



REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE



---

## TERMINAL EVALUATION

### DRAFT REPORT

#### SIERRA LEONE RURAL WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT (P-SL-E00-003)

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (AfDB) - GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)  
PROJECT

---

**GEF Implementing Agency:** African Development Bank

**Country:** Sierra Leone

---

**Prepared and Submitted by Collins Annoh**

**December 19, 2022**

## Table of Contents

List of Acronyms .....	iii
<b>1. Main Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Background.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Project Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.3 Main Conclusions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.4 Summary of Terminal Evaluation Criteria and Rating Outcomes.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Project Description and Development Context .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1 Project Description.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2 Development Context .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3. Evaluation Framework .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.1 Objective.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.2 Scope.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.3 Approach and Methodology .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.4 Structure of this Report.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4. Evaluation Findings .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1 Project Relevance.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1.1 Project Concept and Design .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1.2 Stakeholder Participation in Formulation .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.1.3 Risks Assessment.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.1.4 Linkages and Lessons Learnt from Other Projects .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.1.5 Project Relevance to Country .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.2 Project Implementation and Execution – Efficiency .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.2.1 Project Implementation .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.2.2 Project Governance and Execution.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.2.3 Project Finance .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.2.4 Stakeholder Participation in Implementation.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4.2.6 MTR Outcomes Summary .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>4.2.7 Gender Mainstreaming .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.3 Project Results and Impacts – Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>31</b>

4.3.1	Overall Achievement .....	31
4.3.2	Project Outcomes .....	47
4.3.3	Project Outputs .....	47
4.3.4	Attainment of Project Objective .....	48
4.3.5	Progress to Project Impact .....	48
4.3.6	Remaining Barriers to Achieve Project Objective .....	49
4.3.7	Sustainability .....	50
4.3.8	Ownership and Partnerships.....	52
4.3.9	Lessons Learnt .....	53
4.3.10	Summary Conclusions and Assessment Ratings.....	54
4.3.11	Recommendations .....	57
ANNEX A: EVALUATION MATRIX .....		59
ANNEX B: CONSULTANT’S TERMS OF REFERENCE .....		67
ANNEX C: CONTENT OF GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT .....		70
ANNEX D: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED .....		78
ANNEX E: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED REMOTELY/IN-PERSON - AfDB & GEF EVALUATION .....		79

## List of Acronyms

Acronym	Full name
AFD	African Development Fund
AfDB	African Development Bank
A4P	Agenda for Prosperity
AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
CLTS	Community Led Total Sanitation
COSL	Country Office Sierra Leone
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
DHMT	District Health Management Team
DPs	Development Partners
EA	Executing Agency
EcoSan	Ecological Sanitation
EIRR	Economic Internal Rate of Return
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
EVD	Ebola Virus Disease
FIRR	Financial Internal Rate of Return
FSF	Fragile State facility
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GFS	Gravity Flow System
GoSL	Government of Sierra Leone
HDW	Hand Dug Well
HH	Household
HP	Hand Pump
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
ICT	Information, Communication and technology
IPR	AfDB Implementation Progress and Results Report
IMIS	Integrated Management Information System
JMP	Joint Monitoring Program
LGFD	Local Government Finance Department
Le	Leone (Sierra Leone Currency)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MICS	Multi Cluster Indicator Survey

MOE	Ministry of Education
MOFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MOSH	Ministry of Sanitation and Health
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise
MTNDP	Medium Term National Development Plan
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MWR	Ministry of Water Resources
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHDW	New Hand Dug Well
NWRMA	National Water Resources Management Agency
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
ODF	Open Defecation Free
PAR	Project Appraisal Report
PCC	Project Coordination Committee
PCR	Project Completion Report
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PSF	Public Sanitation Facility
QPR	Quarterly Progress Report
RWH	Rain Water Harvesting
RWSSI-TF	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative – Trust Fund
RWSSP	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project
SALWACO	Sierra Leone Water Company
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TA	Technical Assistance
TYS	Ten Year Strategy
UA	Unit of Account
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
USD	United Stated Dollar
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WB	World Bank
WD	Water Directorate
WHO	World Health Organization
WSP	World Bank Water and Sanitation Program

## **Acknowledgement**

The evaluator expresses his gratitude to all persons who willingly provided useful information and made suggestions on project implementation and results during meetings and interviews to facilitate preparation of this report. These include representatives of sector institutions, project beneficiary communities, District Councils, Contractors, Consultants and Development Partners.

The evaluator will like to thank staff of SALWACO, the Executing Agency and AfDB Project Task Team for the immeasurable support provided in providing relevant project background documentation and review comments to ensure adequacy of the report.

# 1. Main Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

## 1.1 Background

This report presents the outcome of a Terminal Evaluation of the **Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project** financed by the African Development Bank in partnership with Government of Sierra Leone, and with GEF co-financing support. The project was financed by the African Development Bank with loan of USD 13,797,500 and grants amounting to USD 20,858,800 (including USD 8.6 million (GBP 5.7 million) from the DFID), a GEF trust fund grant of USD 4,000,000 and Government of Sierra Leone contribution of about USD 1,776,000. The project was approved on September 18, 2013 by the African Development Bank and commenced on October 22, 2013, following which the GEF grant financing was approved in October 2016. The original closing date of December 2018 after 5 years' of implementation was revised to December 2021 following two extensions.

Table 1-0-1 Project Information

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project</b>		
<b>GEF Project ID:</b>		<b>Project Approval Date</b>	<b>September 18, 2013</b>
<b>AfDB Project ID:</b>	<b>P-SL-E00-003</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	<b>October 2016</b>
<b>Country:</b>	<b>Sierra Leone</b>	<b>Project Document Signature Date</b>	<b>October 22, 2013</b>
<b>Region:</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Project Launch/Inception Workshop Date</b>	<b>February 17 to 21, 2014</b>
<b>GEF Focal Area</b>		<b>Midterm Review Date</b>	<b>August 22 to September 9, 2016</b>
<b>GEF Strategic Program</b>		<b>Original Closing Date</b>	<b>31 December 2018</b>
<b>Executing Agency</b>	<b>Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO)</b>	<b>Revised Closing Date:</b>	<b>30 December 2021</b>
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	<b>Janet Atim, Collins Annoh (Consultant)</b>	<b>Extensions:</b>	<b>Two (2)</b>
<b>Project Financing</b>			
	<b>At CEO Endorsement (USD)</b>	<b>At Completion (TE) (USD)</b>	
<b>(1) GEF Grant</b>	<b>4,000,000.00</b>	<b>3,645,600.00</b>	
<b>(2) Government (MOF)</b>	<b>1,776,000.00</b>	<b>1,776,000.00</b>	
<b>(3) ADF Loan</b>	<b>13,597,500.00</b>	<b>11,107,032.92</b>	
<b>(4) ADF Grant</b>	<b>4,281,000.00</b>	<b>4,165,413.00</b>	
<b>(5) FSF Grant</b>	<b>9,520,708.50</b>	<b>8,846,642.34</b>	
<b>(6) RWSSI - TF Grant</b>	<b>7,057,069.05</b>	<b>6,824,891.48</b>	
<b>(7) Total Co-financing (2 to 6)</b>	<b>36,232,277.55</b>	<b>32,719,979.73</b>	
<b>Total Project Cost (1 + 7)</b>	<b>40,232,277.55</b>	<b>36,365,579.73</b>	

## 1.2 Project Overview

Sierra Leone with over 5.9 million inhabitants in 2013 had an estimated safe water and improved sanitation coverage of 57% and 13% (JMP Report, 2013), respectively. The country was among the eight sub-Saharan African countries which performed above the regional average of 26% in terms of the population that gained access to safe water during the last 15 years, but was considered off track for achieving the water

and sanitation MDG. The low water and sanitation coverage resulted in high infant mortality and cholera epidemics in the country.

Rural water supply coverage of 40% against the national target of 74%, and rural sanitation coverage of 7% against the national target of 66%. 39% of the rural population practice open defecation. Progress in the sector required action on multiple fronts taking into account the limited financial and institutional capacities. However, improvement of public financial management systems, as well as sector policies and legislation, provided a good basis for intervention.

To improve access to safe water and sanitation, the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project was designed to be implemented in five rural districts selected from the Northern, Southern and Central regions of Sierra Leone. The project development objective was to increase sustainable access to safe water supply from 40% to 49%, and access to improved sanitation from 7% to 13% in rural Sierra Leone, including improved sanitation access for 91,000 school children; and to develop a comprehensive national framework for rural water supply and sanitation investments.

The project was designed to directly benefit about 625,000 people (47% women), who would be provided with access to safe water, and an estimated 42,860 households (HHs) who would be enabled to improve hygiene and sanitation habits, of which at least 22,700 HHs (160,000 people) would gain access to improved sanitation facilities, thereby significantly reducing water borne diseases.

The Project comprised four components, namely:

- (a) Component 1: Water Supply and Sanitation Infrastructure** that provided for new construction and rehabilitation of existing water supply infrastructure, construction of public sanitation facilities (schools, health centres, and markets), installation of water monitoring infrastructure, and construction of WASH facilities in riverine areas based on appropriate technologies.
- (b) Component 2: National RWSS Program Development** that involved developing a framework for improved and coordinated sub sector management, and mobilizing resources for RWSS investments.
- (c) Component 3: Capacity Building** involving training of WASH sector professionals and beneficiary communities, provision of tools for improved functionality of water points, organization of sector coordination meetings, and development of knowledge products.
- (d) Component 4: Project Management** that involved effective and efficient project planning and implementation, including progress monitoring and reporting.

The project development objective was to be achieved through delivery of 3 expected outcomes and 12 related outputs:

- Outcome 1:** Increased number of people with improved access to safe water supply and basic sanitation
- Outcome 2:** Better managed water and sanitation sector
- Outcome 3:** Improved wash knowledge, attitudes and practices & improved capacity to deliver sustainable rural water supply and services



## 1.3 Main Conclusions

### ***Project Relevance***

- a) The project is considered highly relevant to Government of Sierra Leone national development agenda towards poverty alleviation, including achievement of targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene.**

The project development objective was to contribute to the effort to improve human capital and infrastructure within the context of the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP III), including achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene by: (i) increasing sustainable access to safe water and basic sanitation in rural areas, resulting in 9 % increase in safe water coverage, including restored access, and at least 6 % increase in improved sanitation coverage, with a better managed sector and improved knowledge, attitudes & practices of primary beneficiaries; and (ii) developing a comprehensive national framework for rural water supply and sanitation investments.

The development objective was fully aligned with GoSL's Agenda for Prosperity (A4P), 2013-2017 that promoted economic diversification and emphasizing infrastructure development, African Development Bank (AfDB) Ten Year Strategy (TYS) and High Fives, and Operational Priorities focusing on economic growth stimulated by investments, and GoSL and AfDB water related policies and strategies.

The development objective was relevant to beneficiary needs that included increased access to WASH, better sector management and investments, and remains relevant to the Medium-Term National Development Plan (MTNDP), 2019-2023 which prioritizes WASH infrastructure and water resources management.

- b) A well designed project with sound implementation logic incorporating past experiences and good implementation arrangements**

The project design was sound and remained fully relevant throughout project implementation, with minor adjustments made to some outputs and related targets at Medium Term Review (MTR) resulting from DFID funding withdrawal. Adjustments made regarding (a) increased participation of District Council (DC) works engineers in works monitoring and certification, and (b) recruitment of individual consultants to enhance district level works supervision, after the main supervision consultant's contract was ended, were timely and yielded positive results. The design allowed extensive stakeholder consultation and validation of outcomes through workshops during project preparation and appraisal for better appreciation and feedback; and also considered national and Bank requirements to ensure environmental and social safeguards. The design was consistently conducive to achieving the project results, despite the limited riverine communities' acceptance of ecosan toilets.

### ***Project Implementation***

- c) The three- tier project management arrangement was effective and ensured achievement of expected project results.**

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) function was performed by the Sector Policy Coordination Team (SPCT), an inter-ministerial committee comprising representatives from seven (7) stakeholder agencies (5 sector ministries, the private sector and WASH-Net Sierra Leone). The SPCT was an effective governance body that provided overall project oversight and coordination, and policy guidance to resolve project related cross-sectoral issues. The SPCT performance was satisfactory and contributed to the successful implementation of the project.

Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO), acting as the Executing Agency (EA), satisfactorily performed their functions for overall project management, including procurement and financial management. They also provided relevant technical and institutional support to implementing partners, despite their failure to address some initially identified lapses in financial management (FM) and environmental & social (E&S) safeguards that resulted in 9 months suspension of project disbursements.

The Project Coordination Committee comprising 6 permanent representatives chaired by SALWACO, provided project level coordination of the activities of the three (3) key implementing partners - the Water Directorate (WD), Local Governance Finance Department (LGFD) and District Councils (DCs). Overall, the PCC performance was satisfactory, despite their irregular meetings in the first few years of project implementation. The PCC used adaptive management measures to resolve issues and ensure progress towards achievement of expected results.

**d) The collaborative partnership arrangements with stakeholders ensured timely and successful implementation of project activities.**

Collaborative partnership arrangements have been established between SALWACO, District Councils, School Authorities, Ministries of Education, Sanitation and Health, Civil Society, Academia, Development Partners, Communities and Private Sector Institutions through the extensive stakeholder engagements and participation during project preparation and implementation. The partnership arrangements provided opportunity for timely resolution of implementation challenges, and ensured successful execution of project related activities by the key implementing partners leading to achievement of project results. The arrangements are likely to be sustained through continuous engagement and dialogue and participation in coordination meetings convened and chaired by District Councils and MWR at the local and national levels, respectively.

**e) M&E plan and measuring indicators for project progress monitoring were appropriate, but inadequate for measuring capacity enhancement and gender mainstreaming.**

The M&E plan was premised on the results based logical framework, including 36 SMART outcome and output indicators and related end targets for monitoring project performance. The plan provided for local and national level results monitoring activities by various stakeholder institutions, and was satisfactorily implemented by SALWACO to facilitate project performance monitoring under the responsibility of an appointed M&E officer. Some indicators track the number of people or committees trained but not progress made towards enhancing their capacities. The absence of an adequate tool and resources for measuring gender participation and mainstreaming did not facilitate gender related progress monitoring. Field supervision missions jointly undertaken by co-financiers, sector review meetings, and impact studies were adopted to validate results. The Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) and Ministries of Health and Sanitation (MoHS), and Education (MoE) were responsible for outcome and impact monitoring based on primary data

obtained from field surveys. The said institutions are yet to fully realize their responsibilities due to funding limitations.

**f) The GEF grant is likely to be fully expended at project closure despite some undisbursed balance against the approved budget.**

As at December 30, 2021, about 91% of the total grant amount of USD 4,000,000 had been disbursed. The remaining undisbursed amount of USD 354,400 was committed and was likely to be fully disbursed by March 30, 2022, i.e., three (3) months beyond the project closure date. As at April 5, 2022 the undisbursed balance was USD 283,166.48 (7.1% of total GEF resources), which had reduced to USD 111,832.58 (2.8% of total GEF resources) at the time of preparing this report. The GEF grant resources were planned to be used to finance construction of new water supply facilities (75%), capacity building (24%) and project management (1%) activities.

In spite of the implementation delays, the project was significantly successful in achieving the envisaged outputs and outcomes with regard to increased access to sustainable water supply and water resources monitoring infrastructure, capacity building and training of community WASH management committees, women and youth to ensure sustainable delivery, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure, among others.

***Project Results and Effectiveness***

**g) The project delivered most of the expected outcomes and outputs by the revised completion date of December 30, 2021.**

The project results for the WASH infrastructure and National RWSS Program Development components were satisfactory, except for the limited achievement of increased access to basic sanitation, and inability to adequately provide water supply and sanitation infrastructure to help improve access in riverine communities.

Overall, progress made towards realizing outcome targets was over 93% (on average). 70% of the expected outcome targets were fully achieved or exceeded. The rest are on course to be achieved subject to implementation of complementary investment projects and programs by development partners in collaboration with GoSL in the near future.

While the project achieved the expected outcome to increase access to improved water supply in rural Sierra Leone, the outcome regarding increased access to basic sanitation was not achieved. Despite the significant progress made to improve the functionality rate of water points through rehabilitation of several existing facilities and installation of new hand pumps (HPs), the expected target was not met.

Although the mechanism for donor coordination is established, irregular meetings and limited opportunity for joint annual sector performance review impact on effort to achieve adequate sector coordination, and to implement complementary donor supported projects and programs within the context of the NRWSSP in partnership with GoSL. The situation is likely to improve with increased support to implement planned activities for donor coordination and annual sector performance review.

Overall progress towards achieving the output targets was 95% (on average). Over 74% of the expected output targets was fully achieved or exceeded, while another about 13% was significantly achieved and on

track to be fully achieved. Outputs relating to training of community leaders, installation of rainfall gauges, and provision of water supply and ecosan facilities in riverine communities could not be achieved.

The DFID funding withdrawal, and delay in the preparation and approval of the strategy and action plan for WASH sector staff training, though not a project output, resulted in the limited progress made towards achieving the desired results for short and long term staff training, including study tours. Progress towards achieving effective sector coordination through annual sector reviews was hampered by the EVD crisis and COVID 19 pandemic. However, the PSC/ SPCT held regular monthly meetings to provide project oversight over the entire implementation period.

Additionally, although significant progress was made towards achieving the results for effective and efficient planning and execution of project related activities, agreed timelines for submission of required reports were mostly not respected.

### ***Sustainability***

#### **h) The project put in mechanisms that support continuous flow of benefits from improved sector management and investment financing, and capacity enhancement to ensure sustainability.**

Mechanisms like the operation of trained community WASH management committees; periodic levying of households to mobilize O&M funds; creation of a cadre of trained caretakers and skilled artisans; existence of the NRWSSP to facilitate sector coordination and resource mobilization; etc., support effort towards ensuring project sustainability.

The project provided for training of (a) community WASH management committees to oversee the sustainable management of WASH infrastructure, (b) caretakers to perform routine operation and maintenance activities, and (c) entrepreneurs, sanitation marketers, and artisans to provide various services. In addition, GoSI committed to provide USD 596,000 per year to support sustainable delivery, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure. However, GoSL continuous and timely provision of the amount cannot be ascertained, given the magnitude of sector needs.

The various WASH management committees have different arrangements to mobilize revenue to meet repair and maintenance requirements of WASH infrastructure. Committees levy between Le 2,000 and 3,000 per household per month in most small communities, and between Le 3,000 and Le 5,000 per person per month in larger communities (up to 1,500 people). While larger communities are capable of mobilizing enough revenue over a short period to finance their routine O&M and minor repair costs, smaller communities require relatively longer periods to do same. The financial sustainability of systems in smaller communities is questionable without additional GoSL financial support.

### ***Lessons Learnt***

#### **Implementation Arrangements**

(a) In spite of clear formulation and adequacy of project design, achievement of project development objectives and desired outcomes is dependent on the implementation arrangements, and implementation capacity which in turn is driven by staff qualification, experience and level of motivation.

- (b) Clear identification of implementing partners and clarification of their respective roles and responsibilities at project appraisal and inception ensure timely and successful project implementation.

