

# IEG ICR Review

Independent Evaluation Group

1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 11/24/2009	
PROJ ID : P064573		Appraisal	Actual
<b>Project Name :</b> Senegal River Basin Water And Environmental Management Project	<b>Project Costs (US\$M):</b>	21.20	6.74
<b>Country:</b> Africa	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M):</b>	5.25	4.72
<b>Sector Board :</b> WAT	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M):</b>	2.30	2.47
<b>Sector(s):</b> Central government administration (75%) General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (15%) General water sanitation and flood protection sector (8%) Tertiary education (2%)			
<b>Theme(s):</b> Water resource management (23% - P) Environmental policies and institutions (22% - P) Regional integration (22% - P) Land administration and management (22% - P) Participation and civic engagement (11% - S)			
<b>L/C Number:</b>			
	<b>Board Approval Date :</b>		10/28/2003
<b>Partners involved :</b> UNDP-GEF, IDA, AfDB, France, the Netherlands	<b>Closing Date :</b>	07/31/2008	07/31/2008
<b>Evaluator :</b>	<b>Panel Reviewer :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group :</b>
George T. K. Pitman	Roy Gilbert	IEGSE ICR Reviews	IEGSG

## 2. Project Objectives and Components:

### a. Objectives:

GEF's global objective was to provide: (a) a participatory strategic environmental framework for the environmentally sustainable development of the Senegal River Basin and (b) to launch a basin-wide cooperative program for transboundary land-water management. The project was to achieve global environmental benefits through promotion of broad, basin-wide participation in developing and implementation of measures that would lead to sustainable, transboundary management of the Senegal River Basin's land and water resources.

**Key Indicators were :**

1. The Senegal River Basin Authority (Organisation pour la mise en valeur du fleuve Senegal (OMVS)) and Guinea harmonize their water legislation in accordance with the existing legislation in the other riparian countries for better management of land and water resources across the basin .
2. Guinea's hydrology network in the Senegal Basin upstream portion be upgraded to be compatible with the existing OMVS hydrology network.
3. A framework for sustainable transboundary information exchange and knowledge sharing between the four riparian countries is prepared.
4. A Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) is prepared and completed.
5. From the TDA findings, a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) document is completed.

**b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?**

No

**c. Components (or Key Conditions in the case of DPLs, as appropriate):**

Actual cost figures are only for those financed by the US\$ 7.25 million grant; total costs per component are not reported by the ICR.

1. **Environmental management capacity -building . Appraisal estimate US\$ 5.36 million; actual US\$ 2.45 million.** This was to build a core group of specialists with transboundary environmental management expertise in the national institutions associated with the *OMVS* and Guinea. Specific component activities will: (i) establish a dialogue within Guinea on its environmental management and legislation; (ii) strengthen the national and regional institutional and legislative capacity to enable the riparian countries to address priority transboundary water and environmental issues through workshops, training, and information exchange; (iii) support Project management and operations of the regional project management unit within the OMVS Headquarters; (iv) promote and facilitate, through a regional forum, the exchange of experiences in other GEF international waters projects and other comparable projects in Sub-Saharan Africa; (v) support technical capacity building, through a regional collaborative and cooperative effort to assess invasive species (water weeds) management issues; and (vi) organize a donor conference to secure further investments to address the SAP -identified priority actions.
2. **Data management and knowledge . Appraisal estimate US\$ 4.8 million; actual US\$ 1.39 million.** Specific Component activities were: (i) through a series of studies, assess the existing data, monitoring indicators, and knowledge baseline in the four riparian countries; (ii) complete a cartographic assessment of the Basin; (iii) prepare a baseline rainfall/flow model for the upper Basin; (iv) strengthen the institution's technical capacity through training, workshops, and equipment upgrade; (v) conduct the necessary studies on technical and protocol matters for effective regional collaboration; and (vi) establish a cooperative basin-related data management protocol and implementation process for the collection and exchange of information for Basin resource management.
3. **Transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) and strategic action plan (SAP). Appraisal estimate US\$1.04 million; actual US\$ 0.93 million.** The TDA was to: (i) examine existing conditions and management; (ii) identify and analyze the Basin's transboundary issues; (iii) propose options to address these issues; and (iv) address any related socio-economic and land-use issues. The TDA process was to extend the participatory approach by engaging a broader network of regional, national, and local stakeholders . Based on the TDA findings and further consultations with Basin stakeholders, the key environmental issues were to be prioritized and a SAP prepared . Both the TDA and SAP were to served as critical documents to improve environmental management in the Basin; introduce relevant environmental protection policies; provide opportunities for innovative community-based micro-grant funded investments; and inform the public about issues in the Basin .
4. **Priority actions . Appraisal estimate US\$ 9.67 million; actual US\$ 1.64 million.** This aimed to provide micro-grant funding for community-driven priority actions to curb land degradation, to enhance water quality and improve wetland management.
5. **Public participation and awareness . Appraisal estimate US\$0.33 million; actual US\$ 0.33 million.** This aimed to enhance public participation in, and awareness of, environmental issues affecting the river basin .

