

DFID / PAWS PROGRAMMES

Presentation to MCC

24 May 2007

DFID ANNUAL REVIEW

- The key objective were to evaluate
 - The extent to which the purpose of each component has been achieved and their consequent contribution to the purpose of the overall WFSP
 - The contribution of the project outputs to the achievement of the purpose
 - The impact (positive and negative) of each project

DFID ANNUAL REVIEW

- The extent to which the achievements of the projects were sustainable
- Whether the management arrangements were appropriate and operated satisfactorily
- Lessons for DFID, DWAF and other stakeholders which has relevance beyond the boundaries of the current projects

DFID ANNUAL REVIEW

- The review team comprised
 - DWAF: Helgard Muller and Deborah Mochotlhi
 - DFID: Malcolm Ridout and Karen Jones (with inputs from Subethri Naidoo and Kate English)
 - Independent reviewers: Malcolm White (Irish Aid providing technical expertise)
 - Ursula Blackshaw: Independent consultant

FINDINGS

- The WSS component suffered especially from an overambitious logframe
- The logframe OVIs at the output level were couched in terms of sectoral change
- A second complexity was that Outputs 1 and 2 were confusingly worded

FINDINGS

- Substantial redesign and budget reductions scaled back Output 2, and radically reduced Output 3
- These were partly in response to concerns that little progress has been made with project implementation in the first year to 18 months (partly due to staff turnover in the implementation team, and partly due to difficulties with establishing the new procurement process)
- In reality, the project managed to achieve more under Output 2 than this reorientation implied, and so the level of effort against Output 3 was again increased

FINDINGS

- Management arrangements were altered so that individual DWAF managers assumed direct responsibility as ‘Output Managers’
- The project became more responsive to DWAF needs
- Project activities were more clearly aligned with DWAF priorities and
- Output managers ‘owned’ and were committed to achieving outputs
- This improved the likelihood that the project benefits will be sustained after the end of the project. On the other hand it makes it difficult to distinguish project achievements from the mainstream DWAF work, making attribution difficult

FINDINGS

- This change reduced the sectoral orientation of the project
- Although linked to Masibambane, and exchanging information with this sector-wide support programme
- Non-DWAF stakeholders perceived WSS as having become a DWAF project
- Independence from Masibambane viewed in two ways – While majority of stakeholders felt that this independence allowed WSS to operate more flexibly, a small group felt that the project should have been fully integrated with Masibambane

FINDINGS

- WSS provides a lesson in balancing strategic and responsive project activities
- The WSS experience illustrate the value of working closely alongside operational managers, responding to needs as they arise, which creates the opportunities for strategic interventions

GENERAL LESSONS

- The dangers of allowing overambitious LOGFRAMES to stand uncorrected
- Paying insufficient attention to risks
- The need to ensure that project implementation begins promptly and effectively
- The WFSP programme steering committee, which was a forum for strategic interaction between DFID AND DWAF disbanded after only one meeting
- In addition, the potential to use this steering committee as a high-level channel for information and feedback between project implementation teams and decision makers was lost
- DFID may not have been sufficiently closely engaged with the projects, outside the various review processes

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The LOGFRAME should be revised as soon as possible so that it more accurately reflects the reality of what the project was intended to
- The confusion between Output 1 and Output 2 should also be eliminated
- WSS should develop a comprehensive programme for wide dissemination of the project outputs – building on the various publications, case studies and showcase workshops

RECOMMENDATIONS

- WSS should prepare an explicit exit strategy which incorporates support for stakeholders' implementation planning

In effect, each Output Manager should formulate an explicit plan indicating where, how, and by when they will use the outputs of the project to implement the new sectoral support and regulation strategies

FUTURE OF WSS

- Meeting to confirm budget 31 May 2007
- Priority will be to implement the recommendations
- September 2007 – DFID/SRK contract ends
- December 2007 – DFID/Deloitte contract ends

PAWS

- PAWS will continue for the next 3 years
- Hosted by WEDC
- Funded by DFID
- 50% of municipalities active
- Appreciate role of regions in making this initiative work

PAWS

- Visits in the last quarter
- Support to Komati CMA
- Support to Mogale City
- Support to Sekhukhune