### **Sector Capacity Enhancement**

Effort to build sector capacity through staff training and institutional strengthening may not yield the desired results unless:

- (a) Government demonstrates adequate commitment by prioritizing and mobilizing adequate resources for sector investments;
- (b) National sector capacity building strategy and action plan are developed to facilitate staff training;
- (c) Training Institutions develop appropriate curricula and provide adequate training based on short and long term courses; and
- (d) Sector institutions are adequately resourced to provide mandated services.

### **Delayed Procurement and Disbursement**

Unduly delayed completion of procurement processes for goods, works and services, and untimely EA requests and Bank processing of such requests, negatively affect implementation progress and early achievement of project results. Delayed completion may cause contract prices to escalate without possibility of price adjustment for small works contracts.

### **Improved Access to Institutional WASH**

Successful implementation of projects to improve access to institutional WASH depends on ability to extensively engage with and secure the full commitment of the beneficiary institutions regarding O&M. The beneficiary institutions may need to demonstrate such commitment by putting in place a workable arrangement for O&M prior to project execution. Government and community support to realize O&M objectives are crucial.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made based on the findings presented above.

#### **1. *Ensure adequate capacity is built and roles clearly defined among project actors.***

- (a) The Executing Agency has adequate capacity to enable timely and successful project execution. This can be achieved through capacity building programs and support for institutional strengthening, where necessary. Trained staff need to be motivated to reduce the risk of attrition.
- (b) Key implementing partners and beneficiaries have interest and are committed to provide the necessary support during and after project implementation to consolidate and sustain project benefits. This requires careful assessment of their roles and the extent to which they support the institutional and financial sustainability of the project.

#### **2. *Ensure Government provision of adequate resources as counterpart financing to complete all outstanding works and payments.***

Government counterpart funds should be made available to (a) complete financing of all outstanding minor remedial works, and (b) ensure payment of PBIs that have been outstanding since 2020 based on the agreed framework for PBI payment.

**3. Ensure continuous and timely mobilization of financial resources to support operation and maintenance, major repair and expansion of WASH systems.**

It is necessary that Government makes available through the sector conditional transfers to DCs each year, the estimated USD 596,000 to finance recurrent costs, major repair and expansion of existing WASH infrastructure that are beyond the financial capability of communities. Government support should be continuous and timely; and where necessary, communities may rely on family members and friends living abroad to help mobilize additional resources to support repair and maintenance of their WASH systems.

**4. Ensure training of individuals and small businesses to enhance local capacity for O&M.**

Effort should be made to support further training of persons identified by other Chiefdoms to acquire technical and business development skills, and to support them with the necessary logistics, including basic tools and equipment to establish themselves as small businesses to enhance local capacity for operation and maintenance.

**5. Ensure strengthening of existing collaborative partnerships among stakeholders.**

The existing collaborative partnership arrangements achieved through the Project Coordination Committee (PCC) need to be sustained through periodic meetings convened by SALWACO to discuss and resolve issues relating to rural water supply and sanitation. The District Councils should also play a facilitative role in continuous sensitization and engagement of beneficiary communities to increase awareness, community ownership and support for sustainable O&M.

### 1.4 Summary of Terminal Evaluation Criteria and Rating Outcomes

The table below presents a summary of the performance criteria and related ratings based on the prescribed rating scales presented in Annex C.

*Table 1-0-2: Summary of Performance Criteria and Rating Outcomes*

A. Outcomes		B. Sustainability	
Criteria	Rating	Criteria	Rating
Relevance	HS	Financial	ML
Effectiveness	S	Institutional	ML
Efficiency	S	Social and Environmental	MU
<b>Overall Outcome Rating</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>Overall Likelihood of Sustainability</b>	<b>MU</b>
C. Monitoring and Evaluation		D. Implementation and Execution	
Criteria	Rating	Criteria	Rating
M&E Design	S	Quality of AfDB Implementation	S
M&E Plan Implementation	S	Quality of Executing Agency Execution	S
<b>Overall M&amp;E Quality Rating</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>Overall Implementation/Execution Rating</b>	<b>S</b>

## 2. Project Description and Development Context

### 2.1 Project Description

The Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (RWSSP), funded by the African Development Bank (AfDB), co-financed by DFID, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and GoSL has the overall goal of contributing to the Sierra Leone's Agenda for Prosperity (A4P), including the contribution towards achievement of the water supply, sanitation and hygiene targets set out in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The project was intended to directly benefit an estimated 625,000 rural Sierra Leoneans, and result in nine percentage points increase in safe water coverage, including restore access, and at least six percentage points increase in improved sanitation coverage, besides a better managed sector and improved knowledge, attitudes & practices of the primary beneficiaries.

The specific objectives of the RWSSP were to (a) increase access to safe water supply from 40% to 49%, and (b) increase access to improved sanitation from 7% to 13% in rural Sierra Leone, including improved sanitation access for 91,000 school children. An estimated 42,860 households (HHs) would be enabled to improve their hygiene and sanitation habits. The project also included the development of a comprehensive national program for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation.

The project was approved by the Board of the African Development Bank on 18th September 2013 at an estimated total cost of USD 43.3 million (UA 28.87 million) with a completion date of 30<sup>th</sup> December 2021, after 5 years of implementation. The project was financed by ADF loan of USD 13.6 million, ADF Grant of USD 4.3 million, FSF Grant of USD 12.7 million (including DFID funding of GBP 5.7 million), RWSSI-TF Grant of EUR 5.3 million, GEF Grant of USD 4.0 million and GoSI counterpart contribution of USD 1,776,000. The Bank, including DFID earmarked resources were expected to finance 87% of the total project cost. GEF resources were to finance climate change adaptation interventions, including infrastructure development and capacity building up to 9% of the total project cost. Government's contribution was to cover salaries and a portion of the cost of office supplies and operation of vehicles (4% of total project cost).

The project covered the six rural (previously five) districts (Kambia, Kono, Koinadugu, Bonthe Pujehun and Falaba Districts) selected from the Northern, Southern and Central regions of Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO) with the mandate of provision of water supply to specified urban, and all rural communities across the country, was responsible for project execution under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Water Resources (MWR), currently governed by a four (4) member Ministerial Oversight Committee appointed by the Minister of Water Resources. The project comprised four main components as follows:

#### **(c) Component 1: Water Supply and Sanitation Infrastructure**

This component supports provision of water supply and sanitation infrastructure through rehabilitation and new construction of water supply and sanitation facilities to increase safe water coverage within the project area by an additional 46 percent, and national rural water coverage by an additional 9 percentage points, of which 47 percent will be women and girl child beneficiaries. The facilities to be provided include 1440 rehabilitated water points, 570 hand-dug wells and spring boxes, 80 boreholes, 25 rainwater harvesting systems, over 180 Gravity Flow System taps, and 250 solar power pumped standpipes.

In addition, a total of 390 sanitation facilities, including 360 VIP latrines and 30 EcoSan toilets will be constructed in public institutions to increase access to improved sanitation facilities by at least 6

percentage points. Each sanitation facility shall have separated units for the disabled and girls/women. 47 percent of the units shall be for women and girls.

As part of the climate risk management, 200 rain-gauging stations and 20 surface and groundwater monitoring stations will also be re-established.

#### **(d) National Program Development**

The objective of this component is to develop a comprehensive framework to facilitate effective sub-sector management and resource mobilization. The component supports review of the outputs of relevant sector analytical and programming work financed by DFID and WSP, and development of strategies and preparation of a comprehensive program and investment plan for the rural water supply and sanitation sub-sector with the active involvement of key stakeholders; and strengthening of some national and sector governance systems and processes. The Program Development process will also be informed by a couple of sector review meetings to ensure ownership and commitment to its implementation. A resource mobilization workshop will be convened to mobilize additional funding for program implementation. The workshop is programmed to take place just before the Mid-Term Review to ensure that the relevant program recommendations are duly integrated in the project during mid-term review.

#### **(e) Capacity Building**

Sustainability of rural water and sanitation facilities is identified as a major challenge as demonstrated by low functionality rates. The project aims to address this challenge by undertaking capacity building initiatives to overcome some of the key human resources and institutional capacity constraints at the national and local levels, including enhancing the capacity of beneficiary communities to own and derive maximum benefit from their water supply and sanitation infrastructure. At the national level, staff of the Water Directorate of the Ministry of Water Resources and SALWACO will be targeted. The staff include water supply and sanitation specialists, water resources management economists, planners, engineers, hydrologists, hydro-geologists, and environment and climate change specialists.

It is expected that about 55 technical staff will be trained, including at least 17 women. Post graduate training will be provided to at most 33 newly appointed young professionals (not more than 30 - 35 years of age) to positions in MWR and SALWACO. 22 qualified technicians will also be trained at appropriate institutions within Sierra Leone and/or neighbouring countries in the region. On-the-job training will also be provided through technical assistance. In addition, office and field equipment including computers, printers, terrameters, water level recorders, drawing equipment, vehicles, etc., will be provided to strengthen institutional capacity.

At the local level, the project adopts and builds on existing O& M and sustainability initiatives that include establishment and training of WASH Committees, and training of pump mechanics to ensure effective community level management of facilities and sustainability of the investments.

#### **(f) Project Management**

The objective of this component is to ensure efficient and effective implementation of the project. The component will finance project operational and administrative costs as well as technical assistance to the District Councils, Water Directorate (WD), Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO) and Local Government Finance Department (LGFD).



## 2.2 Development Context

Sierra Leone has a total land mass 71,740 sq.km with water surface area of 120 sq. km and coast line of 102 km. The country is among the poorest countries in the world with HDI ranking of 180 among 187 countries ranked in 2011. The brutal civil war that ended in 2002 displaced millions of people and resulted in widespread destruction of infrastructure. Democracy and a stable environment for development became gradually re-established in the country, following the 2007 presidential elections.

The country is endowed with vast surface and groundwater resources which are unevenly distributed spatially and in temporally, and results in water shortages in some areas, particularly in the dry season. The resources are also threatened by rapid population growth, increased extractive industry activities, environmental degradation causing soil erosion, recession of wetlands and pollution of rivers. In addition, knowledge regarding the specific resource quantity and quality characteristics is scanty due to completely destroyed hydrometric infrastructure. The Ministry of Water Resources which is responsible for water resources management is poorly resourced and unable to adequately discharge their responsibilities.

The National Water and Sanitation Policy enacted in 2010, provides ambitious targets of extending water supply and sanitation services to the entire population by 2025, and commits Sierra Leone to achieve the 2015 MDG targets of 74 percent and 66 percent for improved water supply and sanitation coverage, respectively. To achieve these targets, the need for accelerated extension of water and sanitation services could not be overemphasized.

According to World Bank Water Partnership Program, sector expenditure averaged USD 6 million per annum (0.2 percent GDP) from 2002 – 2009, but was far less than the investment needs to reach the MDG targets. Maintaining current access rates absorbs a large portion of public expenditure because of population growth and relocation, rehabilitation needs and lack of cost recovery. Progress in the water and sanitation sector required action to address the limited financial, human and technical capacities, and Government priorities for the water and sanitation sector.

The RWSSP sought to help address the following:

- **Need for increased sector investment:** Thousands of existing water points require repair and many new points need to be built, particularly in rural areas that lack adequate access to safe water. Investment planning is required to identify areas of particular need, and to mobilize funding to meet needs.
- **Need to address problem of seasonality:** About 40% of protected in-use water points provide insufficient water during the dry season due to insufficient well depth or improper well siting. Clear policies and standards should be formulated, together with adequate monitoring of water resources to improve the quality of delivery of infrastructure and services and reduce impacts due to seasonality.
- **Need to strengthen ownership and management** to address problem of high breakdown rates and issues of O&M. Several water points are dysfunctional, and most others experience frequent breakdown. Management and ownership of water points needs to be strengthened to contribute towards achieving sustainability.
- **Need for improved sector coordination among external agencies and government:** Over 25 major implementers have been actively funding and constructing water points in rural communities in Sierra Leone, in addition to smaller NGOs, government agencies, utilities, local communities,

religious groups and private persons. In some chiefdoms, up to seven different external agencies are active. This requires better coordination to avoid duplication of efforts, reduce overheads, and improve planning.

- **Need for improved water supply and sanitation infrastructure:** Government's sector development drive seeks to shift focus from delivery of traditional technologies that of innovative and appropriate technologies for water supply and sanitation, where feasible. The operation and maintenance requirements of such of technologies imply the need for development of the requisite skills through training of a cadre of community based technicians and artisans that target the youth to contribute to reduce youth un-employment.

### 3. Evaluation Framework

The independent Terminal Evaluation of the RWSSP co-funded by GEF and others has been undertaken by a sole evaluator in fulfilment of GEF requirements for project completion and evaluation. The evaluation was conducted remotely in November 2022, following project closure earlier in March 2022. The evaluator, who participated in the preparation of the African Development Bank (AfDB) Project Completion Report, collected and reviewed various background and project related documents, and employed use of communication tools like email exchanges, Zoom, WhatsApp, mobile phone calls, etc., to obtain and verify data through stakeholder interviews. The evaluator also relied on most of the information obtained during preparation of the AfDB completion mission undertaken in March 2022.

#### 3.1 Objective

The objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to prepare a Project Terminal Evaluation Report in accordance with the GEF requirements that include assessment of achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of the benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of future GEF supported projects.

#### 3.2 Scope

As indicated in the TOR (Annex B), the scope of the Terminal Evaluation required familiarization with the project design as well as actual activities undertaken by the project, review of the African Development Bank's recently completed Project Completion Report and other project related reports and discussion with key stakeholders to: (a) establish details of the reported level of completion of project activities undertaken during project implementation, (b) assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved, (c) assess the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes, and the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project, (d) assess the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation, performance of the project executing entity in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities, and to prepare lessons learned.

#### 3.3 Approach and Methodology

##### 3.3.1 Evaluation Process

The evaluation process followed the guidance and procedures provided in the **Guidelines for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of GEF-financed Projects**. The evaluation was undertaken in accordance with the principles enshrined in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2006) which include: independence,

impartiality, transparency, disclosure, ethical partnership, competencies and capacities, credibility and utility. The process ensured accountability for the achievement of reported project results, and provided opportunity for feedback and information sharing on the reported project results and lessons learnt among stakeholders and implementing partners. The rights and confidentiality of informants have been protected as much as possible in line with the requirements of UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators (2007). The evaluation was based on six major evaluation criteria as follows:

- **Relevance:** the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
- **Coherence:** the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.
- **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and results, including any differential results across groups.
- **Efficiency:** the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely manner.
- **Impacts:** the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
- **Sustainability:** the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

The steps used in preparing the Terminal Evaluation Report are summarized as follows:

#### **1. Initial Consultation and Documents Review**

- Initial consultations with key project staff
- Collection and review of project documents, including AfDB Appraisal, Completion and Quarterly Progress Reports, Supervision Reports and Aide-Memoires to glean relevant secondary data.
- Preparation of requisite data collection tools

#### **2. Additional Data Collection**

- Interviews with stakeholders to verify data and collect additional data
- Debriefing of AfDB Project Task Team

#### **3. Data Analyses and Synthesis**

- In-depth data analyses and interpretation
- Additional follow up stakeholder interviews
- Synthesis of outcomes

#### **4. Preparation of Terminal Evaluation Report**

- Preparation and circulation of Draft Report
- Incorporation of review comments
- Finalization of Report

### **3.3.2 Evaluation Instruments**

Secondary data was obtained from available documents, while primary data was obtained from stakeholder interviews. The following evaluation instruments were used to perform the evaluation:

**Evaluation Matrix:** An evaluation matrix was developed based on the six evaluation criteria and taking into account the evaluation scope, the project log-frame and the review of key project documents. The matrix was used to guide the evaluation process.

**Document Review:** Available documents were collected and reviewed to obtain secondary data for analyses. Data obtained and analyzed was used to facilitate stakeholder interviews. The list of documents reviewed is presented in Annex D.

**Stakeholder Engagement:** The list of stakeholders engaged with and or interviewed is presented in Annex E. The list comprised representatives of implementing partners, project beneficiaries and development partners, most of whom were engaged with during the AfDB project completion mission in March 2022.

**Key informant Interviews:** Semi-structured interviews were conducted using relevant interview protocols. Interviews were undertaken remotely by phone, Zoom, WhatsApp, Email, etc.

**Achievement Rating:** Project achievements were rated using the “Ratings” guidance provided in the Terms of Reference (TOR). It included a six point rating scale to measure progress towards results and project implementation, and a four point rating scale for sustainability (Ref.: Annex C).

### 3.3.3 Limitations and Constraints

The timeline for completion of the evaluation was limited to ten (10) professional days input over a period of two (2) calendar months. The assumption was that the finalized AfDB Project Completion Report and several other project related documents serve as sources of adequate secondary data, which, coupled with limited primary data obtained from additional stakeholder interviews, would facilitate timely preparation of the Terminal Evaluation Report. Incidentally, the effort has required more professional input than was anticipated due to the need to ensure adequate data collection and review.

Only a limited number of stakeholders who had been identified and engaged with initially during preparation of the AfDB Project Completion Reporting, could be available for further discussion and interview.

In spite of the above mentioned shortcomings, the evaluation was performed successfully to ascertain project relevance, performance and sustainability.

## 3.4 Structure of this Report

The Report is structured and presented in 4 chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 presents the main conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and ratings.

Chapter 2 presents an overview of the project.

Chapter 3 presents the objective, scope, methodology, and limitations of the evaluation.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the evaluation.

Annexes

## 4. Evaluation Findings

The evaluation findings are presented based on the requirements of the evaluator's TOR and the GEF terminal evaluation guidelines.

### 4.1 Project Relevance

#### 4.1.1 Project Concept and Design

The project sought to improve human capital and infrastructure in response to identified developmental needs, and to support effort to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene through increased sustainable access to safe water and basic sanitation in rural areas, coupled with better sector management and development of a national framework to mobilize resources for rural water supply and sanitation sub-sector investments.

In addition to the inadequate access to safe water supply and sanitation, the major constraints in the rural water and sanitation sub-sector include: (a) lack of a comprehensive strategy and investment plan; (b) limited national and local level institutional capacity; (c) weak sector coordination among both Government agencies and Development Partners; (d) absence of an effective sector monitoring and evaluation infrastructure; (e) lack of a sense of community ownership which adversely impacts sustainability of constructed facilities; and (f) frequent outbreaks of Cholera, especially in riverine areas, where ground conditions do not allow delivery of traditional water supply and household sanitation technologies.

The project design sought to address these constraints by providing for institutional capacity building, supporting sector coordination and monitoring, and promoting use of appropriate technologies in difficult areas, as well as developing tools and implementing climate change adaptation interventions to ensure sustainability.

In particular, the project design sought to (a) improve access to safe water supply and basic sanitation through rehabilitation and construction of WASH facilities; (b) provide engineering design and construction supervision, and TA support services; (c) establish a PSC for project oversight, PCC for project coordination, and mainstream project implementation; (d) depend on collaborative support of implementing partners, including district councils; (e) procure goods and works at national and district levels; (f) facilitate community level observance of sound environmental sanitation practices; (g) enhance capacity for improved sector performance, including sector monitoring, training, and performance based incentive payments; and (h) promote gender equality and private sector participation, etc.