**d. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates:**

- Project financing was complicated and is inconsistently reported in the ICR . According to the PAD (page 41) total project costs were US\$21.20 million comprising US\$7.25 million from GEF and US\$13.95 million from parallel financing (the PAD incorrectly calls this cofinancing even though it was managed independently of the Bank). A small amount of IDA Institutional Development Fund (IDF) was allocated for "inclusive governance of the Senegal River Basin" and this was additional to the components listed in Section 2. The ICR reported the appraised amount as US\$0.31 million and actual disbursement as US\$0.50 million. There is no record of this IDF in the Project Portal for this project . Both the UNDP GEF Grant and the IDF are included in this Review

under "cofinancing" in section 1.

- According to the ICR total project costs at appraisal were US\$ 15.90 million and US\$18.56 million was actually spent. According to the Bank's Project Portal the Bank disbursed US\$ 4.72 million of the GEF Grant and the ICR reports UNDP GEF Grant disbursement as US\$1.97 million. Thus total disbursement of the GEF Grant was thus US\$6.69 million. However, the ICR shows total GEF disbursement as US\$ 7.25 million in Annex 1 and US\$6.90 million in the ICR summary (page (vi). There is no discussion in the ICR to reconcile these differences .
- Parallel financing was to be provided by the African Development Bank (AfDB, planned US\$4.02 million, actual zero), the French Agency for Development (AFD, planned US\$1.58 million, actual zero), and The Netherlands (planned US\$7.16 million, actual US\$9.78 million). At the time of project completion only 29% of the the Netherlands parallel financing was disbursed and its contribution is expected to close in March, 2010. There is no account in the ICR of why the AfDB and the AFD did not make parallel financing available .
- The PAD makes no mention of parallel financing from the IUCN but the ICR reports that US\$ 0.30 million was planned and US\$0.15 million was contributed.
- The ICR reports that some of the GEF allocation to project activities was reallocated so that it did not duplicate parallel financing from these other donors . Details of the amounts and activities are not reported .
- Two of the main components were not complete at project closing . Component 3 was awaiting final translation of the TBA and SAP from French to English after which it will go for approval to the OMVS Inter -Ministerial Council, probably in June 2009. Component 4 had delayed funding that has caused it to be extended until 2010 to enable second-phase micro-projects to be implemented. According to the ICR The UNDP-managed components spent 99.1% of their allocation. The project closed on schedule when US\$ 0.54 million of the GEF grant was cancelled.

