

# IEG

## ICR Review

Independent Evaluation Group

<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b>	09/26/2006	
<b>PROJ ID:</b>	P046836		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name :</b>	Ug: Lake Victoria Env. Proj. (ida)	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	28.05	31.65
<b>Country:</b>	Uganda	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	12.09	16.6
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Board: ENV - Agricultural extension and research (44%), General water sanitation and flood protection sector (22%), Central government administration (16%), General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (14%), Animal production (4%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>	13.14	15.24
<b>L/C Number:</b>	C2909			
		<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		97
<b>Partners involved :</b>	GEF	<b>Closing Date</b>	12/31/2002	12/31/2005
<b>Evaluator:</b>	<b>Panel Reviewer :</b>	<b>Division Manager :</b>	<b>Division :</b>	
Shawki Barghouti	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	IEGSG	

## 2. Project Objectives and Components

### a. Objectives

The original project development objectives were stated broadly to reflect the long term program approach to the sustainable regional management of Lake Victoria . The objectives included: a) maximize the sustainable benefits to riparian communities from using the resources within the basin to generate food, employment and income and safe water; b) conserve biodiversity and genetic resources for the benefit of the riparian communities and global community, and c) harmonize national management programs to protect achievements in arresting increasing degradation of the environment around the lake . These objectives were not changed during the course of the implementation and no formal revision was made to these objectives . But during the mid term review and the stock taking missions which assessed progress in implementation, the following operational objectives were devised and project impact in the ICR was measured accordingly .

- 1- Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem
- 2- Establish mechanism of cooperative management by the three countries .
- 3- Identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies.
- 4- Build capacity for ecosystem management.

The project performance is being assessed against these more specific objectives which most closely match the intent inferred in the design.

### b. Components (or Key Conditions in the case of Adjustment Loans ):

The original project design was complex, with nine components and more than 32 sub components. The design was somewhat simplified after the 1999 mid term review which reduced it to 17 sub components. The changes were largely reorganization of the components and did not translate in restructuring of the project.

**1-Fishery management :** Planned US\$ 6.13 million, actual US\$ 5.02 million, or ( 16%): To improve overall management and protection of fisheries resources in lake Victoria by strengthening both national and regional institutional framework and promotion of conservation measures . This component established fish levy, fisheries co management, strengthen extension services, statistical data collection and frame survey .

**2-Fishery research :** Planned US\$ 4.70 million, actual US\$ 4.87 million (15.7%) : To establish a baseline on ecology of the lake, impact of environmental factors on the lake system and socioeconomic impact on resources; restoration of threatened species through aquaculture . This component supported fish biology and biodiversity conservation, aquacultural research, socio-economic studies, and build information and data base .

**3-Water quality and ecosystem management :** Planned US\$ 6.01 million and actual US\$ 6.18, (20%).To study the nature and dynamics of the lake ecosystem; to improve management of industrial and municipal effluent and assess the contribution of urban run-off of lake pollution in order to design alleviation measures . (To establish a water quality

monitoring network throughout catchment, estimating the effects of changes in land use planning on pollution loads in the lake, and developing policies and programs to control non-point source pollution). The components supported monitoring of in-lake water quality, industrial and municipal waste management of pollution loading assessment and monitor the role of agrochemicals in pollution of Lake Victoria. Although pollution hotspots were identified, the merged component (including Water Quality, Industrial and Municipal Waste Management, and Management of Pollution Loading) became too focused on data collection with inadequate emphasis on addressing the critical pollution problems in the lake.

**4-Water Hyacinth control** :Planned US\$ 3.17 million, actual US\$ 2.52(10%). To establish sustainable long-term capacity for maintaining control of water hyacinth and other invasive weeds in the Lake Victoria. The component supported bio-control program, mechanical/manual/chemical control program, supervision, legislation and public awareness and water hyacinth research.

**5-Wetland management and Micro projects** : Planned US\$ 1.63 million, actual US\$ 1.97 (6.5%). To increase knowledge of wetlands buffering processes and of Lake Victoria wetlands; to determine economic potential of the Lake Victoria Basin wetlands products; to demonstrate wise use of wetland resources; and to develop strategies for wetlands management. The project targeted service delivery among the Lake basin communities by implementing a range of demand driven projects in the health, water, education, sanitation, access roads, afforestation and fisheries sectors.

**6- Soil and water conservation** : Planned US\$ 2.02 million, actual US\$ 1.59 (5%). To promote improved land management practices in the Lake Victoria for increased and sustained agricultural productivity and reduce agro-chemicals nutrient and sediment loading into water systems leading to Lake Victoria.

**7-Catchment afforestation** : Planned US\$ 0.93 million, actual US\$ 0.88 million (4%). To protect vital areas of Lake Victoria catchment by planting trees by involving local communities and institutions

**8-Capacity building** : Planned US\$ 0.35 million US\$ 0.69 million (2%). To strengthen facilities for research and training at local universities.

**9- Coordinating national secretariat** : Planned US\$ 0.85 million, actual US\$ 5.54 (17%). Responsible for overall monitoring and reporting progress, coordination and information sharing at the regional and national levels.

#### **c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates**

Due to significant delays in the start-up of the program, at the mid-term review (MTR), many of the components and sub-components were revised. The scope of several activities and components was narrowed, but still within the overall objectives and targets for the program. The appraisal estimated project costs at US\$ 28.05 million financed by an IDA credit of US\$ 12.09 million, GEF grant of US\$ 13.14 million and Government of Uganda funding of US\$ 2.83 million for the initial period of 1997-2002. A supplementary credit was approved in 2002 of US\$ 4.5 million brought the total IDA credits to US\$ 16.6 million, GEF 15.24 and GoU U Uganda Shilling 3.29 billion (approximately US\$ 1.94 million). As work programs within components were revised, resources were reallocated between and among them. For example, the secretariat was originally budgeted for about 3 percent of the cost, and ultimately absorbed an estimated 17 percent of funds.