The design allowed extensive stakeholder consultation and validation of outcomes through workshops during project preparation and appraisal for better appreciation and feedback; and also considered national and Bank requirements to ensure environmental and social safeguards. The design was consistently conducive to achieving the project results, despite the limited riverine communities' acceptance of ecosan toilets.

The design was sound and remained fully relevant throughout project implementation, with minor changes made to some outputs and related targets at Medium Term Review (MTR) resulting from DFID funding withdrawal. The changes did not have an impact on the overall project objective and design, and facilitated results monitoring and verification at the local level.

Subsequently, changes were made to the agreed implementation arrangements through adaptive management processes to improve district level supervision and progress monitoring which included (a) increased participation of DC works engineers in works monitoring and certification, and (b) recruitment of individual consultants to enhance district level works supervision, after the main supervision consultant’s contract was ended. The changes made were timely and yielded positive results. Given the delay in concluding the engineering design and supervision contract, the initial TA services provided support for design and construction supervision.

Project design is rated **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.1.2 Stakeholder Participation in Formulation

Project formulation processes involved extensive consultation with national and local level stakeholders, including representatives from water, health, education, social welfare and local government agencies, as well as NGOs, Civil Society and beneficiary community as well as the private sector. The national level stakeholders included the District Councils, Beneficiary representatives including CSOs and CBOs, SALSWACO, Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning, Energy and Water Resources, Health and Sanitation, Social Welfare Gender and Children’s Affairs, Local Government and Rural Development and the National Youth Commission and Environment Protection Agency. Development Partners active in the water sector, including DFID, UNICEF, World Bank, EU, JICA, China Aid and Sierra Leone NGO Consortium were also consulted, resulting in the co-financing from DFID and GEF-LDCF.

The national stakeholders were first met individually, followed by organization of a stakeholder workshop of all representatives during which the findings and recommendations of the individual meetings were presented and discussed by participants. The workshop presentation and discussions included the criteria used for selection of the project area, the existing water supply and sanitation situation and major constraints impeding safe and improved access, outline of the proposed interventions, and likely technology options for delivery of water supply and sanitation facilities.

The major issues raised during the consultations included the (a) need for effective coordination among sector stakeholders, including Development Partners; (b) the need for training of water source caretakers and user communities; (c) the need to strengthen sector monitoring at national and local levels; (d) recognition of the marginalization of riverine and coastal areas where vehicular access is very limited, if not impossible, and traditional water supply and sanitation technologies are inappropriate; and (e) emphasis of the PRSP II articulation of use of higher levels of technology in rural areas through promotion of power pumped and pipe borne water supply systems, as opposed to hand-pumped point water sources, among others.

The categories of stakeholders consulted and the concerns raised are presented below:

*Table 4-41: Stakeholder Consultation and Issues Raised*

Stakeholder Category	Issues/Concerns Raised
Likely Beneficiary Communities	complained about inadequate water supply and sanitation facilities; high rate of failures for hand dug wells and boreholes; in coastal areas, water logged areas and those with shallow water tables pit latrines, VIP toilets seemed in appropriate and collapsed more often; and that recent cholera outbreak was more severe among the

	coastal, riverine and wetland communities than among inland communities.
DCs/Private Sector Entities	Concerned about the use of substandard materials for dug wells and latrines, and the large number of wells that dry out during the dry season. Local authorities also raised the issue of marginalization of relatively disadvantaged communities in riverine and coastal areas where vehicular access is very limited, if not impossible, low population density with communities not meeting the minimum community size criterion set by NGOs, and traditional water supply and sanitation technologies are inappropriate. They pointed out that these areas are the “epicenters” of the frequent cholera outbreaks in the country. The need for involvement and training of user communities and water source caretakers, especially pump mechanics was emphasized
Sector Ministries	The need for strengthening coordination among sector stakeholders, including Development Partners; Non-involvement of district councils especially in projects undertaken by NGOs; lack of standards in water wells and pit latrine construction. Supervision and monitoring at national and local levels needed to be strengthened with due involvement of the local communities. The issue of limited of capacity within both the public and private sectors was emphasized.  The PRSP II articulation of higher levels of technology in rural areas through promoting power pumped systems and pipe borne water, as opposed to hand-pumps, was also heavily emphasized by public officials.
Donor Community	Need to strengthen coordination among the different agencies which are involved in the provision of water supply and sanitation services.

These the concerns raised and outcomes of the consultation processes informed the choice of the project area, selection of interventions as well as choice of technologies, and the design of procurement, implementation and monitoring arrangements.

**4.1.3 Risks Assessment**

There following risks were envisaged at project formulation. The **risks considered did not have any significant level of impact.**

*Table 4-2: Assessment of Risks and Related Action/Mitigating Measures*

Risk	Planned Action/Mitigating Measure	Evaluator Assessment/Comment
Failure to implement WSS reforms.	Continuous dialogue between government and donors – Bank’s strengthened local presence will facilitate active promotion of donor	<b>Low level of impact. Risk did not occur.</b> The African Development Bank continues to maintain local presence, and currently acts as

	and policy dialogue in the water sector.	the lead for donor dialogue and coordination activities in the water sector. Government action to organize Annual Sector Performance Reviews have supported Government effort to implement policy and related sector reforms.
Weak sector coordination resulting in duplication and obscure accountability.	Bank to catalyse sector leadership and project resources to be provided for promoting regular stakeholder coordination forums.	<b>Low level of impact. Risk did not occur.</b> The African Development Bank continues to provide leadership for donor dialogue and coordination activities in the water sector. Project resources were applied to finance annual sector reviews and project level coordination activities to promote accountability.
Resistance to accountability for non-performance of DCs due to negative political interference, besides poor coordination of lower local government establishments and DCs, slowing down project implementation.	Project will facilitate coordination at local levels; in addition to coordination support provided under World Bank financed DSDP II. Project resources are provided to enable effective oversight by national level authorities, and facilitating sector coordination at national and local government levels. Incentives for good performance are provided.	<b>Medium level impact. Risk occurred but was adequately mitigated.</b> Initial contracts awarded by the DCs did not fully comply with agreed project procurement requirements. Through effective project management oversight, identified lapses were corrected to improve performance. Payment of Performance Based Incentives (PBIs) to relevant national and local level project staff contributed to improve performance.
Delayed implementation of organizational and HRD reforms, and attendant limited capacity of the agencies which will be directly involved in implementation.	Technical assistance is provided to the key implementing agencies, i.e. the five DCs, SALWACO, WD and LGFD.	<b>Low level impact. Risk occurred but was adequately mitigated.</b> Project resources were applied to finance TA support services to enhance the capacity of key implementing agencies in the first few years of project implementation. Subsequently, the project applied adaptive management strategies to overcome capacity limitations after TA support ended.
Co-financing	Joint financing of critical activities is completely avoided.	<b>Low level impact. Risk did not occur</b> given the co-financing arrangement adopted that



		allowed sole financing of critical activities, and parallel financing of less critical activities, where necessary.
--	--	---

#### 4.1.4 Linkages and Lessons Learnt from Other Projects

The African Development Bank has been supporting the water sector in Sierra Leone since 1968, and at the time of project formulation, the total Bank Group assistance to the water sector amounted to USD 48.99 million (UA 32.66 million) in five (5) operations which have been completed: Freetown Sewerage study (1978 - 1980); Freetown water supply (1978 - 1982); Extension of Water Supply Network (1969 - 1973); the Water Supply and Sanitation Study (2004 - 2009) that resulted in the Three Towns Water Supply and Sanitation project (2012 - 2019). The Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project is the sixth operation in the sector. The key lessons learned from the completed water sector and other sector interventions included:

- Creation of parallel implementing units within the Executing Agency undermines ownership of the project, accountability and sustainability of project output. It also undermines effort to improve the capacity of the Executing Agency. In line with decentralized service delivery, the District Councils will be the implementing agencies. The relevant central government agencies will provide strategic guidance and oversight in line with their core mandates. Mainstreaming implementation responsibility within established national and local institutions will enhance their capacity.
- Commencing the process of fulfilling covenants and disbursement conditions after project approval delays achievement of project effectiveness and disbursement. Follow up by project formulation team to ensure that related issues were duly addressed by the relevant Government agencies facilitated timely satisfaction of the applicable conditions during appraisal and the period leading to Board presentation. For example, the need for timely implementation of the organizational reforms of the Ministry of Water Resources and Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO), without which SALWACO could not have had the mandate to provide technical support to the District Councils to facilitate local level project implementation, was paramount. Dialogue throughout the formulation and appraisal process enabled the acceleration of the reforms and recruitment of the necessary personnel for the water Directorate of the MWR and SALWACO.
- Provision of technical assistance to the executing agency to secure smooth implementation of the RWSSP, besides overcoming the institutional capacity related challenges exacerbated by the increased staff workload due to a recent increase in Government sector spending, and implementation of additional project interventions financed by donors like JICA, India Exim Bank, BADEA and IsDB that together have impacted negatively on the implementation progress of individual project interventions.
- Concept of quarterly performance bonuses instead of regular monthly allowances for EA counterpart staff is introduced as an incentive for timely implementation.
- Recent analytical work and technical studies carried out by other development partners forming the basis for the capacity building activities and choice of project area, approaches and technologies. The studies confirmed widespread infrastructure sustainability challenges due to poor construction and low user participation: Emphasis was placed on increasing the level of

functionality in the project area through measures that included: (i) Professional approach to siting of water points/water sources through provision for improved point source investigations utilizing the basic scientific information and use of construction and supervision guidelines and manuals. Provision is made for well siting and supervision services; (ii) Establishment of community based O & M of facilities through the formation and training of local user committees, mechanics and artisans; and (iii) Sanitation and hygiene education for the user communities to ensure maximum benefit from the improved water sources which in turn contributes to sustainability of the infrastructure.

#### 4.1.5 Project Relevance to Country

The project development objective was to contribute to the effort to improve human capital and infrastructure within the context of the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP III), including achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene by: (i) increasing sustainable access to safe water and basic sanitation in rural areas, resulting in 9 % increase in safe water coverage, including restored access, and at least 6 % increase in improved sanitation coverage, with a better managed sector and improved knowledge, attitudes & practices of primary beneficiaries; and (ii) developing a comprehensive national framework for rural water supply and sanitation investments.

The development objective was fully aligned with GoSL's Agenda for Prosperity (A4P), 2013-2017 that promoted economic diversification and emphasizing infrastructure development, African Development Bank (AfDB) Ten Year Strategy (TYS) and High Fives, and Operational Priorities focusing on economic growth stimulated by investments, and GoSL and AfDB water related policies and strategies.

The development objective was relevant to beneficiary needs that included increased access to WASH, better sector management and investments, and remains relevant to the Medium-Term National Development Plan (MTNDP), 2019-2023 which prioritizes WASH infrastructure and water resources management.

GEF resources were applied to improve institutional capacity for surface and ground water monitoring and mapping and implementation of E&S measures to contribute towards resilience against climate change impacts.

The project is considered **highly relevant** to the Government of Sierra Leone's national development agenda and effort towards poverty alleviation, including achievement of national and MDG targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene. The overall rating for relevance is **Highly Satisfactory (S)**.

## 4.2 Project Implementation and Execution – Efficiency

### 4.2.1 Project Implementation

The project was approved by the Board of the African Development Bank on 18th September 2013 with a completion date of 30<sup>th</sup> December 2021, after 5 years of implementation. The Project was declared effective for first disbursement in January 2014 and was closed on 30 December 2022, after two extensions necessitated by the impact of the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak and temporary suspension of project disbursements. The actual implementation period was 8 years, instead of the 5 years envisaged at appraisal. Signing and entry into force of all four Grant agreements (ADF, FSF, RWSSI-TF, and GEF Grants) were achieved in October 2013 (one month after project approval in September 2013). However, the ADF

Loan agreement could enter into force in January 2014 (four months after approval) due to the inability to meet all relevant conditions for effectiveness.

After project effectiveness, actual first disbursement of the ADF and FSF Grants in March 2014 (after 2 months) was timely. While first disbursement of the ADF Loan was made in December 2014 (after eleven months), that for the RWSSI-TF and GEF Grants was made in October 2015 and January 2017, respectively (up to three years after effectiveness) mainly due to implementation challenges resulting from the impact of the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak, and the untimely availability of the GEF funds for disbursement only after GEF Council approval in October 2016.

The progress of implementation is presented as follows:

(1) After signing of the Loan and Grant Agreements in October 2013, the Project was declared effective in January 2014 (about 3 months after signing) after meeting the conditions for effectiveness and first disbursement like evidence of (a) GEF commitment to finance the Project, in lieu of which GoSL has arrangements to cover the financing gap, and (b) opening of 3 Special Accounts (one each, denominated in EUR, USD and Le). The 3 months period complied with Bank's operational requirement of 90 days for effectiveness after signing. The Project was launched in February 2014 (four months after signing).

(2) In most instances, the Project encountered major procurement challenges and therefore could not meet procurement timelines. The situation was exacerbated by the impact of the EVD outbreak (2014 to early 2016), and suspension of project disbursements (June 2020 to March 2021). That notwithstanding, while significant progress was made to satisfactorily complete some WASH infrastructure within 6 months of contract award, most others experienced delayed completion in excess of 3 years despite original contract durations of up to 10 months. A few facilities (1 No. RWH, 10 No. NHDWs, and 10 No. PSF) that are substantially completed, require minor outstanding works to be completed to enable the full benefits to be derived. Such works can only be completed with GoSL financing beyond project closure.

(3) All planned procurement of goods and services were substantially executed despite delayed completion of some of the related activities. Original TA contract for overall implementation support and consultancy contracts for engineering design and construction supervision, and E&S were allowed to expire without renewal mainly for budgetary reasons.

(4) Overall, the Project achieved disbursements of 89.0% Bank financing (as at 12 March 2022). This is expected to reach about 95.0% based on Bank commitments. Untimely procurement processes, including unnecessary delay in processing payments for certified works, failure to abrogate and re-award contracts of non performing contracts, and delayed approval of detailed engineering designs had an adverse impact on disbursement rates and implementation progress.

(5) Reportedly, two contractors have since not received Bank direct payment for certified works completed in 2019. While the matter is currently under Bank investigation, GoSL should take measures to avoid the potential risk of litigation and reputational damage to both the GoSL and the Bank.

(6) Government commitment for counterpart funding of USD 1,776,000 (UA 1,184,000) to support project activities has not been fully honoured. The outstanding balance of over USD 433,500 (UA 289,000) has been earmarked to finance various outstanding payments, including performance-based incentives (PBIs) based on a newly agreed PBI framework. Payment is yet to be effected.

(7) Untimely finalization of training plan/strategy resulted in delayed implementation of the capacity building for professional staff in short and long term courses.

(8) The Project did not fully comply with the requirements for environmental and social safeguards (E & S) and Project Audit. Despite incorporation of E & S measures in the engineering designs and works contracts, some contractors did not fully comply with the requirements during works execution. E&S monitoring and reporting were inadequate, and the required E&S Compliance Audit is yet to be satisfactorily completed.

(9) Despite timely submission of the 2019 and 2020 Annual Audit reports, those of 2017 and 2018 were untimely submitted. The closing audit report for 2021/2022 is likely to be submitted by June 2022.

(10) Other critical outstanding activities like asset labelling that required supply and installation of over 4,300 labels need to be completed. Reportedly, all the labels have been supplied and installation in some facilities is already completed.

The African Development Bank acted as the Implementing Agency (IA) for the project, on behalf of GEF. The Bank, represented by the Sierra Leone Country Office (COSL) was actively involved in the project from formulation through implementation and closure. The Bank performance at various stages of the project cycle is presented as follows:

1. The Bank worked closely with SALWACO during project formulation and appraisal, and provided opportunity for SALWACO to appreciate the Bank operational strategy and procedures.
2. The guidance provided on Bank procedures and control to ensure compliance with procurement, disbursement and financial management requirements was laudable.
3. The close engagement and timely responses from the Bank facilitated satisfactory accomplishment of project appraisal, approval and effectiveness.
4. The Bank support and participation with regard to project supervision and progress monitoring through review of Quarterly Progress Reports and participation in key meetings were satisfactory.
5. The Bank provided support to organize a Mid-Term Review in August/September 2016, and their performance with regard to providing No Objection to requests by the EA and processing of disbursement applications, was generally satisfactory. However, there were several instances where responses to EA requests were highly unsatisfactory (sometimes up to 12 weeks delayed response) in the period preceding suspension of project disbursement.

Other aspects of project task management with respect to technical support and assistance, and organization of bi-weekly follow up meetings since 2019 to address implementation challenges were effective and highly commendable. The overall rating of IA performance is **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.2.2 Project Governance and Execution

The **Sector Policy Coordination Team (SPCT)**, an existing inter-ministerial committee was responsible for policy oversight and organisation of the Annual Sector Reviews (ASRs). The membership of the SPCT is drawn from seven (7) stakeholder agencies, namely: (i) Ministry of Water Resources (Chair), (ii) Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, (iii) Ministry of Health and Sanitation, (iv) Ministry of Education, (v) Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, (vi) Private Sector and (vii) WaSH-Net Sierra Leone. To adequately exercise their project oversight function, the SPCT co-opted representatives from (viii)

Ministry of Social Welfare Gender and Children Affairs, (ix) Ministry of Lands Planning and Environment, and (x) Meteorological Department. The committee was also responsible for approval of Annual Work Plans and Budgets and Quarterly Progress and other project reports, and was required to convene quarterly meetings to resolve project related policy issues. The committee performed their oversight and approval functions regularly and **Highly Satisfactorily (HS)**.

The **Project Coordination Committee (PCC)** was established to be responsible for project coordination at the national level. The PCC comprised six (6) representatives, one each from SALWACO, Water Directorate, Local Government Finance Department (LGF), and Ministries of Education, Health and Sanitation. The PCC was chaired by SALWACO that also acted as the secretariat. PCC meetings were initially irregular during the first few years of project implementation, but improved to at least quarterly meetings in 2019 and after. The performance of the PCC is assessed to be **Satisfactory (S)** given their coordination role and ability to resolve implementation problems among the implementing partners over the entire duration of project implementation.

**SALWACO acted as the Executing Agency (EA)** for the project, on behalf of the Ministry of Water Resources, and was responsible for overall project management, including procurement and financial management, and also provided technical and institutional support as necessary. The following presents the performance assessment of SALWACO:

1. SALWACO had a good appreciation of Bank operational procedures that enabled them to satisfactorily comply with the requirements of the Loan and Grant Agreements with respect to procurement, disbursement and financial management, despite the initial, and subsequent challenges with compliance soon after effectiveness. Financial management services became inadequate after resignation of the FM Specialist in 2016. Failure to comply with repeated Bank supervision mission recommendations (3 years delay) to address identified lapses in FM and E&S safeguards resulted in 9 months suspension of project disbursements.
2. SALWACO laudable effort to ensure early start up with loan and grant signing in October 2013 (1 month after approval), and achievement of effectiveness in January 2014 (3 months after signing) complied with Bank requirements.
3. Project implementation, monitoring and reporting were generally satisfactory and were carried out in accordance with the requirements of the PAR and Loan and Grant Agreements. Quarterly progress reports (QPRs), Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP&B) and Procurement Plans (PPs) were regularly submitted, but with inadequate content, and were sometimes delayed (up to two months of submission deadline). The last QPR for 2021 is yet to be submitted.
4. SALWACO technical support to DCs to address their capacity limitation regarding procurement and construction supervision was laudable.
5. However, shortfalls were noted in SALWACO performance as: (a) inadequate attention paid to ensure timely training of sector professionals; (b) inadequate implementation of ESMP requirements; (c) failure to ensure timely abrogation of non-performing contracts, and retrieval and refund of funds advanced to commercial banks of the non-performing contractors (up to 2million USD), despite repeated representations made by the Bank. Reportedly, only one non performing contract remains; and (d) delayed processing and approval of disbursement requests that affected payments and implementation progress. The EA could have explored additional follow up avenues such as the bi-weekly progress meetings to address challenges encountered, including payments not received by contractors to avert the delays and resultant abandonment of works by one contractor.