### 3. Relevance of Objectives & Design:

#### **Objectives . Relevance is high .**

- The project objectives are substantially relevant to GEF's Operational Program Number 9 (GEFOP-9), "Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program," that aims to provide "support for preparation of water resources management strategies by riparian countries for a transboundary basin ... to allow harmonizing of sectoral water uses among basin countries in an environmentally sustainable manner ." Under the current GEF policies the SAP is no longer mandatory although " undertaking the equivalent of a SAP may be useful" (GEFOP-9, page 9-3).
- Project objectives are highly relevant to the overarching goals of the Bank's Regional Integration Assistance Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa by strengthening collaboration across borders, by promoting institutional cooperation with a particular focus on regional policy harmonization, and most importantly, by coordinating investments in support of shared water resources . The objectives were relevant to the Bank's CASs for the riparian countries Mali, Mauritania and Senegal and remain relevant in the 2007 CASs that emphasize accelerated growth and wealth creation based on environmental sustainability principles . The respective PRSPs also note that sound natural resource management within the Senegal basin makes an important contributions to rural livelihoods.
- Project objectives remain highly relevant to OMVS's current work program that was approved by the 58th Ministerial Council in late 2007.

#### **Design . Relevance is rated modest .**

- It built on ongoing initiatives in the Basin to develop a cooperative regional approach to the environmental management, contribute to effective water resources management, and provide benefits beyond national boundaries. In many respects design was over-ambitious given the scale of problem, the scope of work required and funding available. This was clearly recognized by the Bank as they prepared a much larger APL operation (US\$141 million) that had a considerable overlap in objectives and in its the design focus on institutional development. The 10-year APL operation was started 2 years after this GEF project and clearly duplicated support for many of the GEF activities in the overlap period of 2 years.
- Execution of the GEF grant was split among the Bank and UNDP taking into account their relative comparative advantage. The Bank's comparative advantage was its experience of investment lending that focused on institution building, infrastructure development, policy reform and the use of various financial mechanisms to foster economically sustainable development. UNDP's comparative advantage was its strong network of country offices, its direct interaction with country stakeholders and NGOs, wide experience at institutional capacity-building and policy dialogue, and extensive experience in transboundary Basin cooperation and inter-country programming. In practice it proved difficult to coordinate the management of the Bank and UNDP components and the synergy expected at appraisal was not only not realized but the coordination proved to be onerous for both Bank and UNDP .
- The Senegal Basin and OMVS has been recipient of many studies and support by more than a dozen donors over several years prior to the project . Despite this experience, institutional analysis of OMVS and the way in which the many co-financing and parallel financing partners would work with OMVS was extremely vague as was the scheduling of the many project activities and outputs . There was no comprehensive needs assessment to set priorities taking into account the whole range of external support to OMVS and riparian states . In effect it

became an omnibus project that bundled together a disparate array of activities with little coherence . A more considered design with fewer activities and a well -defined schedule of activities would have been better. In response the TTL stated that the design of the project met the demand of OMVS's stakeholders and the Donors' Coordination Committee (established in 1996 and meeting monthly) who were firmly of the view that the project had to benefit all water users in the basin . Many of the proposed activities were ineligible for GEF funding . However, the Dutch wanted the Bank to take the lead via GEF as a condition for their continued involvement . As a result other donors helped finance the project through a mix of cofinancing and parallel financing . The TTL agreed it did look rather complex but stated it was effective in delivering resources to help stakeholders implement water management and conservation projects (in the current follow-on project all financiers subscribe to a common pool managed by OMVS.)

#### **4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy):**

**Objective (a) a participatory strategic environmental framework for the environmentally sustainable development of the Senegal River Basin was substantially achieved . Efficacy is rated substantial .**

##### Outcomes:

- Ratification by the Guinea Parliament in March 2006 of OMVS's Water Charter. This was the final step in aligning national legal frameworks for water and water resources among all four riparians .
- The Water Charter has been widely disseminated through regional and national workshops, media, universities, NGOs and among development partners.
- Terms of reference for the development of Regional Environmental Codes were agreed .
- A Strategic Action Plan for the Senegal Basin was developed and agreed in line with GEF guidelines . It awaits inter-ministerial council approval pending completion of translation from French to English . The Plan provides the framework for the development of a basin -wide master plan that integrates environmental priority actions into overall development planning .

