a GEF International Waters project because it was very much a country project rather than a transboundary one. However, even with the reduction of its explicit transboundary and regional elements, the project was still very much within the goals and objectives of the GEF-IW theme. This is because in Botswana, with minor exceptions, all surface waters have a transboundary character and integrated water resources planning and management in Botswana is of great relevance to the countries that share the river basins of the Okavango, Orange-Senqu, Limpopo and Zambezi.The project achieved very well considering the level of investment by the GEF. | **Satisfactory (S)** |

**6.3 Lessons that have emerged**

**6.3.1 Issue: Long gestation period and other delays to project implementation**

This project took a long time to formulate and between the concept stages and actual implementation circumstances changed significantly, making some of its activities less relevant.

**Lesson:** In the interest of relevance and meaningful project design, and under exceptional circumstances, the inception workshop should be encouraged to re-design and refine a project. This should include changing targeted Outcomes if it makes the Objective more attainable.

**6.3.2 Issue: Reliance on a co-financing partner for an essential Outcome**

The project design relied on activities and funding from co-financing partners for a very important element of the project, namely its transboundary dimension. With the delay in project start-up, these funds were no longer available and project activities under Outcome 2 were hampered thus negating the benefit which would have otherwise accrued.

**Lesson:** While collaboration and partnerships are to be encouraged, total reliance on a partner is risky and project design must identify this risk in advance and set up mitigation measures to deal with non-delivery for whatever reason.

**6.3.3 Issue: Best timing for a Terminal Evaluation**

This evaluation took place some five months after project closure, not because of negligence but because of circumstances. In spite of members of the PSC being readily available and DWA being very active in the post-project activities, the evaluation faced some difficulties.

**Lesson:** The best time for a Terminal Evaluation to take place is between four and two months before project closure, preferably when the Project Terminal Report is available and the PMU is still functioning. The TE should be timed to allow the evaluator to present Preliminary Findings at the end of the mission to the last meeting of the PSC.

**6.3.4 Issue: GEF-IW preference for transboundary projects**

It is unusual for a GEF International Waters project to be country-based rather than transboundary. However, in Botswana, with minor exceptions, all surface waters have a transboundary character and integrated water resources planning and management in Botswana is of great relevance to the countries that share the river basins of the Okavango, Orange-Senqu, Limpopo and Zambezi.

**Lesson:** Where waters are shared across borders, such as in some river basins, a single-country project could have benefits for the transboundary river basin as a whole thus satisfying GEF objectives.

**7 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**7.1 Issue: Water conservation in schools**

The six school pilot projects have had mixed results and a strong influence appears to have been the lack of a central policy from the Ministry of Education which could provide guidance and incentives for schools to conserve water.

**Recommendation:**

That UNDP, in collaboration with DWA, explore how best the Ministry of Education can develop and implement a policy for water conservation (including wastewater treatment and reuse) in schools possibly incorporating renewable energy.

**7.2 Issue: Water information management across the region**

For a number of reasons, the project was not able to fully achieve its target of information management at the transboundary regional level. And yet this is essential because in a country like Botswana, the water resources of one transboundary river basin could be protected at the cost of another transboundary river basin. The need for this has already been identified by SADC which, in its Regional Strategic Action Plan (RSAP III) has listed a Water Information Sharing Hub as a programme activity.

**Recommendation:**

That DWA, with the assistance of UNDP if required, collaborate with SADC and its members, to build a metadatabase of Regional Water Information Management, based on its Programme 4.5 in its RSAP III. Such an information management system will not replace individual databases that may exist at country level or among the River Basin Organizations. On the contrary, these individual databases will be nurtured and supported and the Regional Water Information Management System will create access and sharing links between them.

**7.3 Issue: GEF IW Tracking Tool**

The current format of the GEF IW Tracking Tool template focuses heavily on transboundary agreements, institutional set up and regional level (multi-country) actions, and is not really relevant to a project like this in spite of its valuable transboundary benefits. With a number of NAPs being produced with GEF investment and with SAP/NAP implementation increasingly including IWRM Plan development and implementation, it would be more helpful for project monitoring and for terminal evaluations if the GEF IW Tracking Tool template can be revised to capture these national level actions that yield transboundary benefits.

**Recommendation:**

That UNDP make representations to the GEF to revise the IW Tracking Tool template to enable it to capture national level actions that yield transboundary benefits.
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