In total, SALWACO directly procured 5 goods, 59 services, and 14 out of 143 civil works contracts. 5 biogas construction contracts awarded in February 2021 to Messrs. Infinity Trading (2 Lots) and Imperial Trading (3 Lots) are yet to be executed, despite advance payment to them. These contracts will be terminated and the advance payment will need to be reimbursed to the Bank. Most of the services contracts (individual) were only procured beginning the first quarter of 2021 following the Bank's recommendation to have TA support for project implementation. Bank and TA support facilitated procurement and management of the contracts.

SALWACO had to build capacity at the district level to support project implementation in partnership with the DCs. TA technical support was initially provided to facilitate preparation of designs and execution of works until consultancy contract with Messrs. Aurecon in association with CEMAT was concluded for engineering design and construction supervision. Given the limited supervision capacity of Aurecon/CEMAT, 5 Resident Engineers and 40 technicians were recruited as individual consultants to support and improve construction supervision at the district level, following expiration of their consultancy contract.

Bank supervision mission recommendations to improve implementation progress in 2018 and 2019 were not readily adhered to by the EA, leading to suspension of disbursements. That notwithstanding, effort was made to ensure timely completion of most outstanding activities, except for minor works to address E&S issues identified during works execution. Long term sustainability of the project may be assured if GoSL provides the needed budget estimated at USD 595,500 (UA 397,000) per year to support major repairs and expansion of WASH infrastructure.

During the life of the project, 31 QPRs were prepared and submitted: 4 QPRs each in 2014 through 2020, and 3 QPRs in 2021. The last QPR in 2021 is yet to be submitted as at 15 March, 2022. Preparation of AWP&B and PPs and Annual Audits were sometimes unduly delayed.

Overall, the quality of performance of SALWACO as an Executing Agency is rated **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 4.2.3 Project Finance

The project was approved by the Board of the African Development Bank at an estimated total cost of USD 43.3 million (UA 28.87 million) financed by ADF loan of USD 13.6 million, ADF Grant of USD 4.3 million, FSF Grant of USD 12.7 million (including DFID funding of GBP 5.7 million), RWSSI-TF Grant of EUR 5.3 million, GEF Grant of USD 4.0 million and GoSI counterpart contribution of USD 1,776,000. The Bank, including DFID earmarked resources were expected to finance 87% of the total project cost. GEF resources were to finance climate change adaptation interventions, including infrastructure development and capacity building. Government's contribution was to cover salaries and a portion of the cost of office supplies and operation of vehicles (4% of total project cost).

Together, the DFID and GEF grants amounting to USD 8.7 million or UA 5.8 million and USD 4.0 million or UA 2.60 million, respectively, accounted for 29% of the original project cost of USD 43.2 million (UA 28.8 million). Subsequently, EA failure to fully comply with FM and E&S safeguards requirements resulted in DFID cancellation of USD 3.2 million or UA 2.1 million (36%) of their commitment without significant impact on expected project results. Despite delayed ratification of GEF funding, available funds from DFID and GEF were significantly disbursed to mainly support WASH infrastructure development and capacity building. DFID performance regarding implementation progress and disbursement monitoring was laudable.

At completion, about 98.2% of the total project resources provided was committed. Disbursement progress for the year 2021 was low (less than 6%) following lifting of disbursement suspension in March 2021. Given that most activities are now completed and several requests are in the pipeline for processing, the overall cumulative disbursement may exceed 95.0% of total commitments.

The total budget and disbursement outlook are presented in the table below. As at March 9, 2022, about 91.1% of GEF total resources was committed including the amount disbursed. The remaining 8.9% of the GEF total resources was fully committed and earmarked to finance minor outstanding activities, including implementation of E&S safeguards measures for the Maputolo water supply infrastructure, completion of construction of Gravity Flow Schemes, technical and business skills training of women and youth, among others.

Table 4-43: Project Budget and Commitments including Spending as at March 9, 2022

Project Financing	At CEO Endorsement (USD)	At Completion (TE) (USD) (Committed including Disbursed)
(1) GEF Grant	4,000,000.00	3,645,600.00
(2) Government (MOF)	1,776,000.00	1,776,000.00
(3) ADF Loan	13,597,500.00	11,107,032.92
(4) ADF Grant	4,281,000.00	4,165,413.00
(5) FSF Grant	9,520,708.50	8,846,642.34
(6) RWSSI - TF Grant	7,057,069.05	6,824,891.48
(7) Total Other Financing (2 to 6)	36,232,277.55	32,719,979.73
<b>Total Project Cost (1 + 7)</b>	<b>40,232,277.55</b>	<b>36,365,579.73</b>

Subsequently, as at April 5, 2022 the amount of GEF resources undisbursed was USD 283,166.48 (7.1% of total GEF resources) which was further reduced to USD 111,832.58 (2.8% of total GEF resources) following completion of some outstanding activities. The breakdown of the undisbursed amount by category of expenditure is as follows:

Table 4-4: Disbursement of GEF Resources by Category of Expenditure as at June 30, 2022

Category of Expenditure	Works	Services
Total Allocation (USD)	3,100,488.20	899,111.41
Total Disbursed and Committed (USD)	3,059,836.07	828,331.35
<b>Total Undisbursed (USD)</b>	<b>40,652.13</b>	<b>70,780.06</b>

While the total amount allocated for works was about 3.5 times that for services, the corresponding undisbursed amount for works is about 57% of that for services. The remaining total undisbursed amount of USD 111,832.52 may be spent to finance some outstanding activities like further training of youth and women in skills and business development. The project mainstreaming implementation arrangements with TA support, and enhanced District Council and community participation, and the partnership arrangements with relevant sector ministries contributed to the efficient use of resources. The rating for financial resource use efficiency is **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.2.4 Stakeholder Participation in Implementation

The following present performance assessment of the various stakeholders during project implementation:

Table 4-5: Stakeholder Performance Assessment

Stakeholder	Role and Responsibilities	Performance Assessment
MWR and other Allied Ministries	Policy and management oversight and overall coordination	<b>Performed creditably</b> , ensuring policy related implementation issues were addressed in a timely manner.
District Councils	Local level implementing partners responsible for award and progress monitoring of local level contracts, facilitation of district and community level consultations, and support in prioritizing and selection beneficially communities, etc.	<b>Played a facilitating role</b> in stakeholder consultations at the district and community levels. In spite of their capacity limitation in procurement and contract management, they played a key role in procuring the works for water point rehabilitation and construction between 2014 and 2018. Their collaborative partnership with SALWACO, NGOs, and other sector players is likely to be sustained through continuous engagement and dialogue.
Beneficiary Communities	Responsible for community mobilization and participation. Provided needed support for project design to address community needs. Responsible for implementation support at the community level.	<b>Performance of local communities was satisfactory.</b> Local communities were supportive and played a vital role in providing the necessary information (based on traditional experiences and local knowledge) for project development. Communities, including selected schools and community clinics ensured their full participation in the delivery and management of WASH infrastructure.
Works Contractors	Responsible for construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure.	<b>Contractors with contracts for construction of GFS, Solar powered BH and RWH systems generally performed creditably.</b> Most other contractors with contracts for RHDW and PSF and some NHDW, performed unsatisfactorily due to delayed completion of their works. Some contractors, including Messrs. Assil Trading, Melvina Construction



		and BBC Construction performed creditably by pre-financing their contracts up to 60% without requesting for advance payment.
Consultants (NGOs, Individual and Consulting Firms, TAs)	Responsible for community sensitization and training, technical services, including engineering design and construction supervision; technical assistance to implementing partners.	<b>Five NGO contracts awarded in 2016 and several individual consultancy contracts awarded in 2021, performed creditably.</b> The only contract for design and construction supervision experienced scope reduction and was allowed to end without extension due to limited capacity for works supervision. <b>TA performance was laudable</b> regarding technical support to SALWACO and implementing agencies.
Suppliers	Supply of project related goods like vehicles, motorbikes, hand pumps, ICT and office equipment, tool kits for trained artisans, etc.	<b>Goods contracts for supply of vehicles, motorbikes, hand pumps, ICT and office equipment, tool kits for trained artisans, etc., performed satisfactorily.</b> The contract for supply and installation of project visibility labels is yet to be completed, despite fabrication of over 4,300 labels. Vehicles, motorbikes and other project assets procured to facilitate district level field work are yet to be handed over to the respective District Councils.

**4.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan was developed to facilitate project performance monitoring based on the agreed results-based logical framework, that included 8 outcome and 28 output SMART indicators, with related baseline and targets and means of data verification. The plan required periodic field data collection and validation using various monitoring tools developed and provided by SALWACO, in collaboration with the Water Directorate (WD) to all relevant national and local level stakeholder institutions to facilitate implementation progress and results monitoring. SALWACO, as the Executing Agency, ensured consolidation and incorporation of all monitoring results in project related reports, including Quarterly Progress Reports. SALWACO appointed a dedicated M&E officer to ensure field data collection and consolidation, though reportedly, this function was the responsibility of the WD, given their institutional mandate for sector monitoring. The design of M&E at entry is rated **Satisfactory (S)**.

At the local level, the District Councils were responsible for M&E data collection and compilation to prepare quarterly and annual monitoring reports under the management supervision of the WD. M&E activities by

the District Councils were performed creditably. Field supervision missions jointly undertaken by co-financiers, coupled with sector review meetings and field verification studies were adopted to validate results. Overall, the M&E plan was satisfactorily implemented by SALWACO. Rating for M&E plan implementation is therefore **Satisfactory (S)**.

The Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) and Ministries of Health and Sanitation (MoHS), and Education (MoE) were responsible for outcome and impact monitoring based on primary data obtained from field surveys. The said institutions are yet to fully realize their responsibilities due to funding limitations.

With regard to capacity building, some M&E indicators tracked the number of people or committees trained but not progress made towards enhancing their capacities. In addition, despite SALWACO engagement and responsibilities of a dedicated gender specialist, the absence of an adequate tool and resources for measuring gender mainstreaming did not facilitate gender related progress monitoring, except for example, the number of women trained or appointed to serve on community water and sanitation management committees.

Overall quality rating of M&E is **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.2.6 MTR Outcomes Summary

At MTR, some output indicators in the Log Frame were redefined to facilitate field monitoring and reporting of results without changing the scope of the project intervention. The indicators presented in the original Log Frame were used as the basis for the Terminal Evaluation as the project did not make any changes to the Log Frame. Table 4-8 below presents the redefined indicators.

Table 4-6: Newly Introduced or Revised Output Indicators AT MTR

Component	Output Indicator		Output Target	
	Original (at Appraisal)	Introduced/Revised at MTR	Original (at Appraisal)	Introduced/Revised at MTR
Water Supply and Sanitation		Number of old water points rehabilitated.	Nil	1,440
	Number of GFS taps provided.	Number of GFS constructed.	160 new	At least 16 new
	Number of solar power pumped schemes taps provided.	Number of solar power pumped schemes constructed.	252 new	At least 30 new
	Number of Toilet Stances Constructed in Schools & PHUs.	Number of Toilets Constructed in Schools & PHUs.	2,382 (of which 47% girl/women stances)	390

Key issues and recommended actions/outcomes of the MTR are presented in Table 4-9 below together with the evaluators comments on the status of implementation of the recommendations.

Table 4-7: MTR identified Issues and Recommended Actions

Key Issue	Corrective Action/Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Status at TE
<p>Enhancing Functionality and authority of the PCC and Strengthening communication between: (i) District Councils and the Executing Agency (SALWACO); (ii) Council Administration and Council Members and technical staff at district level and the meaningful involvement of key stakeholders in implementation of project activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PCC membership is to be widened to include representatives of all the five District Councils.</li> <li>• Project information should be disseminated to all Councilors and Chiefs at all levels. All project related issues, including work plans and budgetary allocations are to be duly discussed during Council meetings.</li> <li>• Chiefs must be duly involved in project implementation especially in the user community mobilization and training activities, and site selection for infrastructure.</li> <li>• The condition of the Loan and Grant Agreements pertaining to transfer of Water Directorate Staff at District level should be implemented.</li> <li>• SALWACO in conjunction with District Councils should put in place the administrative protocol for governing the work of all technical staff involved in project implementation at district level.</li> <li>• It is necessary to train the District Water Officers (Mappers) and Council Engineers to fully appreciate their respective roles in such a way that does not undermine project implementation, i.e. technical oversight, quality assurance and monitoring versus implementation of project activities.</li> </ul>	<p>PCC; District Councils; NGOs contracted to carry out user mobilization activities.</p>	<p>The corrective actions were fully implemented to enhance the role of the PCC and to improve communication among local level actors.</p>
<p>Delayed Identification of sites for Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure and assumption of uniform unit costs in tendering.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure sites should be identified by GPS Coordinate and location name, and relevant information included in the bidding documents and construction contracts.</li> <li>• LGFD to facilitate and ensure compliance by the District Councils.</li> </ul>	<p>LGFD; District Councils; PCC</p>	<p>Recommended action was fully implemented. This action also facilitated development of identification codes for all project assets.</p>
<p>Intervention in difficult areas like mountainous and riverine environments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attention to be paid to provision of appropriate water supply and sanitation solutions in riverine areas. Infrastructure Design and Supervision Consultant's attention to be specifically drawn to the need to prioritize their activities towards providing solutions for the less privileged communities in the riverine and mountainous areas.</li> </ul>	<p>PCC; Water Directorate and District Councils; Infrastructure Design Consultants</p>	<p>Recommendation was not fully implemented. Water supply infrastructure was provided in difficult areas. Unfortunately, the intended adoption of ecosan toilet as appropriate technology for riverine areas was not</p>

Key Issue	Corrective Action/Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Status at TE
			implemented mainly due to social unacceptance.
Strengthening technical supervision to avoid undue delays in execution of on-going works contracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly Site Meetings calendar to be prepared for each district based on planned meetings at relevant active works site(s).</li> <li>• All “As Built Details” including detailed design of hydraulic installations and load bearing concrete structures to be prepared and archived, with copies provided to the District Councils.</li> <li>• Designs prepared before commencement of the services of the Infrastructure Design and Construction Supervision Consultant to be quality assured by them prior to archiving.</li> <li>• Instructions to contractors to immediately resume on-going civil works and pump installation at the borehole sites.</li> </ul>	SALWACO; Water Directorate; District Councils; Supervising Consultant	Recommended actions were fully implemented.
Quality of Community Empowerment and CLTS activities, and risk of duplication of the activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate coordination of NGOs at the outset to ensure the same level of appreciation of expected outputs and outcomes of their assignments, and appreciation of the principles and strategies for delivering community mobilization and empowerment services.</li> <li>• NGOs to be encouraged to recruit their community mobilisers/facilitators from the communities, especially where such staff have already received training from previous interventions.</li> </ul>	MoHS and Project Coordination Committee	Recommended actions were fully implemented.
Sector Coordination and Management Support activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special attention to be paid to facilitating effective coordination of sector stakeholders (i.e. effective functioning of the Sector Coordination Platform), including pro-active support to the process of preparing the Annual Sector Performance Report and convening of the joint Government/Donor Annual Sector Review.</li> </ul>	Technical Assistance Team and Water Directorate	Recommended actions were fully implemented.
Limited capacity of District Bid Evaluation Committees causing procurement delays.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase assistance (financial and technical) during district procurement activities.</li> </ul>	SALWACO / TA	Recommended action was fully implemented.

#### 4.2.7 Gender Mainstreaming

At appraisal, the Project did not have a systematic approach to gender mainstreaming that allowed for preparation of a gender mainstreaming action plan, and provision of resources for implementation of related activities to help close the gender gap. That notwithstanding, the Project provided support towards gender mainstreaming by ensuring that (a) established and trained community WASH management committees have at least 40% female representation. The WASH committees consistently have 3 to 5 females out of a total of 7 to 9 committee members, which has had a positive impact on women

participation and their leadership role. Most caretakers of water point sources are women, and are responsible for operation and routine maintenance; (b) women and youth were provided opportunity to be trained and empowered to become entrepreneurs, sanitation marketers and technicians through technical and business skills development training. Women accounted for 36% of all trainees; and (c) planned training of WASH sector professionals included at least 40% women. The selection and training of local artisans took into consideration women participation. SALWACO gender expert ensured articulation of gender related matters. The Ministry of Social Welfare, Gender and Children Affairs also exercised oversight regarding compliance with national gender policy and strategies.

SALWACO field assessment of jobs created imbibed a sense of gender awareness and encouraged works contractors and service providers to increase female employment, thereby increasing opportunity for women to effectively participate in project related activities, and to contribute to reduce the vulnerability of women to sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment.

The development objective to improve access to safe water supply and basic sanitation is beneficial, particularly to women and children who will save time (spending up to 20 minutes instead of over 1 hour in most instances) by not walking long distances to fetch water for domestic use; and who will be protected against sexual assault by men for using shared sanitation facilities at night. Girl child school enrolment is likely to increase due to increased access to school sanitation.

### 4.3 Project Results and Impacts – Effectiveness

Assessment of project results considers the progress made towards achieving the project objectives, and the extent to which the project's actual outcomes are commensurate with the expected outcomes. The project results are presented in Table 4-10 together with the progress made at MTR.

#### 4.3.1 Overall Achievement

The Project comprised four components, namely:

- (a) **Component 1: Water Supply and Sanitation Infrastructure** that provided for new construction and rehabilitation of existing water supply infrastructure, construction of public sanitation facilities (schools, health centres, and markets), installation of water monitoring infrastructure, and construction of WASH facilities in riverine areas based on appropriate technologies. Overall progress is 96%.
- (b) **Component 2: National RWSS Program Development** that involved developing a framework for improved and coordinated sub sector management, and mobilizing resources for RWSS investments, and with overall progress of 100%.
- (c) **Component 3: Capacity Building** involving training of WASH sector professionals and beneficiary communities, provision of tools for improved functionality of water points, organization of sector coordination meetings, and development of knowledge products. Overall progress is about 89%.
- (d) **Component 4: Project Management** that involved effective and efficient project planning and implementation, including progress monitoring and reporting, with overall progress of 100%.