(The ratification of the Water Charter cannot be solely attributed to this GEF project because it was a condition of negotiation for the US\$ 141 million Senegal River Basin Multipurpose Water Resources Development APL Project that was approved in June 2006. A major trigger for the second phase APL project is Guinea's satisfactory integration within the OMVS framework.)

##### Outputs:

- A study of the national legal framework of Mali, Mauritania and Senegal was completed .
- Studies of the harmonization gaps among riparians and comparison with OMVS directives and Guinea legislation were completed .
- Work started on updating and harmonizing Guinea legislation in line with study recommendations .
- Representatives from OMVS parliaments and senates received information /training seminars on OMVS's role, perspectives and challenges . Members from National Cells and Local Coordination Committees (56 in all) were trained in local development planning .

**Objective (b) to launch a basin -wide cooperative program for transboundary land -water management was substantially achieved . Efficacy is rated substantial .**

##### Outcomes:

- This program was primarily directed at producing outputs that would facilitate knowledge generation, capacity-building and partnerships. Thus, for example transboundary diagnostic analysis was developed for each country and this led to the strategic action plan for the Basin developed by OMVS .

##### Outputs reported in the ICR:

- Basic environmental, hydrometric, meteorological and water quality data collection networks were modernized, upgraded and integrated into a basin -wide standardized system . Considerable attention was given to the upper basin in Guinea and memoranda of understanding (MOU) on data-sharing were signed . Data generated are freely published and shared .
- Maps showing the environmental conditions of the Senegal River Basin (including Guinea) were developed and disseminated .
- Core group of specialists with transboundary environmental management expertise were established in national OMVS-related institutions . National working groups were formed to facilitate Guinea's induction into OMVS .
- Public information dissemination systems, including broadcasting and newsletters, were established throughout the Basin .
- An additional (14) Local Coordination Committees were established in each of the 4 participating countries .
- 55 micro-projects for activities including reforestation, sustainable land management, water storage for agriculture, pisciculture etc were approved throughout the basin .
- 16 MOU/partnership agreements were signed with a university in each country . An OMVS scientific advisory group was established .
- Water resource planning information (river flows, water quality, land use data etc .,) is shared throughout the basin .

**Given the achievements of both objectives the global environmental objective to establish sustainable, transboundary management of the Senegal River Basin 's land and water resources was substantially achieved .**

- However, the achievements of the GEF project are partly attributable to other projects that were independently managed. Five small Technical Assistance Projects financed by the Bank also promoted the same institutional objectives and governance within the Senegal Basin and among the four riparians over the period 2002-2006. Subsequently a larger Bank two-phase 10-year US\$141 million Senegal River Basin Multipurpose Water Resources Development APL Project was approved in 2006. This APL allocated US\$8 million for the first of three components that "will support actions at the regional level to consolidate and strengthen policies, plans, and actions relating to integrated water resources development, implementing the Inclusive Framework will require the strengthening of institutional knowledge and technical capacity but also strengthening of the legal, institutional, and financial frameworks."

**Overall efficacy is rated substantial .**

#### **5. Efficiency (not applicable to DPLs):**

There were no formal measures of efficiency primarily because it was an institutional development project . And because of the multiplicity of activities simpler measures such as unit cost analysis are not available . There is also the difficulty of cost and output attribution given the several parallel Bank and donor -supported projects assisting the same agency. The Regional Project Management Unit maximized ownership and reduced costs by recruiting technical expertise from within the region and the project achieved objectives at 93% of the appraisal estimate. In terms of leverage, the GEF grant was very effective in mobilizing bilateral support - for example the Netherlands grant. At appraisal each GEF dollar raised 1.2; by project closing this had increased to 1.8. On this basis efficiency is rated substantial.

