

IEG

ICR Review

Independent Evaluation Group

1. Project Data:		Date Posted :	09/26/2006	
PROJ ID:	P046837		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name:	Tz-lake Victoria Environment (ida)	Project Costs (US\$M)	20.3	30.4
Country:	Tanzania	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	10.1	18.6
Sector(s):	Board: ENV - Animal production (25%), Central government administration (25%), Other social services (20%), General water sanitation and flood protection sector (20%), Tertiary education (10%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)		
L/C Number:	C2908			
		Board Approval (FY)		
Partners involved :	GEF	Closing Date	12/31/2002	12/31/2005
Evaluator:	Panel Reviewer :	Division Manager :	Division :	
Shawki Barghouti	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	EGSG	

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 9 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 into restructuring of the proje ct.

1-Fishery management : Planned US\$ 4.31 million, actual US\$ 5.74 million (21%): 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: a fish levy, fisheries co management, strengthened extension services, statistical data collection and frame survey .

2-Fishery research : Planned US\$ 3.52 million, actual US\$ 3.51 million (13%) : 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 an information and data base .

3-Water quality and ecosystem management : Planned US\$ 6.72 million and actual US\$ 5.92 million (22%).To study the lake ecosystem; improve management of industrial and municipal effluent and assess the contribution of urban run-off of lake pollution in order to design alleviation measures . The components supported monitoring of in-lake water quality, industrial and municipal waste management of pollution loading assessment and monitor the of the role of agrochemicals in pollution of Lake Victoria .

4-Water Hyacinth control :Planned US\$ 2.10 million, actual US\$ 2.77 million (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 : Planned US\$ 1.31 million, actual US\$ 2.1 million (7%). 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.

6- Soil and water conservation : Planned US\$0.36 million, actual US\$ 1.1 million (4%). To promote improved land management practices in 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\$ 0.69 million, actual US\$ 1.71 million (6%). To protect vital areas of Lake Victoria catchment by planting trees by involving local communities and institutions

8-Capacity building : Planned US\$0.28 million actual US\$ 0.77 million (3%). To strengthen facilities for environmental analysis and graduate teaching at University of Dar es Salaam .

9- Coordinating national secretariat :Planned US\$ 0.99 million, actual US\$ 4.25 million (15%).Responsible for overall monitoring and reporting progress, coordination and information sharing at the regional and national levels .

9-Micro projects :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.

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

Due to significant delays in start-up of the program, several components at the mid term review were revised and the sub components reduced. The original IDA credit was US\$10.1 million and there was a GEF grant of US\$ 10.3. Two IDA supplements totaling US\$8.5 million were approved , bringing the total IDA to US\$ 18.6. As work programs with the components were revised, resources were reallocated between and among them . The GEF grant was not changed.

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 satisfactory, and the achievement of the development objectives as defined after the mid term review (outcomes) is rated **Moderately Satisfactory** .Project implementation was slow.The project closing date was extended by two years, which allowed for a few activities to be completed with reasonable impact. The lack of adequate measurable development objectives and associated performance indicators for each components makes it difficult to assess achievement in terms of results on the ground related the improvement of the Lake ecosystem.

The implementation process was not adequately guided by well defined results based framework .

Instead it achieved sequential incremental progress . The lack of strategic focus impeded prioritization and led insularity within the components . Activities under the project were weakly linked to the ongoing work of the relevant ministries. Lack of emphasis on cost effectiveness, efficiency, and consistent quality assurance reflected weakness in technical and administrative management .

Objective one : *Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem: Satisfactory* :

The project supported many knowledge -building activities that advanced the understanding of the Lake Ecosystem, levels and sources of pollution, fish stocks, and hydrology .

Objective two : *Establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries : Satisfactory*

The three countries made considerable progress in advancing the regional perspective in both planning and implementation. The Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization was operationalized, although it requires strengthening. Fisheries sector rules and regulations were harmonized and regional information exchange was strengthened.

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 improving local livelihoods and empowering communities.

Objective four : Building capacity for ecosystem management :: Satisfactory

Training and research activities financed by the project provided experience in designing scientific research and resource management, while technical skills were upgraded and the implementing institutions were equipped.

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):

No major safeguard issue was involved, and the environmental studies in several components were carried out as planned in the SAR. The expected environmental impact was significant, but at this stage at the output level in strengthening the data base for sustainable management of Lake Victoria.

8. Ratings :	ICR	ICR Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	ICR used modifiers introduced under the current six point scale.
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		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 provided well structured analysis of the strength and weakness of project design, implementation, and Bank's and borrowers performance. The SAR did not include adequate risk analysis, or cost benefit assessment at national or households levels. The ICR could not fill this gap. The ICR includes well prepared annexes and provides adequate guidance to regional management as to the lessons learned .