### Colour Coding for Assessment

Green = completed, the indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project
Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure

Table 4-84-1: Project Results Assessment and Rating

Outcome indicators	Baseline value (Year) (A)	Most recent value (B)	End target (C)	Progress towards target	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
<b>Outcome 1: Increased Number of People with Improved Access to Safe Water Supply and Basic Sanitation</b>							<b>S</b>
1.1: Access to improved water sources in Rural Sierra Leone; (Additional Number Served)	40% (2010)	53.0%	49% (2017)	144.4%	According to JMP Progress on Household WASH Report, 2021, access to improved water supply reachable within 30 minutes in rural Sierra Leone is 53%. Project contributed to increase access by 13%.	Target Exceeded	HS
	NA	(720,000 persons)	(625,000 persons)	115.2%	Over 720,000 rural people (estimated based on population served) were provided with improved access based on the various water supply infrastructure provided. About 50.8% of the additional population is women (2015 Population and Housing Census, SL Statistics).	Target Exceeded	HS
1.2: Access to Improved Sanitation in Rural Areas	7% (2010)	10.0%	13% (2018)	50.0%	According to JMP Progress on Household WASH Report, 2021, access to basic sanitation in rural Sierra Leone is 10%. Project contributed to increase access to basic and	Target Partially Achieved	MU

Outcome indicators	Baseline value (Year) (A)	Most recent value (B)	End target (C)	Progress towards target	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	NA	Additional 25,371 HH (with Unshared Latrine)	Additional 22,700 HHs (with Unshared Latrine)	111%	improved sanitation by 3% instead of the targeted 6%.	Target Exceeded	HS
<b>Outcome 2: Better Managed Water and Sanitation Sector</b>							<b>MU</b>
2.1: Joint Government/Donor Partner Sector Working Group Established & Operational	Working Group Established (Not Fully Functional) (2013)	Annual Joint Sector Review Commenced	Annual Joint Sector Review Commenced (September 2013)	100.0%	<p>Two instead of five Annual Joint Sector Reviews have been held to date. Due to the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) crisis (2014-2015), the Annual Sector Reviews for 2014 through 2016 were combined and held in November 2017. That for 2017 was held in December 2018.</p> <p>The Annual Sector Reviews for 2018 through 2020 planned for April 2020, was cancelled due to Covid-19. GoSL intends to combine these Reviews with that of 2021 planned to be held by third quarter of 2022.</p> <p>GoSL effort to hold the Annual Joint Sector Reviews has been partly undermined by external factors. This needs to be regularized.</p>	Target Achieved	S

Outcome indicators	Baseline value (Year) (A)	Most recent value (B)	End target (C)	Progress towards target	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
2.2: Functional Sector Donor Coordination Group	Donor Coordination Group Established (Not Fully Functional) (2013)	Irregular Quarterly Meetings	Regular Quarterly Meetings (2018)	12.5%	Donor coordination group meetings have been irregular. Only 2 meetings out of the expected 16 quarterly meetings have been held since 2018. Progress was hampered by EVD crisis between 2014 -2015. Recent efforts to revive this have been affected by Covid-19.	Target Not Achieved	HU
<b>Outcome 3: Improved WASH Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices &amp; Improved Capacity to Deliver Sustainable Rural WSS Services</b>							<b>S</b>
3.1: Number of Additional ODF Communities	N/A	1,088	1,000 (2018 )	108.8%	Target was exceeded based on effectiveness of the community mobilization and sensitization activities undertaken by NGOs. Each project district was assigned one local NGO to provide the relevant services.	Target Achieved	HS
3.2: Additional Households (HHs) with Latrine	N/A	25,371 HHs	22,700 HHs (2016)	111.8%	Project resulted in additional 25,371 HHs with unshared sanitation facilities due to effective community mobilization and sensitization and adoption of CLTS strategies in project communities. Further improvement is expected as more HHs provide domestic sanitation facilities in the project communities.	Target Exceeded	HS
3.3: Incidence of Cholera and Diarrhoea	Cholera 4%	Cholera 0%	Cholera 0% (2018);	100.0%	Reportedly, there has been no incidence of cholera in the project districts since 2018.	Target Achieved	S



Outcome indicators	Baseline value (Year) (A)	Most recent value (B)	End target (C)	Progress towards target	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	Diarrhoea 14%	Value not available	Diarrhoea 3% (2018)	No data available	No data readily available on incidence of diarrhoea.	NA	UA
3.4: Water Point Functionality Rate in Project Area	60 – 68%	72%	75%–80% (2018)	80%	An increase of up to 15% was expected at appraisal. Results of a water point survey undertaken in December 2017 confirmed about 12% increase. Functionality rate was significantly improved with the rehabilitation of several water points and procurement and installation of 150 HPs.	Target Partially Achieved	MS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
<b>Output 1: New Water Points Constructed/Rehabilitated</b>							<b>S</b>
1.1: Number of Hand Dug Wells (HDWs) & Spring Boxes (SBs)	3690 (390 New)	3880 (580 New) (2017)	95.1% (67.2%)	10%	375 HDWs and 15 Spring Boxes were newly constructed instead of the target of 580. Construction completion of 10 new HDWs is outstanding, reportedly due to non-	Target Partially Achieved	MS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	1563 Rehabilitated	1440 (2018) Rehabilitated	108.5%	10%	<p>receipt of payment for partly completed certified works by the contractor.</p> <p>The project supported rehabilitation of 1,563 out of 1,583 existing water point sources identified during project execution.</p> <p>Only 10% progress had been made at MTR.</p>	Target Exceeded	HS
1.2: Number of Boreholes (BHs)	408 (125 New)	367 (84 New) (2017)	111.2% (148.8%)	60%	<p>41 additional boreholes were drilled resulting from need to meet increased demand, and consideration of the prevailing hydrogeological conditions.</p> <p>Significant progress had been made at MTR.</p>	Target Exceeded	HS
1.3.1: Number of Gravity Flow Scheme (GFS)	15	16 (2017)	93.8%	Nil	15 GFS were constructed.	Target Partially Achieved	MS
1.3.2 Number of GFS Taps provided	760 (180 New)	740 (160 New) (2017)	102.7% 112.5%		Total number of taps provided is 180 based on an average of 12 taps per GFS. Total number of taps increased from 580 to 760.	Target Exceeded	HS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
1.4.1: Number of Solar Power Pumped Scheme	25	30 (2018)	83.3%	60%	Significant progress had been made at MTR	Target Partially Achieved	MS
1.4.2: Number of Solar Power Pumped Scheme Taps provided	275 (252)	275 (252 New) (2017)	100.0%		The project resulted in provision of additional 252 taps to increase the total number of taps from 23 to 275.	Target Achieved	S
1.5: Number of Rainwater Harvesting Systems (RWH) constructed	50 (25)	50 (25 New) (2017)	100.0%		Target was met. However, a few of the facilities provided in schools and community clinics are not in operation as they have serious leakage problems and require minor repair of the plumbing. GoSL, through the DCs will have to provide resources through the LGFD to ensure repair and sustainable operation and maintenance of such facilities.	Target Achieved	S
<b>Output 2: Institutional Toilets</b>							<b>HS</b>
2.1: Number of Toilet Stances Constructed in Schools and PHUs	3,297	2,382 of which 47% girl/women stances (2017)	138.4%	15%	388 facilities were constructed with 1,552 additional stances, which is more than twice the expected number of 669 stances at appraisal. Some facilities were constructed in communities to improve access to safe but shared public sanitation.	Target Exceeded	HS
	388		108.8%				HS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
		360 Additional (2017)			Consistently, 50% of the stances was provided for girls and women.	Target Exceeded	
2.2: Number of ODF Communities	1,088	840 (2017)	129.5%		The strategy adopted with use of NGOs, one per district to provide services for community mobilization and sensitization and adoption of CLTS was successful. ODF communities were certified as ODF free after monitoring and verification by the CLTS District Task Force led by the DHMT.	Target Exceeded	HS
<b>Output 3: Water Monitoring and Evaluation Infrastructure</b>							<b>MS</b>
3.1: Number of Stream Flow (SF) Gauges & Groundwater (GW) Monitoring Stations installed	23	20 (2017)	115.0%	Nil	Project supported rehabilitation of equipment for 100 stations. Solar panels of a GW station in Kambia are stolen. Reportedly, some SW gauging stations are dysfunctional due to defective sensors after a few months of operation. Some stations also encounter data relay challenges due to inadequate mobile network services. The Ministry of Water Resources needs to remedy the situation with the manufacturers of the sensors and the network service provider.	Target Exceeded	S

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
3.2: Number of Rainfall Gauges installed	60	200 (2017) Revised to 100	60.0%	Nil	Initial target was reduced to 100 at MTR to enable reallocation of resources to finance increased number of identified water points requiring rehabilitation. The revised target could not be realized as implementation focused on priority needs.	Target Partially Achieved	MU
<b>Output 4: Appropriate Water Supply and Sanitation Technologies for Riverine Areas Constructed</b>							<b>MU</b>
4.1: Number of Toilets & Water Points	1	30 EcoSan Toilets (2017)	3.3%	Nil	While progress was made towards achieving the target for water points, insignificant progress was made towards that for ecosan facilities in riverine communities. This was mainly due to (a) delayed finalization and approval of designs that address the peculiar hydrological and hydrogeological conditions, and (b) the limited social acceptance of ecosan technology based on existing socio cultural norms. Increased community sensitization could help address the problem of limited social acceptance in future.	Target Not Achieved	HU
	20	30 safe water points (2017)	67%	Nil		Target Partially Achieved	MS
<b>Output 5: Framework for Improved and Coordinated Subsector Management Developed</b>							<b>S</b>
5.1: Validated RWSS Program	Validated document	Validated document distributed to	100.0%	70%	National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program (NRWSSP) (2015 to 2030) has been developed, validated and	Target Achieved	S

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	distributed to stakeholders	stakeholders (Sept. 2015)			distributed among stakeholders since 2016. The NRWSSP has since been submitted to Cabinet for approval as well as to follow up on resource mobilization and implementation. The AfDB, in collaboration with GoSL and other donors, is considering future development and implementation of various projects based on the NRWSSP.		
<b>Output 6: Resources for RWSS Investments Mobilized</b>							<b>S</b>
6.1: Resource Mobilisation Workshop	Workshop Convened	Workshop Convened (Dec. 2015)	100.0%	Nil	The National RWSSP resources mobilization workshop was convened on 23rd November 2017. The workshop made donors and sector actors fully aware of the NRWSSP and related resource requirement for sub sector development, as well as the strategy for resources mobilization. The NRWSSP is slated for cabinet approval after which Government will roll it out and follow up on the recommendations therein, including the financing structure from different sources.	Target Achieved	S
<b>Output 7: WASH Sector Professionals Trained</b>							<b>S</b>

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
7.1: Number of water sector professionals trained (40% women)	33	30 Professionals (at least 40% women) (2018)	100%	5%	<p>At MTR, the indicator - number of sector professionals trained with target of 30, replaced the two indicators - number of Local Council WASH staff trained with target of 22, and MWR staff trained with target of 33 as defined at appraisal. 9 staff (representing 28%) were women.</p> <p>It was later envisaged that an additional 30 sector staff could benefit from training. Though the relevant training programs were identified and approved, these were not implemented due to delayed EA clearance and submission of requests for the said training programs.</p>	Target Achieved	S
7.2 On the Job Training of District Council, WD, SALWACO and LGFD Staff through Technical Assistance Support	TA on the Job Training Provided	TA on the Job Training of Staff Provided (2017)	100.0%	Nil	TA on the job training was provided to 15 DC and 1 SALWACO staff in finance and accounting, 5 DC and 1 SALWACO staff in procurement, and 1 SALWACO technical staff, 5 WASH Engineers and 5 Mappers from MWR in contract management.	Target Achieved	S
<b>Output 8: Beneficiaries Trained, including CC Adaptation Training</b>							<b>HS</b>

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
8.1: Number of Community WASH Trainers trained	100	100 Trainers at least 40% women (2018)	100.0%	15%	Services provided by the NGOs engaged to provide community mobilization and sensitization services contributed to the achievement of the target. Project ensured 40% women participation.	Target Achieved	S
8.2: Number of WASH Committees Established and Trained	1,740	1,000 Committees; at least 40% headed by women (2018)	174.0%	15%	The approach to engage one NGO to provide services for both community mobilization and sensitization and adoption of CLTS strategies in each district, resulted in targeting more communities than anticipated at appraisal. In addition, some communities had existing WASH committees that needed to be reconstituted and trained, ensuring the active participation of women. Reportedly, 35.4% of the trained WASH Committees is headed by women.	Target Exceeded	HS
8.3: Number of Community Artisans Trained	168	165 (50% youth) (2018)	101.8%	Nil	<p>Technical and business skills training provided for 168 trainees targeting youth and women from 68 chiefdoms across the six districts. Overall, 36% of trainees was women, and youth constituted over 90%.</p> <p>Technical training involved hands on training and supply of tool kits that are kept in the custody of the chiefdom council, and used for maintenance and</p>	Target Exceeded	S



Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
					minor repair of water and sanitation infrastructure.		
8.4: Number of CLTS Triggered Communities	1,740	1000 Communities (2018)	174.0%		Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak triggered intensive sensitization to improve hygiene and sanitation practices.	Target Exceeded.	HS
<b>Output 9: Tools for Improved Functionality of Water Points</b>							S
9.1: Groundwater (GW) Map	GW Map Provided	GW Map Provided (June 2015)	100.0%	20%	Map was provided by 2017. GoSL needs to confirm arrangement to ensure continuous financing of the National Water Resources Management Agency (NWRMA) fees for post project server hosting and data management.	Target Achieved	S
9.2: Field & Office Equipment	6 Vehicles; 2 Boats; 56 M/cycles; 17 Laptops; 11 Heavy, and 6 Light Duty Printers with	6 Vehicles; 2 Boats; 8M/cycles; 29 Computer; 6 Printers;	100.0% 100.0% 700.0% 58.6% 283.3%		Field and office equipment were procured based on needs and available budget.  56 No. motorcycles were provided instead of the 8 initially anticipated due to the need for increased capacity for construction supervision.	Target Exceeded  Target Exceeded  Target Exceeded	S  HS  S

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	Scanner and Copier 0 Terrameters	6 Copiers; 3 Terrameters (2013)	283.3% 0.0%		17 No. 3 in 1 printers were procured instead of separate printers and copiers.  The 3 No. Terrameters were not procured, given that prospective bidders did not express interest when the procurement was advertised.	Target Not Achieved	HU
<b>Output 10: Sector Coordination Meetings</b>							<b>MS</b>
10.1: PSC/SPCT Meetings	Monthly PSC/SPCT Meetings Held	One Meeting Every Month (2018)	100.0%		Monthly meetings have been held since 2017 (on Tuesdays) by the SPCT that also performs the functions of Project Steering Committee regarding oversight and document approval for all sector related projects.  On the contrary, the Project Coordination Committee (PCC) held two meetings every quarter prior to project suspension. Thereafter, only one meeting was held per quarter. A total of 18 meetings were held between May 2014 and January 2022.	Target Achieved	S
10.2: Annual Joint Sector Performance Review and Report	4 Annual Performance Reviews;	5 Annual Performance Reviews; and	80%	50%	Annual Sector Reviews for 2014, 2015 and 2016 were combined and organized in November 2017. The 2017 Annual Sector Review was held in December 2018. Sector	Target Partially Achieved	MS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
	4 Annual Reports	5 Reports (2018)			Review for 2018, 2019 and 2020 planned for April 2020, was cancelled due to Covid-19. This is intended to be combined with that for 2021 and planned to be held by third quarter of 2022.		
<b>Output 11: Knowledge Products for Subsector</b>							<b>S</b>
11.1: M&E,O&M and CLTS Manuals	Seven (7) Manuals/ Guidelines prepared	Seven (7) Manuals/ Guidelines including on cost recovery (2018)	100.0%		Manuals were prepared for M&E, CLTS, WASH Infrastructure O&M including cost recovery, Ground Water Mapping, Technical and Business Skills Training, Solar Powered Pumping Scheme Operation, and Borehole Siting, Drilling and Development	Target Achieved	S
<b>Output 12: Effective and Efficient Planning and Implementation of Project Activities</b>							<b>MS</b>
12.1: Project Completed on Time & within Budget/Disbursement Schedule	87 % of all planned targets achieved	100 % of all planned targets timely achieved (2018)	87.0%		Target was not met. Project was extended by three years due to the impact of the Ebola Virus Disease and partial suspension of disbursements. Project completion was within budget. At project closure, 87.7% of total budget is disbursed for full or substantial completion of all planned activities. This is expected to reach 95% by the agreed disbursement deadline.	Target Partially Achieved	MS

Output indicators	Most recent value (A)	End target (B)	Progress towards target	MTR Achievement	TE Assessment	TE Comment	Rating
12.2: Technical Assistance to Implementing Agencies	Assistance provided	Assistance provided to all agencies	100.0%	100%		Target Achieved	S
12.3: Submission of Acceptable Reports to the Bank (AWPB, QPR, Annual Audit, MTR, PCR)	AWPB;	AWPB by 30 November;	80.0%	Nil	Required submission timelines for reports were not respected. The issue was consistently raised during Bank supervision missions and continued to be discussed during the Bank's bi-weekly follow-up meetings with Government.	Target Partially Achieved	MS
	QPR;	QPR within 15 days of end of quarter;	80.0%				
	Annual Audit;	Annual Audit Reports by 30 June	100.0%	35%	To date, all AWPB and QPR have been submitted but with several months delay. Due to project extension, three additional annual audit reports were required. The closing audit report may be submitted by June 2022.	Target Achieved	S
	MTR;	MTR	100.0%	100%			
PCR	PCR	100.0%	100%	Nil			

The implementation efforts of SALWACO, the Executing Agency (EA) were geared towards successful completion of all four components resulting in significant progress made in realizing the expected targets. Overall implementation progress is estimated at 96.1% with overall cumulative disbursement at 89.0% (as at 12 March 2022). The project contributed to increase access to safe water supply by 13% instead of 9%, and to safe basic sanitation by 3% instead of 6% envisaged at appraisal. In total, about 720,000 people benefitted from the rural water supply interventions, while 25,371 households were provided access to safe basic sanitation.

Most outstanding activities under the project relate to completion of minor remedial/civil works for WASH infrastructure, as well as E&S and Independent Verification consultancies. A few other outstanding works resulting from non-performing contracts (GSCE contract for PSF construction) and (Melvina contract for construction of NHDWs) require completion with likely GoSL financing. These outstanding activities do not have any significant impact on project results.

Significant progress was made in training community WASH committees and artisans, and ensuring women and youth participation and empowerment for sustainable management of WASH infrastructure towards full realization of the project development objectives. The Bank played a proactive role in ensuring project extension, and also encouraged the EA to expedite action to meet procurement and disbursement deadlines to enhance achievement of project results prior to closure.

#### 4.3.2 Project Outcomes

Overall, progress made towards realizing outcome targets was over 93% (on average). 70% of the expected outcome targets were fully achieved or exceeded. The rest are on course to be achieved subject to implementation of complementary investment projects and programs by development partners in collaboration with GoSL in the near future.