#### **a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR)/Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation :**

	Rate Available?	Point Value	Coverage/Scope*
Appraisal	No		
ICR estimate	No		

\* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

#### **6. Outcome:**

The project substantially achieved its global environmental objective to establish sustainable, transboundary management of the Senegal River Basin's land and water resources . Institutions and a framework to enable participatory planning and management were successfully established . Cooperative programs linked the riparian states, fostered local development and built institutional and human capacity . Given the high relevance of project objectives, modest relevance of design, substantial efficacy and efficiency, and the achievement of project objectives, the outcome of the project is rated satisfactory .

#### **a. Outcome Rating :** Satisfactory

#### **7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating:**

Ownership of the OMVS by riparian states is high and the project successfully built on earlier projects to enlarge membership to include Guinea . Supervision reports, however, raised concerns about the "limited sustainability of activities beyond the life of the project" (ISR September 2007). But this concern was addressed (ICR pages 16-17) by the overlapping multi-donor Senegal River Basin Multipurpose Water Resources Development APL Project that provides large incentives (that include institutional and technical support and investment financing to stakeholders ) and technical support to enable OMVS to continue with sound water and environmental management with the basin .

#### **a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating :** Negligible to Low

#### **8. Assessment of Bank Performance:**

**Quality at entry .** Project preparation had four Task team Leaders and this, added to delays in entering the GEF pipeline because of environmental concerns about the Manantali Dam operated by OMVS, extended preparation over 5 years. In addition the multiplicity of donors and activities made it difficult to develop a more tightly focussed project, and tie down a schedule for deliverables and expected outcomes . Thus, for example, one of the five components remains incomplete at project closing . Insufficient attention was given to development of M&E other than process indicators . Contrarily the Bank went overboard on safeguard policies (e.g. Involuntary Resettlement) and it was not relevant. QAG (QEA7, FY05) rated quality at entry moderately satisfactory and criticized the poor oversight and quality of the Bank's internal monitoring of project preparation .

**Supervision .** This was a demanding project to supervise but this was generally successfully carried out jointly with

UNDP despite some difficulties over coordination . Even so, the ICR notes (page 23) that the Bank's communication and coordination with activities managed by others (AfDB and the Dutch), and with national cells was weak. Attention to reporting and fiduciary aspects was satisfactory; to safeguards less so .

**a. Ensuring Quality -at-Entry:**Moderately Satisfactory

**b. Quality of Supervision :**Satisfactory

**c. Overall Bank Performance :**Moderately Satisfactory

#### **9. Assessment of Borrower Performance:**

**Government .** Government's role in the project was limited to providing counterpart funding for OMVS's management. All four riparian governments agreed annual allocations to the project through a pooling arrangement. Thus if one country was late in making payments, the other 3 made up the difference that was recouped at a later date. In general this worked well throughout the project .

**Implementing Agency .** OMVS had high ownership of the project both during preparation and implementation (ICR page 23-24) and managed the GEF Trust Fund . Coordination of the many different tasks and with riparian countries governments was excellent and a participatory and inclusive culture was further strengthened . Despite this, some components (3 and 4) were not ready for implementation as they had no baselines or proper arrangements for M&E. The ICR team found "insufficient evidence/documentation of linking project impact indicators to the OMVS Environmental Observatory database " (ICR. page 53.) Project Manuals were not always realistic or relevant (this was problematic as they were key instruments guiding processes in the geographically and ethnically diverse and wide-ranging project area) and some of the project delays were attributable to this problem. The PIU was effective and OMVS coped well with the delays to parallel funding and rescheduled activities accordingly. OMVS's credibility would have been better served if the MTR evaluation (see below) had been conducted independently .

**a. Government Performance :**Satisfactory

**b. Implementing Agency Performance :**Satisfactory

**c. Overall Borrower Performance :**Satisfactory

#### **10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization:**

**Design .** The PAD did not give a lot of attention to developing comprehensive M&E arrangements . No baseline was established for components 4 and 5. The primary indicators were about processes, not outcomes and impacts (PAD, Annex 13).

