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Executive Summary

Introduction and Context

This report details the results of a tracer evaluation that was undertaken by the Evaluation Unit of EDI on the Water Reform Policy Program (WPRP). Specifically, the unit surveyed participants from 16 WPRP activities conducted by EDI in various countries throughout the world between 1993 and 1997. The primary source of evaluative data came from a questionnaire that was mailed to 100 program participants in various countries. Twenty-eight participants completed and returned the questionnaire.

Specifically, the report will discuss the tracer evaluation's design, methodology, analysis, and results, as well as the program's impact on its participants. The evaluation was begun in the summer of 1997 in order to provide relevant data to an external consultant who was at that time preparing a larger evaluation report. This present report formalizes the material provided in draft to the consultant.

In May 1993, the World Bank's Board of Executive Directors approved a water resources management policy that called for an integrated approach to water management and a departure from the traditional focus on individual water-using sectors. EDI was given a mandate to assist client countries in the dissemination and mainstreaming of the principles set forth in the policy paper. EDI responded to this challenge by developing a three-year training strategy in water resources management. This strategy became the basis for WPRP and was developed and implemented by a team in EDI's Environment and Natural Resources Division (EDIEN). The program's main objective is to assist countries in adopting environmentally and socially sustainable water policies, through facilitating policy dialogue activities and disseminating development knowledge and experience.

Evaluation Design and Methods

WPRP managers and consultants, as well as an external consultant, began their evaluation in April 1997, working with the assistance of several evaluators from EDI's Evaluation Unit. The primary sources of data for their evaluation were interviews with participants, managers, and consultants of the program. A questionnaire developed by the Evaluation Unit and by WPRP managers and the consultant also was sent to 100 WPRP participants; the Evaluation Unit analyzed the completed questionnaires as they were returned. It was anticipated that the entire evaluation would be completed by the external consultant in the late fall of 1997.

In December of 1997, the Evaluation Unit undertook a follow-up analysis of the tracer evaluation, the results of which are presented in this report, originally envisioned to complement the report completed by the external consultant. Overall, the evaluation unit’s intent in preparing this present evaluation report was to detail the work it had managed and completed in assisting the external consultant.

The evaluation’s two primary goals were to assess the program’s overall accomplishments since its inception in 1993 and to provide suggestions for future improvements. To help accomplish these objectives, a questionnaire was created to address the following five areas:

- background information on the respondents and their functions within their countries
- respondents’ ratings of the seminars they attended
- respondents’ perception of how the situation had changed in their country since the EDI activity they attended was held
- the current situation for water policy reforms in the respondent’s country
- respondents’ understanding of the role of EDI and the World Bank in water policy reform throughout the world

One hundred questionnaires in English, French, and Spanish were mailed to high-level officials who had participated in WPRP’s seminars and programs since 1993. These participants were selected by the program managers and the external consultant because, within their countries, they were considered influential in the area of water reform and had participated in a seminar or workshop conducted by the program managers. Afterwards, e-mails and follow-up letters were sent to encourage these participants to complete the questionnaires. Additional assistance was sought from the Bank’s field offices and worldwide partners in the various participant countries; they were contacted by phone and e-mail, and asked to entice their country members into completing the questionnaires. A wide selection of participant countries were chosen for the evaluation: South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Morocco, Algeria, the Philippines, the Ivory Coast, Senegal, Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, Panama, Jordan, Yemen, Kenya, Argentina, Mauritania, Mauritius, France, Cambodia, and the United States.

Of the 100 distributed questionnaires, 28 were completed and returned to the Evaluation Unit—a response rate of 28 percent. Several questionnaires were returned as either being undeliverable or having an incorrect address. Although this is a lower response rate than anticipated, the respondents were representative of the total population of participants in various water reform programs conducted by EDIEN since 1993. Moreover, all 28 are high-ranking officials within their countries who have influential roles in reforming water policies. These include academy presidents, NGO presidents, chiefs of staff, ministers and directors of water and agriculture, legislators and congressional representations, chief engineers, program managers, advisors to presidents and secretaries general, and presidents and vice presidents of water and sewage systems.

Two evaluators in the EDI evaluation unit analyzed the content of the returned questionnaires. Closed-ended responses were tallied and examined for their validity.
by both evaluators; open-ended responses were content-analyzed and grouped by
themes that best qualified their responses. These responses were then matched to
the counterpart questions on the questionnaires. The analyses' results are reported
here in the same order and format as the questionnaire; response numbers
correspond to that of the questions. This will allow readers to observe and analyze
the quantitative and qualitative results of the questionnaire in a systematic and
clear manner.

Evaluation Findings

Overall, there were several notable evaluation findings gleaned from the WPRP
seminars. These are categorized into three major areas: outcomes and impacts, course
content, and pedagogical strategies.

Outcomes and Impacts

Positive impacts were reported by many respondents. Forty-one percent said that
reforms in the area of water management policies had been initiated as a result of
the activity they had attended. Forty-six percent stated their countries had either
developed or revised new water laws and tariffs or new policies for water manage­
ment in their countries.

Fifty-nine percent were satisfied with the quality of their country's decisionmaking
on water policies. The specific reasons for this apparent satisfaction are not known;
however, 63 percent of the respondents stated that the quality of their decisionmaking
on water sector reform had improved since attending the activity.