While the project achieved the expected outcome to increase access to improved water supply in rural Sierra Leone, the outcome regarding increased access to basic sanitation was not achieved. The project contributed to increase awareness for improved WASH and also resulted in construction of over 25,370 household sanitation facilities to improve access to domestic sanitation. In addition, despite the significant progress made to improve the functionality rate of water points through rehabilitation of several existing facilities and installation of new hand pumps (HPs), the expected target was not met.

Although the mechanism for donor coordination is established, irregular meetings and limited opportunity for joint annual sector performance review impact on effort to achieve adequate sector coordination, and to implement complementary donor supported projects and programs within the context of the NRWSSP in partnership with GoSL. The situation is likely to improve with increased support to implement planned activities for donor coordination and annual sector performance review. Overall, the performance in terms of achieving expected outcomes is rated **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.3.3 Project Outputs

Baseline studies conducted nationwide with support of UNICEF, UNDP and INGOs in 2016 confirmed the then existing status regarding delivery, functionality and access to water and sanitation infrastructure. At project closure, overall progress towards achieving the output targets was 95% (on average). Over 74% of the expected output targets was fully achieved or exceeded, while another about 13% was significantly achieved and on track to be fully achieved. Outputs relating to training of Community Leaders, installation of rainfall gauges, and provision of water supply and ecosan facilities in riverine communities could not be

achieved. Overall, since most of the outputs have been fully or significantly achieved, the output rating is deemed **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.3.4 Attainment of Project Objective

The project development objective was to contribute to the national development agenda and effort to improve human capital and infrastructure within the context of the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP III), including achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets for water supply, sanitation and hygiene. The specific objectives were to: (i) increase sustainable access to safe water and basic sanitation in rural areas, resulting in 9 % increase in safe water coverage, including restored access, and at least 6 % increase in improved sanitation coverage, with a better managed sector and improved knowledge, attitudes & practices of primary beneficiaries; and (ii) develop a comprehensive national framework for rural water supply and sanitation investments.

Overall, the project results (outputs and outcomes) for the WASH infrastructure and National RWSS Program Development components are satisfactory, except for the limited achievement of increased access to basic sanitation, and inability to adequately provide water supply and sanitation infrastructure to help improve access in riverine communities.

The DFID funding withdrawal, and delay in the preparation and approval of the strategy and action plan for WASH sector staff training, though not a project output, resulted in the limited progress made towards achieving the desired results for short and long term staff training, including study tours. Progress towards achieving effective sector coordination through annual sector reviews was hampered by the EVD crisis and COVID 19 pandemic. However, the PSC/ SPCT held regular monthly meetings to provide project oversight over the entire implementation period.

Additionally, although significant progress was made towards achieving the results for effective and efficient planning and execution of project related activities, agreed timelines for submission of required reports were mostly not respected. Given that most of the twelve (12) outputs and related three (3) outcomes have been fully or significantly achieved, the rating for development objective is considered **Satisfactory**.

#### 4.3.5 Progress to Project Impact

Progress to impact assesses the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project. The project long term impact was defined as **contribute to sustainable human development (as per Agenda for Prosperity 2013-2017)**. Indicators with related baseline and targets for impact monitoring were provided as presented below.

Table 4-9: Impact Indicators at Project Formulation and Appraisal

Impact Indicator	Baseline	Target (2017)
1. Under 5 Mortality Rate	192 / 1000	60/1000
2. Increase in School Girl's Enrollment Rate	64%	100%

As previously mentioned in section 4.2.5 - monitoring and evaluation, the Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) and Ministries of Health and Sanitation (MoHS), and Education (MoE) were responsible for outcome and impact monitoring, and were to obtain and analyse primary data obtained from field surveys for the purpose. The

target indicators are measurable through field surveys conducted periodically and supported by Government, in collaboration with International Organizations like UN Agencies.

The implication is that, such monitoring to access progress towards achievement of the project target can only be done when funds are available. Incidentally, the project did not make funds available for impact monitoring, and this has hampered the ability of the relevant institutions to fully realize their responsibilities, given their limited Government budgetary allocation for field monitoring.

The above notwithstanding, available statistical data suggest child mortality rate (2020) of 107.8 per 1,000 births (<https://data.unicef.org/country/sle/>). The target value for under 5 mortality suggested about 70% reduction by 2017. While long term impacts attributable to any project intervention are not readily measurable shortly after project completion, it appears progress towards achieving the target (60/1000) for child mortality rate is 64%. Available data also suggest primary school enrolment (2020) as 144% (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.ENRR.FE?locations=SL>). This suggests that the expected target had been exceeded by 2020, prior to project completion in December 2021.

The achievement of the project impact cannot be attributed solely to the project, but is likely to be the result of direct Government interventions in the education and health sectors, among others. The project contributed through improved access to water supply and sanitation to reduce the incidence of water borne diseases like cholera and diarrhoea among children. Reduced time spent by the girl child who is responsible to fetch water for the household each day, provides her with opportunity to attend school thereby increasing school girl enrolment.

GEF financial contributions supported delivery of ground and surface water monitoring/gauging stations, preparation of a groundwater map, solar powered community water supply systems, adoption and implementation of environmental and social safeguard measures and community training to improve resilience to climate change. Based on the share of financial contributions, over 10% of the progress made may be attributable to GEF. The overall progress towards achievement of the project impact is assessed as **Satisfactory**.

#### 4.3.6 Remaining Barriers to Achieve Project Objective

**1. GoSL continuous sector financing:** The Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) continuous financing of the rural water and sanitation sub sector is necessary to improve O&M, and to support major repair and expansion of existing systems. Budgeted funds need to be allocated and released in a timely manner to facilitate local level disbursement to meet needs. As previously mentioned, the Government increased sector financing to about 0.2% of GDP from 2002 – 2009, but the financing was far less than the investment needs to reach the MDG targets. The project earmarked USD 595,500 (UA 397,000) per year to support sustainable delivery, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure in rural areas. Government action through the LGFD to ensure timely release of the earmarked funds to the District Councils is therefore critical to the effort towards achievement of the development objective.

**2. GoSL Funding of Outstanding Minor Works:** It is critical that all outstanding works are completed to fully realize project outputs and related outcomes towards achievement of the desired project development objectives. Given the conditions for project closure and in particular, inability to apply project resources to finance project activities beyond closure, it may be necessary for GoSL to provide the needed additional resources through counterpart funding to ensure completion of the outstanding minor works.

**3. Targeted Funding for Impact Monitoring:** Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) and Ministry of Health and Sanitation (MoHS) need to complete the relevant field surveys to enable impact monitoring in future. This could be realized through targeted financing by GoSL or donors using funds available under ongoing projects. SSL and MoHS execution of the field surveys will provide relevant monitoring data to support better assessment of project impact.

#### 4.3.7 Sustainability

##### **1. Financial**

At appraisal, the financial sustainability of the project was not ascertained by taking into account all cost streams and expected revenues as implementation of a rural water supply, sanitation and hygiene project interventions may be considered a social good that presents with socio-economic benefits rather than financial benefits unlike in commercial operations. That notwithstanding, the project provided for the (a) establishment and training of community WASH management committees to oversee the sustainable management of WASH infrastructure provided under the Project, (b) training of caretakers to perform routine operation and maintenance activities, (c) training of entrepreneurs, sanitation marketers, and artisans to provide various services, and (d) GoSI provision of UA 397,000 per year, commencing the year after project closure towards sustainable delivery, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure.

The various WASH management committees have different arrangements to mobilize revenue without a profit motive but to meet repair and maintenance requirements of WASH infrastructure. Committees levy between Le 2,000 and 3,000 per household per month in most small communities (up to 500 people), and Le 3,000 per woman and Le 5,000 per man per month in larger communities (up to 1,500 people). Reportedly, payment default rate is up to 60% in smaller communities, and up to 20% in larger communities. Where necessary, larger communities are capable of mobilizing enough revenue to finance their routine O&M and minor repair costs up to Le 2.8 million. On the contrary, smaller communities require up to Le 250,000 for minor repairs, and are only able to mobilize the needed amount over several months. Given the high default rate in revenue collection, particularly in smaller communities, GoSL assistance to finance major repairs and expansion of the existing WASH infrastructure is paramount. Currently, GoSL provides assistance through the sector conditional transfers to DCs. In addition, communities may need to rely on family members and friends living abroad to help mobilize the needed resources to support repair and maintenance, and ensure financial sustainability of WASH facilities.

In spite of the implementation delays, the project was significantly successful in achieving the envisaged outputs and outcomes, particularly with regard to increased access to sustainable water supply and water resources monitoring infrastructure, community sensitization and adoption of CLTS approach to attain ODF status and improve access to household basic sanitation, capacity building and training of community WASH management committees, women and youth to ensure sustainable delivery, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure, among others.

The project's focus to develop a framework for improved sector management and investment financing, and capacity enhancement ensure that mechanisms like the operation of trained community WASH management committees; periodic levying of households to mobilize O&M funds; creation of a cadre of trained caretakers and skilled artisans; existence of the NRWSSP to facilitate sector coordination and resource mobilization; etc., are in place to support continuous flow of benefits after project completion.



However, Government continuous and timely provision of adequate resources to support post project CAPEX and OPEX financing cannot be ascertained, given the magnitude of sector needs.

At appraisal, the economic viability of the project was ascertained based on the Economic Internal Rate of Return (EIRR) of 25.0% with Net Present Value (NPV) of USD 9.1 million at 18%. The assumptions made based on the total project cost included 5% O&M costs, 20% rehabilitation and/or major repair, and 0% salvage value. In addition, 100% functionality rate was assumed over the project life of 30 years. At completion, the updated EIRR is 24.9% based on the actual investment costs (USD 39.32 million), O&M costs, no salvage value, 30 years project life, etc., and further confirms the project's economic viability.

The economic benefits mainly comprised increased productivity, improved health and time savings resulting from better access to reliable and clean water supply and sustainable public sanitation. Environmental and social benefits like job creation (e.g., supply chain), protection of public and environmental health, increased number of girls attending school, and resources mobilized for additional sector investments based on the national RWSS program, etc., could not be quantified due to paucity of data.

The overall rating for financial sustainability is therefore considered as **Moderately Likely (ML)**.

## **2. Institutional**

The Capacity Building Component of the project provided for a broad set of capacity building activities that, when considered collectively, would provide for durability and continued use of the infrastructure put in place by the project and thereafter. These included National and Local Level Capacity Building Initiatives. Activities included training of WASH professionals at national and local levels, coaching and providing on-the-job training support, community empowerment, including community level WASH education and sensitization campaigns and training of trainers, setting-up and training of WASH Committees, and technical and business skills training including training of artisans. The target beneficiaries were youth and women.

Notably, although the targets for community level training were achieved, there could have been more training provided for sector professional staff. However, due to the delayed development of a training plan for sector professionals, the additional 30 staff from the Ministry of Water Resources and SALWACO were unable to benefit from the short and long term training as initially envisaged. Sector professional staff training provided included training of 30 sector professionals in borehole siting, drilling and development, which has contributed to sharpen the skills of both mainstreamed project staff and other sector staff. On the job training of 33 No. District Council, Ministry of Water Resources and SALWACO staff through Technical Assistance Support was also undertaken to build capacity. Development and implementation of the National RWSS program, in partnership with other sector players, contributes to ensure institutional sustainability.

Capacity enhancement of (a) the Meteorological Services Department through provision of gauging stations, (b) Water Resources management Agency through provision of water monitoring infrastructure, and (c) established Community WASH Committees and selected artisans and entrepreneurs through training to ensure sustainable operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure and services, ensured progress towards institutional sustainability and resilience to climate change impacts. The rating for institutional sustainability is **Moderately Likely (ML)**.

### 3. Environmental and Social

The ESMF and ESMP were prepared and identified mitigating measures were incorporated in the engineering designs, and the bills and specifications of related works contracts. Incidentally, due to inadequate field supervision and contract management by both the construction supervision firm and the DCs, some of the works contractors executing small works contracts, e.g., rehabilitation of existing or construction of new hand dug wells, failed to comply with the required measures during works execution. The EA made effort through contract variation, to address additional mitigating requirements e.g., slope protection and flood control, and painting of plastic storage tanks to resolve problem of algae bloom identified during execution of some major works.

The requirement for environmental and social safeguards monitoring by EPA, and EA submission of quarterly E&S reports were not complied with satisfactorily. Failure to comply with the E&S requirements contributed to suspension of project disbursements for 9 months. The issue was consistently raised during Bank supervision missions and Bank's bi-weekly follow-up meetings with Government.

Effort to establish and train WASH management committees and community trainers with at least 43% female representation, and training of 168 persons (36% women), of whom 99% was youth in technical and business skills contributed towards achieving gender equity, and women and youth empowerment.

Due to the provision of WASH infrastructure, women and children in particular save time (spending up to 20 minutes instead of over 1 hour) not walking long distances to fetch water for domestic use. Girl child school enrolment is likely to increase due to improved access to institutional sanitation. Reportedly, the project created several skilled and unskilled jobs and small businesses that directly benefitted 3,435 people. In addition, capacity enhancement of WASH committees towards post project grievance redress all contribute to achieve social sustainability. Environmental and social sustainability is rated as **Moderately Likely**.

Overall, the sustainability of the project is rated as **Moderately Likely (ML)**.

#### 4.3.8 Ownership and Partnerships

SALWACO, acting as the Executing Agency is responsible for project ownership on behalf of the Ministry of Water Resources (MWR) and other stakeholders, including development partners, public and private sector institutions. Collaborative partnership arrangements have been established between SALWACO, District Councils, School Authorities, Ministries of Education, Sanitation and Health, Civil Society, Academia, Development Partners, Communities and Private Sector Institutions through the extensive stakeholder engagements and participation during project preparation and subsequent implementation. The **partnership arrangements are likely to be sustained through continuous engagement and dialogue and participation in coordination meetings** convened and chaired by District Councils and MWR at the local and national levels, respectively.

The respective institutional responsibilities of key institutions with regard to ownership include:

1. Ministry of Water Resources and SALWACO: The MWR and the SALWACO have the first responsibility for project ownership, given their respective roles in policy and planning (MWR) and program and project development (SALWACO).
2. District Councils and Communities: The extensive engagements with District Councils and Beneficiary Communities facilitated active community involvement and imbibed a sense of district and local level ownership. Continuous sensitization and opportunity provided for women and

youth empowerment will result in community support for sustainable operation and management of facilities.

3. Development Partners: Development Partner's role in project ownership is premised on their likely support for sector investments through co-financing and parallel arrangements within the context of collaborative implementation of the national RWSS program.
4. Academia: Development of training materials and curricula for sector staff training.
5. Private Sector: Interest to participate in investments in rural WASH as vendors and small business entrepreneurs.

#### 4.3.9 Lessons Learnt

The lessons learnt presented below are based on the project experience, and are applicable to the type of project and GEF's overall portfolio, and/or GEF systems and processes.

##### 1. ***Project Implementation Arrangements***

- (a) In spite of clear formulation and adequacy of project design, achievement of project development objectives and desired outcomes is dependent on the implementation arrangements, and implementation capacity which in turn is driven by staff qualification, experience and level of motivation.
- (b) Clear identification of implementing partners and clarification of their respective roles and responsibilities at project appraisal and inception ensure timely and successful project implementation.

##### 2. ***Capacity of Executing Agency***

- (a) Executing Agency in-house technical and managerial capacity and professionalism facilitate project execution.
- (b) Executing Agency early project start up and pro activeness facilitates timely fulfilment of conditions for effectiveness and impacts positively on project implementation and progress.
- (c) Executing Agency early training and support in Bank procurement and fiduciary requirements facilitate timely project execution to achieve desired results.

##### 3. ***Sector Capacity Enhancement***

Effort to build sector capacity through staff training and institutional strengthening may not yield the desired results unless:

- (a) Government demonstrates adequate commitment by prioritizing and mobilizing adequate resources for sector investments;
- (b) National sector capacity building strategy and action plan are developed to facilitate staff training;
- (c) Training Institutions develop appropriate curricula and provide adequate training based on short and long term courses; and
- (d) Sector institutions are adequately resourced to provide mandated services.

##### 4. ***Delayed Procurement and Disbursement***

Unduly delayed completion of procurement processes for goods, works and services, and untimely EA requests and Bank processing of such requests, negatively affect implementation progress and early achievement of project results. Delayed completion may cause contract prices to escalate without possibility of price adjustment for small works contracts.

#### **5. *Improved Access to Institutional WASH***

Successful implementation of projects to improve access to institutional WASH depends on ability to extensively engage with and secure the full commitment of the beneficiary institutions regarding O&M. The beneficiary institutions may need to demonstrate such commitment by putting in place a workable arrangement for O&M prior to project execution. Government and community support to realize O&M objectives are crucial.

### **4.3.10 Summary Conclusions and Assessment Ratings**

#### **4.3.10.1 Summary Conclusions**

##### ***Design and Relevance***

The project was designed to address identified deficiencies in the delivery of water supply and sanitation infrastructure and services in rural communities in Sierra Leone. The objective was to contribute to increase rural access to sustainable and improved WASH. The project adequately aligned with the development aspirations of the GoSL and the AfDB, and was consistent with the GEF global environmental policy requirements, and therefore assessed to be highly relevant.

##### ***Implementation Efficiency***

The Sector Policy Coordination Team (SPCT), acting as the PSC was an effective governing body that provided policy guidance and project oversight through their regular quarterly meetings. The committee performed their oversight and approval functions regularly and highly satisfactorily. The PCC, EA and IA all performed their respective functions satisfactorily despite some lapses in their performance.

Project resources were adequate and overall disbursement was expected to reach 95% of total commitments to satisfactorily achieve the expected project outcomes. The actual implementation period was 8 years, instead of the 5 years envisaged at appraisal. The updated EIRR at completion of 24.9% confirms the project's economic viability.

##### ***Project Results (Effectiveness)***

Overall, progress made towards realizing outcome targets was over 93% (on average). 70% of the expected outcome targets were fully achieved or exceeded. The rest are on course to be achieved subject to implementation of complementary investment projects and programs by development partners in collaboration with GoSL in the near future.

##### ***Monitoring and Evaluation***

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan was developed to facilitate project performance monitoring based on the agreed results-based logical framework, that included 8 outcome and 28 output SMART indicators. The plan required periodic field data collection and validation using various monitoring tools developed and provided by SALWACO, in collaboration with the Water Directorate (WD) to all relevant

national and local level stakeholder institutions to facilitate implementation progress and results monitoring. The plan was clearly articulated and its implementation was facilitated by an appointed M&E officer. Project impact monitoring is still outstanding due to limited resources.

### **Sustainability**

The project financial viability was not ascertained at project formulation. However, mechanisms are in place that may ensure continuous flow of project benefits to guarantee financial sustainability. The project capacity building and institutional strengthening activities provide for durability and likely continued use of the infrastructure provided. Identified E&S mitigating measures were adopted to guide delivery of works contracts. Lapses in EPA safeguards monitoring and reporting and EA failure to fully comply with safeguards measures resulted in a 9 month suspension of project disbursement in 2020. Project impact monitoring is still outstanding.

#### **4.3.10.2 Summary Assessment and Ratings**

Table 4-10 below presents a summary of the assessment with the related ratings. Overall, the rating of project design and implementation and progress towards achievement of the project objective is deemed Satisfactory.