**Implementation .**The PAD stated that an independent evaluation would be conducted at mid -term review (Annex 13, para 36) but this was not done. The TTL stated that the independent evaluation at MTR was thought unnecessary as there were enough interested stakeholders to ensure a balanced evaluation . Instead the consortium of donors oversaw an evaluation done jointly by the Bank, UNDP, OMVS and the country water cells . Even so, the results of this evaluation were not referred to or made available in the ICR . Conversely, routine monitoring of project inputs and outputs was undertaken .

**Utilization .** Periodic activity reports were prepared on schedule .

**a. M&E Quality Rating :** Modest

#### **11. Other Issues (Safeguards, Fiduciary, Unintended Positive and Negative Impacts):**

**Environment .** This was classified as an Environmental category "B" project (OP4.01) and also triggered the Natural Habitats (OP 4.04) safeguard policy. Given that the project was about the management of an international waterway great care was taken by the Bank's Legal Counsel to determine if OP 7.5 projects on International Waters should be invoked. On the information available at appraisal OP 7.5 was deemed not to apply . Subsequently, the TTL informed IEG that the Bank's supervision team decided it did apply for the purpose of good practice and to foster integration of all riparians in basin management. Environmental assessment was required for micro-projects but given their environmental focus and generally small size this was sometimes too onerous and counter -productive. Although a Resettlement Policy Framework was developed at appraisal there was no resettlement . Follow-up on dissemination and use of safeguard policies was less than satisfactory because of poor documentation (ICR, page 53).

**Fiduciary .** The ICR reports that all audits were satisfactory .

12. Ratings:	ICR	IEG Review	Reason for Disagreement / Comments
<b>Outcome:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Risk to Development Outcome:</b>	Negligible to Low	Negligible to Low	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Quality at entry and design were not well focused; insufficient attention was given to M&E. The role of other partners is unclear.
<b>Borrower Performance :</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory requires that there were no shortcomings in implementing agency performance. There were some shortcomings on M&E and Project Manuals.
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Unsatisfactory	

**NOTES:**

- When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.

- The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate .

**13. Lessons:**

**GEF grant funding can play a critical role in building effective regional institutions** . In this project GEF's support to build the capacity of OMVS to facilitate multi-country dialogue on policy, planning and development enabled a consensus among the Senegal River Basin riparian states on how to managed the river basin more effectively and increase environmental benefits .

- **Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis highlights the need for a multi -sector approach to managing river basins shared among several riparians** . In this project TDA facilitated inclusion of environmental and land management consideration into the water planning framework and establishment of multi -sector planning institutions .
- **Carefully examine the transaction costs of partnerships and their management arrangements before committing to them** . In this project the pressure to leverage the GEF grant led to the inclusion of activities at the local level managed by other donors . While the Bank partnered with UNDP (that managed the micro-projects) the apparent synergy of this partnership was undermined by coordination problems and their differing operational practices and procedures . It was also burdensome for the OMVS .

**14. Assessment Recommended?**    ● Yes    ○ No

**Why?** To provide an objective assessment of the Bank's support for one of the more globally prominent river basin organization. A major question would be to assess what value-added the Bank brings to the OMVS given the long-term and broad-based support it received also from some dozen or so other donors .

**15. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

This is not very concise and exceeds the length specified in the ICR guidelines . The annexes provides more clarity and objectivity that mute the many upbeat statements in the main report . Discussion of efficiency and Bank performance is rather thin. There is considerable confusion about the role of bilateral donors and the relationship of their financing to the Bank's financing . The project costs reported in Annex 1 are not correct and differ from those elsewhere in the ICR and those available in the Bank's Operations Portal .

**a. Quality of ICR Rating :** Unsatisfactory