#### **3. Relevance of Objectives & Design :**

The regional program for the sustainable management of Lake Victoria was relevant to the needs of the riparian countries to sustain efficient management of the Lake. The Lake is the source of the White Nile, which is an integral part of the Nile River Basin shared by nine countries. Local communities living around the Lake have been dependent on the Lake resources for their living, transport, fisheries, and energy. The IDA/GEF support was in response to requests from the riparian countries. The design addressed local, national, and regional issues with a high degree of stakeholders participation, well focused on appropriate scientific questions, but with limited explanation to policy makers and the public as to how solutions to these questions could be utilized. The design included several pilots to test new technology on the ground, but suffered from poor follow up to upscale and main stream results in the national agenda. The project design was complex and the functional relationships among the components were loose and lacking strategic connections. The project was prepared over a long period: 1994-97. There was a commendably high degree of stakeholder ownership of the planning process, with the draft project documents being produced by each country.

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

The overall implementation performance (outputs) was **Moderately Satisfactory**, and the achievement of the development objectives (outcomes) was **Moderately Satisfactory**.

**Objective one** : *Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem* : **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project supported activities designed to increase understanding of the Lake Ecosystem, particularly in the sources of pollution, fish stocks, and hydrology. Great emphasis was placed on data collection and less on analysis, collation and dissemination. Quality of reports was not consistent. The lack of time-series data prevented conclusive analysis. Planned sedimentation studies were not completed. The effort at comprehensive lake modeling exceeded capacity at this stage, and was not fully successfully undertaken.

**Objective Two :** *Establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries :Moderately Satisfactory :*  
An important institution, the Lake Victoria Fishery Organization (LVFO) was operationalized, although it requires strengthening. Fisheries sector frameworks were harmonized. Regional synthesis reports were prepared but not of high quality.

**Objective three :** *Identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies :Moderately Satisfactory :*

The project contributed to establishing and strengthening co-management of natural resources.

The participatory approach combined with micro-projects proved to be successful and cost-effective while increasing local livelihoods and empowering communities.

**Objective Four :** *Building capacity for ecosystem management: Moderately Satisfactory .* Efforts to improve forests through local institutions was largely not successful. Most of the activities in the project were oriented towards capacity building. in scientific research and resource management, while technical skills were upgraded.

## 5. Efficiency :

Efficiency is rated as **Not Available** due to the lack of evidence, the environmental nature of the project and the difficulty of assessing the longer term benefits at this early stage. However, more could have been done in the analysis of cost effectiveness. This was a fully blended IDA/GEF project, with shared objectives for both sources of funding. Long term benefits could be substantial but the costs and benefits of the project were not adequately analyzed. The benefits to the local communities were presented in a limited fashion, especially in terms of return to these communities from improved fishing stocks and related diversification of fish species. Cost benefit analysis at regional level to identify trade offs among various usages was not carried out. The economic rate of return was not estimated but, as noted above, it is very early to assess efficiency. At the local level, the activities led to increased capacity in the communities, enabling them to improve resource management, with many positive environmental externalities as well as contributing to improved livelihood.

## 6. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization:

The design of M&E was weak because there was no well defined result based framework.

The design was optimistic in scope, with a large number of components and requiring coordination between a variety of institutions in each country and between and among countries. The plethora of implementing agencies and activities resulted in complicated budgeting and accounting systems. Capacity to implement was weak, and enhancement of capacity was one of the objectives of the program. The design did not include a logframe because that was not customary at the time. The project very much needed an alternative to the log frame; i.e., a practical guide to action and clarity on the results expected. Key performance indicators were established late in the implementation (in 2004) during an attempt to retrofit a log-frame.

On the critical dimension of readiness for implementation it was weak, and this weakness was costly for the performance of the project. Nevertheless, changes introduced at the MTR allowed implementation to accelerate within the components and eventually allowed funds to flow.

## 7. Other (Safeguards, Fiduciary, Unintended Impacts--Positive & Negative):

The project was not classified. No major safeguard issues were involved. The environmental studies in several components were carried out as planned. The project contributed to better understanding of management issues regional environmental concern of shared natural resources.

8. Ratings :	ICR	ICR Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome :</b>	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	The ICR used the modifier under the six point scale.
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Satisfactory	

### NOTES:

- When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.
- ICR rating values flagged with ' \* ' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

## 9. Lessons:

- 1-Regional dimensions of national projects are vulnerable to failure if one of the partners do not deliver on agreed joint plans. Safeguards to mitigate such risks should be built into the design of regional programs.
- 2-Scientific research must be targeted, provide usable information for management decisions and be

widely accessible.

3-The Basin perspective is critical to address the key environmental issues of large systems such as Lake Victoria .

4-Regional projects necessitate greater emphasis on clarity of project objectives, monitorable frameworks, at multiple levels, and adequate mechanisms for governance .

5-Capacity building has to address both current and projected needs of regional cooperation .

6-Implementation in the medium to longer term can be undertaken through strengthening national agencies and governmental structures.

7-Environmental benefits must be strongly linked to improved livelihoods for local people and communities.

**10. Assessment Recommended?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

The ICR is well prepared, objective in presentation facts and data, and accurate in presenting the rating . It provided well structured analysis of the performance of the Bank and borrower, and discussed factors affecting implementation with supporting empirical data . The SAR did not include adequate indicators to assess impact and results, and the ICR could not fill this gap .