*Table 4-10: Summary Assessment and Related Ratings*

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Summary Comments</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Project Formulation</b>		
Project Concept and Design	The project concept and design were clearly formulated. The implementation logic was sound and sought to address identified deficiencies in the rural water supply and sanitation sub sector.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
Relevance	The project aligns with the development aspirations of the Government of Sierra Leone and GEF global environmental objectives of climate change adaptation and resilience.	<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>
Stakeholder Participation	Stakeholders actively participated in project formulation through individual engagements and stakeholder consultation and validation workshops/meetings.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
<b>Project Implementation and Execution</b>		
Project Governance	The SPCT acting as the PSC for the project, provided policy guidance and project oversight, and ensured timely resolution of project related cross-sectoral issues through their regular quarterly meetings.	<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>
Project Execution and Management	The PCC provided project level coordination, with active participation of the DCs to improve performance of Implementing Partners at the district level. WD staff provided technical support to DCs for project implementation. The EA administered and managed project activities on daily basis.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Summary Comments</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Performance of IA	The AfDB acted as the Implementing Agency (IA) for the Project. The IA performance was laudable, except for some lapses in approval of EA requests.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
Performance of EA	SALWACO acted as the EA on behalf of the MOWR. The EA ensured that project covenants and requirements were complied with. EA performance was generally satisfactory.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
Stakeholder Participation in Implementation	Stakeholders actively participated in project implementation through workshops/meetings at the community, district and national levels to guide implementation and help address issues.	<b>Satisfactory (s)</b>
Risk Management	The risks assessed during project formulation were mainly low impact risks, and most of them did not occur. The few that occurred were adequately mitigated.	<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>
Project Finance / Co-Finance	The resources made available for project financing were adequate, given the scope of the project. GEF resources contributed about 9% of total project cost. The remaining 91% were provided by the AfDB and DFID (87%) and GoSL (4%). In some instances, disbursements by the AfDB were untimely.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
M&E Quality	The M&E plan was based on the project log Frame and allowed use of various monitoring tools by respective institutions with assigned roles and responsibilities for results monitoring. The plan was clearly articulated and its implementation was facilitated by an appointed M&E officer. Project impact monitoring is still outstanding due to limited resources.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
<b>Project Results</b>		
<b>Progress Towards Attainment of Objectives and Outcomes</b>		
Project Objective: To contribute to increase access to sustainable and improved water supply and sanitation in rural Sierra Leone	Overall, progress made towards realizing outcome targets was over 93% (on average). 70% of the expected outcome targets were fully achieved or exceeded. The rest are on course to be achieved subject to implementation of complementary investment projects and programs by development partners in collaboration with GoSL in the near future.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
Outcome 1: Increased Number of People with Improved Access to Safe Water Supply and Basic Sanitation	Three (3) out of four (4) outcome targets were exceeded. Project only contributed to increase access to basic and improved sanitation by 3% instead of the targeted 6%.	<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>

Criterion	Summary Comments	Rating
Outcome 2: Better Managed Water and Sanitation Sector	Two annual sector reviews were held in 2017 and 2018 that combined several outstanding annual reviews. Donor coordination group meetings have been irregular.	<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>
Outcome 3: Improved WASH Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices & Improved Capacity to Deliver Sustainable Rural WSS Services	Two (2) out of four outcome targets were exceeded, while one was fully met. The fourth target was significantly met.	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
<b>Sustainability</b>		
Financial Sustainability	Financial viability was not ascertained at project formulation. However, mechanisms are in place that may ensure continuous flow of project benefits thereby guaranteeing financial sustainability.	<b>Moderately Likely (ML)</b>
Institutional Sustainability	Project provided for a broad set of capacity building and institutional strengthening activities that, when considered collectively, would provide for durability and continued use of the infrastructure put in place by the project.	<b>Moderately Likely (ML)</b>
Environmental and Social Sustainability	Identified mitigating measures were adopted to guide delivery of works contracts. There were lapses in EPA safeguards monitoring and reporting. Failure to fully comply with safeguards measures resulted in project disbursement suspension.	<b>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</b>
<b>Overall Project Rating</b>		
		<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>

#### 4.3.11 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings presented above.

**1. Ensure adequate capacity is built and roles clearly defined among project actors.**

- (a) The Executing Agency has adequate capacity to enable timely and successful project execution. This can be achieved through capacity building programs and support for institutional strengthening, where necessary. Trained staff need to be motivated to reduce the risk of attrition.
- (b) Key implementing partners and beneficiaries have interest and are committed to provide the necessary support during and after project implementation to consolidate and sustain project benefits. This requires careful assessment of their roles and the extent to which they support the institutional and financial sustainability of the project.

**2. Ensure Government provision of adequate resources as counterpart financing to complete all outstanding works and payments.**

Government counterpart funds should be made available to (a) complete financing of all outstanding minor remedial works, and (b) ensure payment of PBIs that have been outstanding since 2020 based on the agreed framework for PBI payment.

**3. *Ensure continuous and timely mobilization of financial resources to support operation and maintenance, major repair and expansion of WASH systems.***

It is necessary that Government makes available through the sector conditional transfers to DCs each year, the estimated USD 596,000 to finance recurrent costs, major repair and expansion of existing WASH infrastructure that are beyond the financial capability of communities. Government support should be continuous and timely; and where necessary, communities may rely on family members and friends living abroad to help mobilize additional resources to support repair and maintenance of their WASH systems.

**4. *Ensure training of individuals and small businesses to enhance local capacity for O&M.***

Effort should be made to support further training of persons identified by other Chiefdoms to acquire technical and business development skills, and to support them with the necessary logistics, including basic tools and equipment to establish themselves as small businesses to enhance local capacity for operation and maintenance.

**5. *Ensure strengthening of existing collaborative partnerships among stakeholders.***

The existing collaborative partnership arrangements achieved through the Project Coordination Committee (PCC) need to be sustained through periodic meetings convened by SALWACO to discuss and resolve issues relating to rural water supply and sanitation. The District Councils should also play a facilitative role in continuous sensitization and engagement of beneficiary communities to increase awareness, community ownership and support for sustainable O&M.



## ANNEX A: EVALUATION MATRIX

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<b>Relevance - How does the project relate to the development priorities of the GEF, AfDB and GoSL and effort to increase sustainable access to improved WASH in rural Sierra Leone?</b>				
How is the project relevant to GEF development objectives?	How does the project support the related strategic priorities of GEF?	Level of coherence between GEF and project objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Policies and Objectives</li> <li>• Project Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review and analyses</li> <li>• Stakeholder Interviews with relevant officials and other partners</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
How is the project relevant to AfDB development objectives?	How does the project support the development priorities of AfDB?	Alignment of project objectives to Bank TYS for development assistance, relevant policies and CSP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bank policies, TYS and High 5s, CSP</li> <li>• Project Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review and analyses</li> <li>• Stakeholder Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
How is the project relevant to GoSL development objectives, and effort to increase sustainable access to WASH?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project follow GoSL national development priorities?</li> <li>• How does the Project support the effort to increase sustainable access to WASH? Does the project address the identified problems?</li> <li>• Does the Project adequately take into account national realities, both in terms of institutional framework and programming, in its design and its implementation?</li> <li>• To what extent were stakeholders involved in the design?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree of coherence between the project and local and national priorities, policies and strategies to increase sustainable access to rural WASH.</li> <li>• Level of community ownership.</li> <li>• National stakeholders' appreciation of the adequacy of project design and implementation in relation to national realities and existing capacities.</li> <li>• Level of involvement of Government officials and other partners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National policies, strategies and programmes</li> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Key Stakeholders (government officials and other partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review and analyses</li> <li>• Stakeholder Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
Are the needs of target beneficiaries addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the project support the needs of target beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Is implementation project inclusive of all relevant Stakeholders?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link between expected project results and the needs of target beneficiaries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beneficiaries and Stakeholders</li> <li>• Needs Assessment Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review and analyses</li> <li>• Beneficiary and stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project formulation and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of beneficiaries and stakeholders in project design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visits</li> </ul>
<b>Coherence – How well does the project align with interventions to enhance sustainable access to improved WASH in rural Sierra Leone?</b>				
Is the Project internally coherent in its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were GEF criteria for project identification adequate in view of actual needs?</li> <li>Was the project sourced through a demand-driven approach?</li> <li>Is there a direct and strong link between project expected results (Result and Resources Framework) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between expected project results and internal project design logic.</li> <li>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program and project documents</li> <li>Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review and analyses</li> <li>Stakeholder interviews</li> </ul>
How is the coherence between the project and other relevant interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project coherent in terms of areas of focus and targeting of key activities within the context of other donors' strategies?</li> <li>How does GEF help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are crucial but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>To what extent interventions undertaken by different donors support (or undermine) the same objective of the project?</li> <li>Is there any overlap (or not) between the project and other similar interventions in the country?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which the project was coherent and complementary to another donor programming.</li> <li>List of programs and funds in which future developments, ideas and partnerships of the project are eligible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other Donors' policies and programming documents</li> <li>Other Donor representatives</li> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review and analyses</li> <li>Interviews with donor representatives</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness – To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>				
How is the Project effective in achieving its expected outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is the project effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> <li>What are the factors which contributed to these achievements?</li> <li>Were there any delays?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of execution of outputs under outcomes</li> <li>Degree to which the project contributes to the achievement of the development objective of increased sustainable access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Key stakeholders</li> <li>Project Team</li> <li>Representatives of Government and other Partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Meetings with main Project Partners and Project Team</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were there any factors beyond the control of the project and government which affected the implementation of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in capacity for information management: knowledge acquisition and sharing; effective data gathering, methods and procedures for reporting.</li> <li>Change in capacity for awareness raising among stakeholders and government</li> <li>Change in local stakeholder behaviour.</li> <li>Change in capacity in policy formulation and planning related to rural sustainable access to WASH.</li> <li>Change in implementation capacity.</li> <li>Change in resource mobilization capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies</li> <li>Field observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries</li> <li>Field visits</li> </ul>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well are risks and assumptions being managed?</li> <li>What is the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed, and are they adequate?</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long- term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning</li> <li>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>Quality of risk mitigation strategies developed and applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team and Implementing Partners</li> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Document review and analyses</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency – Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>				
Are Project resources channelled in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>Does the Project Results Framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>Are accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical and financial delivery of annual work plans</li> <li>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team and Implementing Partners</li> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Document review and analyses</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>• How adequate is the M&amp;E framework (indicators &amp; targets)?</li> <li>• Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>• Is project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</li> <li>• Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> <li>• Are financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>• Is the project decision-making effective?</li> <li>• Does the government provide continuous strategic directions to the project's formulation and implementation?</li> <li>• Are there an institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanisms to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to project formulation and implementation effectiveness were shared among project stakeholders, AfDB staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing project adjustment and improvement?</li> <li>• Does the project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>• Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>• Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>• Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>• Quality of RBM reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>• Occurrence of change in project formulation/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>• Existence, quality and use of M&amp;E, feedback and dissemination mechanism to share findings, lessons learned and recommendation on effectiveness of project design.</li> <li>• Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> <li>• Gender disaggregated data in project documents</li> </ul>		
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the government demonstrate its ownership of the project?</li> <li>• Did government provide counterparts to the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of ownership of project amongst project Partners</li> <li>• Level of community ownership and implementation of activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team and Implementing Partners</li> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Document review and analyses</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations are encouraged and supported?</li> <li>Which partnerships/linkages are facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>What is the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements (between local actors, AfDB and relevant government entities)?</li> <li>Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of stakeholder collaboration and support for execution of activities</li> <li>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners</li> <li>Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>		
Does the Project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise and local capacity?</li> <li>Does the project support mutual benefits through sharing of knowledge and experiences, training, technology transfer among developing countries?</li> <li>Did the Project take into account local capacity in formulation and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Was there an effective collaboration with scientific institutions with competence in community resilience to climate change variability and risks?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of total expertise utilized taken from Sierra Leone</li> <li>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team and Implementing Partners</li> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Document review and analyses</li> </ul>
<b>Impacts - Are there indications that the project has contributed to increase access to sustainable and improved WASH in rural Sierra Leone thereby contributing to sustainable human development?</b>				
How is the Project effective in achieving its objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project achieve its objective of increase access to sustainable and improved WASH in rural Sierra Leone thereby contributing to sustainable human development?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to environmental monitoring and risk management</li> <li>Changes in institutional capacity for environmental management</li> <li>Changes to the quantity and strength of barriers such as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Stakeholders</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Studies</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Meetings with AfDB, Project Team and project Partners</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project contribute to reduce climate change impacts?</li> </ul>	<p>inadequate planning, regulatory and institutional framework for better environmental management, limited experience among key government and civil society stakeholders in developing and implementing programs, lack of incentives and benefits to local communities for participation in related programs, and lack of financial resources.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> <li>Field visits</li> </ul>
How is the Project impacting local environment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the impacts or likely impacts of the project on the local environment; poverty; and other socio-economic concerns?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific examples of impacts at those three levels, as relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Stakeholders</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Studies</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Meetings with AfDB, Project Team and project Partners</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> <li>Field visits</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability - To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>				
Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were sustainability issues integrated into the formulation and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Does the project employ government implementation and/or monitoring systems?</li> <li>Is the government involved in the sustainability strategy for project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence/Quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>Evidence/Quality of steps taken to address sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>
Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> <li>Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project end?</li> <li>Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
		funding sources for those recurrent costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end</li> <li>• Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end</li> </ul>		
Are there organizational arrangements and continuation of activities issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are project results well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?</li> <li>• Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support?</li> <li>• Has there been a buy-in process, or was there no need to sell the project and buy support?</li> <li>• What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?</li> <li>• Were appropriate ‘champions’ being identified and/or supported?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>• Number/quality of champions identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents review and analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>
Is there an adequate enabling environment to sustain project achievements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to ensure sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> <li>• Are the necessary related capacities for law making and enforcement built?</li> <li>• What is the level of political commitment to build on results of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies</li> <li>• State of enforcement and law-making capacity</li> <li>• Evidence of commitment by the political class through speeches, enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents review and analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>

Main Question	Sub Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Will institutional and individual capacities adequate at the end of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the capacity in place at the national, and local level adequate to ensure sustainability of results achieved to date?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elements in place in those different management functions, at appropriate levels (national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>
Are there any social and environmental sustainability issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project contribute to key building blocks for social and environmental sustainability?</li> <li>Did the project contribute to local stakeholders' acceptance of the new practices?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Example of contributions to sustainable social and environmental change with regard to environmental management and monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>
Will achievements be replicable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were project activities and results replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?</li> <li>What was the project contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms?</li> <li>Does the project have a catalytic role</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number/quality of replicated initiatives</li> <li>Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives</li> <li>Volume of additional investment leveraged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>
Are there any challenges to sustainability of the Proje	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts?</li> <li>Have any of these been addressed through project management?</li> <li>What could be possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above</li> <li>Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AfDB, project team and partners</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Field Observation data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents review and analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>



## ANNEX B: CONSULTANT'S TERMS OF REFERENCE

### PREPARATION OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR SIERRA LEONE – RURAL WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT (P-SL-E00-003)

---

#### 1. Background

1.1 The Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (RWSSP), funded by the African Development Bank (AfDB), co-financed by DFID, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and GoSL has the overall goal of contributing to the Sierra Leone's Agenda for Prosperity, including the contribution to achievement of the water supply, sanitation and hygiene targets set out in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The project is to directly benefit an estimated 625,000 rural Sierra Leoneans, and result in nine percentage points increase in safe water coverage, including restore access, and at least six percentage points increase in improved sanitation coverage, besides a better managed sector and improved knowledge, attitudes & practices of the primary beneficiaries.

1.2 The RWSSP main objective of the RWSSP project is to increase access to safe water supply from 35% to 44%, and access to improved sanitation from 6% to 12% in rural Sierra Leone, including improved sanitation access for 91,000 school children. The project also includes the development of a comprehensive national program for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation. The project includes four main components as follows: (i) Water Supply and Sanitation Infrastructure (ii) National Program Development, (iii) Capacity Building, (iv) Project Management. The Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project covers six rural (previously five) districts selected from the Northern, Southern and Central regions of Sierra Leone (Kambia, Kono, Koinadugu, Bonthe Pujehun and Falaba Districts).

1.3 The Project was approved by the Bank on 18th September 2013. The project total cost is UA 28.87million (including DFID contribution; and UA 25.57million excluding DFID cancelled grant of UA 2,120,861). The project is financed by ADF loan of UA 9.065 million, ADF Grant of UA 2.854million, FSF Grant of UA 6,347,139 (excluding the cancelled DFID Grant equivalent to UA 2,120,861)), RWSSI-TF Grant of EUR 5.3 million (UA 4,704,712.7) and GEF Grant of USD 4.0 million (UA 2,596,694.41) and GoSI counterpart contribution of UA 1,184,000. The project completion date was 30.12.2021.

1.4 The project is implemented by Sierra Leone Water Company (SALWACO). that was established in 2001 as wholly owned government entity in accordance with the companies Act. It is under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Water Resources (MWR), currently governed by a four (4) member Ministerial Oversight Committee appointed by the Minister of Water Resources. The company is responsible for the provision of water supply to specified urban areas of the country.

1.4 In accordance with the operational procedures, the Bank would like to engage the services of an individual consultant to prepare the Project Terminal Evaluation Report for the GEF financing in line with the attached template.

#### 2. Objective of the assignment

2.1 The major objective of the assignment is to prepare a Project Terminal Evaluation Report in

accordance with the GEF requirements and template.

### 3. Scope of Work

3.1 The assignment will entail familiarization with the project design as well as actual activities undertaken by the project, review of the Bank's recently completed Project Completion Report prepared and discussion with key stakeholders.

3.2 Under the general guidance of the Bank Task manager, the consultant will undertake the following specific tasks, among others:

- (i) Study the Project Appraisal Report, project Quarterly Progress Reports and project supervision reports and Aide-Memoires to establish details of the reported level of completion of the project activities among other aspects pertaining to project implementation.
- (ii) Study the recently finalized Bank Project Completion Report
- (iii) Assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and establish the extent to which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the Endorsement/Approval stage – have been achieved.
- (iv) Indicate if there were any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation.
- (v) Sustainability: Assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination
- (vi) Progress to impact: Assess the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project. Report any available qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction, project's contributions to changes in policy/ legal/regulatory framework, and assess contributions of GEF project to the observed change
- (vii) Monitoring and Evaluation: Undertake assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation.
- (viii) Assessment of Implementation and Execution: Undertake assessment of the implementation and execution of the Project through the performance assessment of the project executing entity in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities.
- (ix) Include other assessments such as the need for follow-up where applicable, materialization of co-financing, Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender Concerns and stakeholder engagements
- (x) Prepare lessons learned that are based on the project experience and applicable to the type of project at hand, to the GEF's overall portfolio, and/or to GEF systems and processes.
- (xi) Carry out any-other tasks that are necessary to enable the achievement of the objective of the assignment.

### 4. Deliverables/Outputs for the Assignment

4.1 A Project Terminal Evaluation Report prepared in accordance with the GEF Template and guide (attached).

### 5. Timing and Duration

5.1 The assignment is programmed to commence on 5th October 2022 and shall be carried out over a period of 10 working days. The consultant will work remotely.

## 6. Consultant's Qualification and Requirements

6.1 The consultant shall be a versatile water and sanitation sector professional with particular qualities that include, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- A Minimum masters' degree in water and waste engineering or closely related field; additional professional training in project/program design & management will be added advantage.
- At least ten years' general experience as a water sector professional
- Verifiable track record of project design and management, including a key role in the design of at least two water supply and sanitation projects in the public sector
- At least five years' working experience with multilateral development institutions, including at least two assignments of similar nature (i.e. PCR preparation).
- Proficiency in the design of both rural water supply and sanitation solutions. Knowledge of innovative community-based sanitation and hygiene approaches is an added advantage. Experience of private sector participation in provision of rural water and sanitation services will be additional advantage.
- Appreciation of project/program monitoring and evaluation principles, including familiarity with water and sanitation results measurement frameworks.
- Good knowledge and appreciation of the set up and functioning of public institutions in general and water sector institutions in particular, including familiarity with partnership modalities with development partners, local and international NGOs in WASH.
- Ability to work closely in a multi-disciplinary team to achieve results.
- Excellent writing skills that includes Report writing in English.
- Computer literacy and proficiency in the use of Microsoft office (word, Excel, project) and related document preparation software.

6.2 The Consultant is required to have a fully functional personal computer (laptop) - at least 100GB HDM and 2GB RAM with Windows 8.1 operating system and Microsoft Office 2013 applications (word, excel, outlook, project, power point), in addition to reliable up-to-date anti-virus software as a minimum. Digital map editing software and a digital camera may be necessary.

## 7. Information to be provided by the Recipient and the Bank

7.1 The Bank and the recipient will provide all background information that is necessary for the successful implementation of the assignment. This information will include the project financing Agreements, AfDB Appraisal Reports, Supervision Mission Reports and Aide-Memoires, service providers' contract records, disbursement records and any other relevant project records which will be requested by the consultant. The GEF Terminal Evaluation Report format will also be provided

## 8. Reporting

8.1 The consultant will work closely with the Bank Task Manager. The consultant will submit an end-of-assignment report not exceeding two pages, in addition to the Terminal Evaluation report.

## ANNEX C: CONTENT OF GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

### **1. Background**

- This section should include information such as GEF Project ID, project name, GEF financing, promised and materialized co-financing, key objectives, GEF Agency, project countries, key dates, name of the project executing entity, whether the project is linked to a GEF program, the evaluation team, etc.
- Where feasible and appropriate, the terminal evaluation reports should include geo-referenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. To facilitate tracking and verification, where feasible, the terminal evaluations should include geo-referenced pictures of the sites where GEF supported interventions were undertaken.

### **2. Objectives and Scope**

- The scope of a terminal evaluation will depend upon the project's theory of change, its objectives, supported activities, M&E design and implementation, and the context in which the project was designed and implemented. The terminal evaluation report will clarify the key questions that the evaluation seeks to answer, the interventions assessed, the geographical and demographic coverage, the methods used, and the time period under review.
- The project's theory of change provides a basis for evaluation of the theory and results. The terminal evaluation report will include a description of the project's theory of change including description of: the outputs, outcomes, intermediate states, and intended long-term environmental impacts of the project; the causal pathways for the long-term impacts; and, implicit and explicit assumptions. The project's objective(s) should also be included within the theory of change.

### **3. Assessment of Project Results**

- Terminal evaluations will assess achievement of outputs and outcomes, and report on these. While assessing a project's results, evaluators will determine the extent to which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the CEO Endorsement/Approval stage – have been achieved. The evaluators should also indicate if there were any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), where feasible, the evaluator should estimate the baseline conditions so that results can be determined.

### **4. Outputs**

- Outputs are tangible direct results of a project, and to a large extent its production is within direct control of the project management. The evaluators should assess the extent to which the key expected outputs were actually delivered. They should also identify and assess the factors that affected delivery of outputs

### **5. Outcomes**

- In the causal pathways of a project, its outputs are expected to lead to its intended outcomes. Although achievement of outcomes is not certain, most GEF projects may be expected to achieve the targeted outcomes at implementation completion. The evaluators should, therefore, assess the extent to which the expected outcomes were achieved and the extent to which its achievement was dependent on delivery of project outputs. They should also assess the factors that affected outcome achievement, e.g. project design, project's linkages with other activities, extent and materialization of co-financing, stakeholder involvement, etc. Where the project was developed within the framework of a program, the assessment should also report on the extent the project contributed to the program outcomes.

## **6. Criteria for Outcome Ratings**

Outcome ratings will take into account the outcome achievements of the projects against its expected targets. Project outcomes will be rated on three dimensions:

- *Relevance*: Were the project outcomes congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies, country priorities, and mandates of the Agencies? Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes?
- *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the project's actual outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes?
- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost-effective? How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects?

## **7. Rating Scale for Outcomes**

An overall outcome rating will be provided on a six-point scale (highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory) after taking into account outcome relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency

## **8. Sustainability**

- The terminal evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination and provide a rating. The assessment of sustainability will weigh risks to continuation of benefits from the project. The assessment should identify key risks and explain how these risks may affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. The analysis should cover financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental risks.
- The overall sustainability of project outcomes will be rated on a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likely incidence and magnitude of the risks to sustainability. Higher levels of risks and magnitudes of effect, imply lower likelihood of sustainability. The Annex describes the rating scale for sustainability.

## **9. Progress to Impact**

- The evaluation report should assess the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project. It should report the available qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction (e.g. GHG emission reduction, reduction of waste discharge, etc.) and environmental status change (e.g. change in population of endangered species, forest stock, water

retention in degraded lands, etc.). When reporting such evidence, the evaluation report should note the information source and clarify the scale/s at which the described environmental stress reduction is being achieved.

- The evaluation report should cover project's contributions to changes in policy/ legal/regulatory framework. This would include observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.). Contribution to change in socioeconomic status (income, health, well-being, etc.) should also be documented.
- Where the environmental and social changes are being achieved at scales beyond the immediate area of intervention, the evaluation report should provide an account of the processes such as sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling up and market change, through which these changes have taken place. The evaluation report should discuss whether there are arrangements in the project design to facilitate follow-up actions, and should document instances where the GEF promoted approaches, technologies, financing instruments, legal frameworks, information systems, etc., were adopted/implemented without direct support from, or involvement of, the project. Evidence on incidence of these processes should be discussed to assess progress towards impact.
- When assessing contributions of GEF project to the observed change, the evaluation report should also assess the contributions of other actors and factors. The evaluation report should assess merits of rival explanations for the observed impact and give reasons for accepting or rejecting them. Where applicable, the evaluators are encouraged to identify and describe the barriers and other risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impacts.
- The evaluation report should document the unintended impacts – both positive and negative impacts – of the project and assess the overall scope and implications of these impacts. Where these impacts are undesirable from environmental and socio-economic perspectives, the evaluation should suggest corrective actions.

#### **10. Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems**

- The evaluation report will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation. To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluation report will assess:
  - Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement/Approval practical and sufficient?
  - Did it include baseline data?
  - Did it specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio-economic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities?
- The evaluation report should assess the M&E implementation. More particularly, it will ask the following questions:
  - Whether the M&E system operated as per the M&E plan?

- Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner?
  - Was information on core indicators and sub-indicators gathered in a systematic manner?
  - Whether appropriate methodological approaches have been used to analyze data?
  - Were resources for M&E sufficient?
  - How was the information from M&E system used during the project implementation?
- The Project M&E systems will be rated on the quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). The Annex provides more details on the scale.

### **11. Assessment of Implementation and Execution**

3. The assessment of the implementation and execution of the Project will take into account the performance of the project executing entity in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The performance of these executing entities will be rated using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). See the Annex for more information on the scale.
4. AfDB-GEF unit is involved in activities related to a project's identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation. To assess performance of the AfDB-GEF unit, the evaluation report will assess the extent to which the unit delivered effectively on these counts, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given GEF unit's perspective. The evaluation report will assess how well risks were identified and managed by the AfDB-GEF unit.
5. Executing entities are involved in the management and administration of the project's day-to-day activities under the overall oversight and supervision of the AfDB-GEF unit. Executing entities are responsible for the appropriate use of funds, and procurement and contracting of goods and services to the AfDB-GEF unit. To assess executing entities performance, the evaluators will assess the extent to which it effectively discharged its role and responsibilities.

### **12. Other Assessments**

The evaluation report should assess the following topics, for which ratings are not required:

- *Need for follow-up:* Where applicable, the evaluation report will indicate if there is any need to follow up on the evaluation findings, e.g. instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks, etc.
- *Materialization of co-financing:* the evaluation report will provide information on the extent to which expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing is cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- *Environmental and Social Safeguards:* The evaluation report will assess whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards, including those on mainstreaming of gender concerns,

were addressed in the project's design and implementation. It is expected that a GEF project will not cause any harm to environment or to any stakeholder and, where applicable, it will take measures to prevent and/or mitigate adverse effects.

- *Gender Concerns:* The evaluation report will determine the extent to which the gender considerations were taken into account in designing and implementing the project. It should report whether a gender analysis was conducted, the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits, and whether gender disaggregated data was gathered and reported on beneficiaries. In case the given GEF project disadvantages or may disadvantage women, then this should be documented and reported. The evaluator should also determine the extent to which relevant gender related concerns were tracked through project M&E.
- *Stakeholder Engagement:* The evaluation report should, where applicable, assess aspects such as involvement of civil society, indigenous population, private sector, etc.

### ***Lessons and Recommendations***

- The evaluation report should provide a few well-formulated lessons that are based on the project experience and applicable to the type of project at hand, to the GEF's overall portfolio, and/or to GEF systems and processes. Wherever possible, the evaluation report should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation that have led to effective stakeholder engagement, successful broader adoption of GEF initiatives by stakeholders, and large-scale environmental impacts. The evaluation report should describe aspects of the project performance that worked well along with reasons for it. They should discuss where these good practices may or may not be replicated.
- Recommendations should be well formulated and targeted. The recommendations should discuss the need for action, the recommended action along with its likely consequences vis-à-vis status quo and other courses of action, the specific actor/actors that need to take the action, and time frame for it.

## **ANNEXE**

### ***Rating Scales***

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in terminal evaluation are: outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution.

#### **A. Outcome Ratings**

1. The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the following criteria:
  - I. Relevance
  - II. Effectiveness
  - III. Efficiency



2. Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:
  - *Highly satisfactory (HS)*: Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings.
  - *Satisfactory (S)*: Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings.
  - *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*: Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings.
  - *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*: Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings.
  - *Unsatisfactory (U)*: Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings.
  - *Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)*: Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings.
  - *Unable to Assess (UA)*: The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.
3. The calculation of the overall outcomes rating of projects will consider all the three criteria, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical. The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall outcome rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU = unsatisfactory range). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range, then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (HS to MS), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range.
4. The second constraint applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the effectiveness rating.
5. During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluation report should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.

## **B. Sustainability Ratings**

6. The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

- *Likely (L)*. There is little or no risks to sustainability.
- *Moderately Likely (ML)*. There are moderate risks to sustainability.
- *Moderately Unlikely (MU)*. There are significant risks to sustainability.
- *Unlikely (U)*. There are severe risks to sustainability.
- *Unable to Assess (UA)*. Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

### **C. Project M&E Ratings**

7. Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:

- Design
- Implementation

8. Quality of M&E on these two dimensions will be assessed on a six-point scale:

- *Highly satisfactory (HS)*: There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.
- *Satisfactory (S)*: There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations.
- *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*: There were some short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation more or less meets expectations.
- *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*: There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected.
- *Unsatisfactory (U)*: There were major short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected.
- *Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)*: There were severe short comings in M&E design/ implementation.
- *Unable to Assess (UA)*: The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / implementation.

### **D. Implementation and Execution Rating**

9. Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the AfDB-GEF unit that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the AfDB-GEF unit and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

- *Highly satisfactory (HS)*: There were no short comings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations.

- *Satisfactory (S)*: There were no or minor short comings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations.
- *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*: There were some short comings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations.
- *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*: There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected.
- *Unsatisfactory (U)*: There were major short comings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected.
- *Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)*: There were severe short comings in quality of implementation / execution.
- *Unable to Assess (UA)*: The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution.

## ANNEX D: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Project Appraisal Report: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project;
2. Project Completion Report: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project;
3. ADF Loan and Grant Agreements;
4. Supervision Mission Aide Memoires, BTORs and IPRs;
5. Mid-Term Review Report;
6. Quarterly Progress Reports;
7. Project Related Correspondences;
8. Engineering Design Report and Drawings;
9. Project Procurement and Implementation Plans;
10. Contract Completion Certificates;
11. Contracts for Construction of Hand Dug Wells;
12. Contracts for Construction of Waste Utilization (Biogas) Systems;
13. Addendum for Pipe Extension and Environmental Works in Mapotolo;
14. Environmental and Social Management Plan (Final Report)
15. Environmental and Social Compliance Audit Draft Report;
16. Loan and Grant Disbursement Ledgers;
17. Terms of Reference and Inception Report for Independent Verification Consultancy;
18. NGO Completion Reports on Community Mobilization and Engagement.

**ANNEX E: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED REMOTELY/IN-PERSON - AfDB & GEF EVALUATION**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
1	P.K. Lansana	Minister	MWR
2	Alusine Sesay	Deputy Permanent Secretary	MWR
3	Musa Shiaka	Performance Tracking & PA to Minister	MWR
4	Mathew Dingie	PDFS	MOF
5	Sam M. Aruna	Deputy Financial Secretary	MOF
6	Halima Hashi	Country Manager	AfDB
7	Felicitas Chi Cho Atanga	Country Program Officer	AfDB
8	Patrick Senesie	Program Manager	FCDO
9	Anthony Mario	WASH Officer	UNICEF
10	Lamin Vandii	Managing Director	SALWACO
11	Dr. Albert Harvey	Deputy Managing Director	SALWACO
	Saffa S. K. Bockarie	Planning Director	SALWACO
12	Yankuba Tarawally	Projects Director	SALWACO
13	Joe Gbouma Alieu	Procurement Director	SALWACO
14	Mary M. Ngegba	Stakeholder and Media Relations Manager	SALWACO
15	Mohamed Metzger- Sheriff	Ag. Admin Manager	SALWACO
16	Samuel Conteh	M&E Expert	SALWACO
17	Kadiatu Dumbuya	Gender and Social Dev. Expert	SALWACO
18	Chrisla Koroma	Planning Manager	SALWACO
19	Jonathan Bangura	Procurement Officer	SALWACO
20	Richard Sylva	Financial Management Specialist	SALWACO
21	Victoria Kadi Saffa	Media/Communications Officer	SALWACO
22	Abubakar Kebbie	Station Manager Kambia	SALWACO
23	Francess Turay	Technician	SALWACO
24	Christopher Thomas	AutoCAD Technician	SALWACO

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
25	Lovetta K. Mammy	Pupil Engineer - Lungi	SALWACO
26	Hamid Kamara	Station Engineer - Makeni	SALWACO
27	John Hallowell	Civil Engineer	SALWACO
28	Marilyn George	Station Manager Blama	SALWACO
29	Bintu Momoh	Station Manager Moyamba	SALWACO
30	Caroline Spain	Mapper, Kambia	MWR
31	Ahmad T. Alghali	Western Rural Engineer	MWR
32	M F K Kamara	Mapping Officer	MWR (Pujehun)
33	Augustine Amara	WASH Engineer	MWR (Kambia)
34	Abubakar S. Sesay	WASH Engineer	MWR (Bonthe)
35	Mamadu J. Jalloh	WASH Engineer	MWR (Kono)
36	Morie Bayoh Kobba	WASH Engineer	MWR (Pujehun)
37	Monya Swarray	WASH Engineer	MWR (Koinadugu/Falaba)
38	Mohamed H. Soko	Hydro-Geologist	NWRMA
39	Eva Boi Mary Jabati	Hydro-Technician	NWRMA
40	Grace Kainessie	Hydro-Geologist	NWRMA
41	James P. Kailie	Asst. Hydro-Geologist	NWRMA
42	Chernor Unisa Jalloh	Trainee Hydro-Technician	NWRMA
43	Simeon S. Sesay	Trainee Hydro-technician	NWRMA
44	Sahr E. Yambasu	Chief Administrator	Pujehun District Council
45	Dr. Edward Alpha	Chief Administrator	Kambia District Council
46	Amadu B.S. Conteh	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Kambia District Council
47	Timothy A. Kamara	Environmental and Social Officer	Pujehun District Council
48	Gebriel Samura	Asst. Engineer	Falaba District
49	Paul Bannister	Environmental Officer	Bonthe District Council
50	Mohamed K. Kamara	Engineer	Kambia District Council
51	Komba M. Bunduka	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Korno District Council

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
52	Daniel Komba	Supervisor	Kambia District Council
53	Foday Bangura	Surveyor	Open Space News Paper
54	Marilyn Kaday Shinu		Radio 98.1
55	Prince C. Kamara	Reporter	SLBC TV
56	Joseph Songo	Reporter	
57	Suluku S. Dumbuya	Reporter	Heal Sierra Leone
58	Saidu Kamara	Technician / Radio Presenter	Sierra Leone Social Aid Volunteers
59	Victor Jah Tucker		Direct Response Dev.
60	Alfred Jatta Dumbuya	Director	Baseline Investments
61	Ibrahim Kamara	Director	Assil Trading Company
62	Bai Kalon	Director	BBC
63	Jhaldun Jawah	Managing Director	BBC
64	Morlai Sesay	Site Manager	BBC
65	Mohamed Bangura	Supervisor	Kambia Gov. Hospital
66	Shekuna Sowe	Store Keeper	Fonikoh /Pujehun
67	Emmanuel Melvin Taylor	Maintenance Officer	Fonikoh /Pujehun
68	Mustapha Silla	WASH Committee Chairman	Yornu Curve/Pujehun
69	Jebbeh Kamara	Chair Lady	Fulawahun/Pujehun
70	Fanta Williams	WASH Committee Caretaker	Fulawahun/Pujehun
71	Edison M. Comoya	School Management Committee Chairman	Fulawahun/Pujehun
72	Bukari Sandi	Town Chief	Walehun /Korno
73	Mustapha Rogers	Speaker	Walehun Health Centre
74	Sahr Kebbie	WASH Committee Chairman	Bambaya /Korno
75	Mariama Charles	Nurse in Charge	Bambaya /Korno
76	Philip Jimisa Bengo	Caretaker	Bambaya /Korno

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
77	Elizabeth Yonga	WASH Committee Member	Rogbere /Kambia
78	Finda Bundor	WASH Committee Member	Rogbere /Kambia
79	Kondeh Tourey	WASH Committee Caretaker	Mapotolo/Kambia
80	Fatima Kebbi	WASH Committee Member	Mapotolo /Kambia
81	Abukari Tourey	Town Elder	Mapotolo /Kambia
82	Palmani Sorie Kamara	Section Chief	
83	Sachiko Kamara	Section Chief Aid	