As a result of WPRP, noticeable changes in respondents’ attitudes were per­
ceived. When asked to suggest specific training programs necessary to implement
effective and sustainable water management reforms in their countries, 32 percent
of the respondents recommended training national staff and NGOs on pertinent
issues of water policy reform. Forty-five percent suggested that EDI should con­
duct additional case studies and hold more workshops to help participant coun­
tries implement effective and sustainable water management reform.

Course Content

The respondents also offered specific recommendations to improve the courses of­
tered by WPRP. The top four priority impacts that respondents suggested EDI tar­
get were (1) increasing implementation of sound policies for better management of
the country's water resources (20 percent); (2) developing environmentally sustain­
able water and (3) improving dialogue between stakeholders (both 14 percent); and
(4) privatizing water management for their countries (13 percent). According to
the respondents, the two top priority content areas that EDI should emphasize in
the future for water management are strengthening national institutions (23 per­
cent), and increasing national capacity for training of sector specialists (17 percent).
Fifty-five percent of the respondents stated that learning about the experiences of other countries was the most useful aspect of the seminars for them. Correspondingly, 25 percent indicated that country presentations (that is, presentations focusing on their own countries) were the least useful aspect.

**Pedagogical Strategies**

Respondents stated that WPRP training needed to be “much more focused” on case study discussions (29 percent), while 52 percent said it needed to be “more focused.” Twenty-six percent said that the recommendations needed to be “much more focused,” while 59 percent believed that concrete recommendations needed to be “more focused.” Fifty-six percent of the respondents stated that WPRP training needed to be “more focused” on seminars; another 19 percent asked that they be “much more focused” on seminars.

The respondents rated EDI’s emphasis on the participants’ involvement and the management and organization of the activities as the two best features of the seminars (59 percent rated both of these features as “very good”). However, a few respondents also gave a low rating to the importance given to participants’ involvement; 15 rated it as only “fair”). Some respondents were dissatisfied with the duration of the activities (19 percent rated this as “fair,” while 4 percent rated it “poor”).

Respondents reported high satisfaction levels with the courses they attended. Sixty-one percent were satisfied with their seminars, while 36 percent were completely satisfied. Only one respondent (3 percent) was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**Summary**

A retrospective view from the evaluation findings suggests that WPRP has had a significant impact on participants since its inception in 1993. The respondents reported that the seminars have influenced them in a very positive manner, notably by changing their perceptions of and attitudes toward water policy reform. These changes have translated, in turn, into a number of specific reforms and vital modifications within their respective countries.

The respondents suggested that several WPRP content areas need greater emphasis. Two content recommendations were to strengthen national institutions and to increase national capacity for training. However, as noted above, the respondents also said that presentations concerning their own countries were often the least useful aspects of the seminars; conversely, the experiences of other countries were the most useful aspects of the seminars they had attended.

The respondents indicated that the management and organization of the activities were very good. However, they also offered several suggestions for improving the seminars’ pedagogical strategies and delivery methods. According to respondents, there should be more emphasis on case studies among the chosen methods to deliver experiences and knowledge during seminars.

It is evident that WPRP is perceived to have accomplished much in the past four years. This conclusion is best supported by the evaluation’s respondents, who
attest that the program has had an impact on them as well as on their countries. As WPRP continues to develop, the respondents' recommendations should be considered as ways to improve the overall effectiveness of the program and to enhance its sustainability and viability.
Introduction and Background: The Water Policy Reform Program (WPRP)

This report discusses the design, methodology, analysis, and results of a tracer evaluation of the impacts on participants in 16 Water Policy Reform Program (WPRP) activities. This evaluation was begun in summer 1997 in order to provide relevant data to the consultant who was at that time preparing a comprehensive report on WPRP. This present report formalizes the material provided in draft to the consultant.

In May 1993, the World Bank's Board of Executive Directors approved a water resources management policy that became the basis for WPRP. That same year, this program was developed and implemented by a team in EDI's Environment and Natural Resources Division (EDIEN).

WPRP focuses on three main areas.

1. Water Resources Management Strategy (WRM) assists policymakers in preparing their national water strategies by sensitizing them (and other key stakeholders) to the issues, and helping them share experiences from within and outside their countries. Strategy formulation seminars focus on single countries, or on groups of countries sharing common river basins. Main topics include institutions and human resources, stakeholders participation, information systems, the role of economics, environment and health, water allocation, and international issues.

2. Water Supply and Sanitation Sector Reform (WSS) introduces policymakers and other stakeholders to the various reform options available, and helps in their implementation. The focus is on legal, regulatory, institutional, financial, and social issues involved in preparing and implementing reforms that in turn will lead to increased coverage and efficiency in water supply and sanitation.

3. Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) helps countries formulate action plans to adopt and implement participatory irrigation management approaches. The activities stimulate high-level policy dialogue, and help the key stakeholders understand the implications of transferring irrigation management responsibilities from the public sector to private associations of water users.

Since WPRP's implementation in 1993, 41 activities, workshops, and study tours have been conducted worldwide on water reform. This evaluation study examines their impact on participants in the following 16 seminars and workshops conducted since 1993 by EDI (for exact names of these programs, see question #1.5 on the summary report questionnaire provided in this report):

---

The Water Policy Reform Program of the Economic Development Institute:

- Zimbabwe conference, July 1993
- Maghred (Morocco) seminar, March 1994
- Philippines seminar, July 1994
- Tanzania seminar, September 1994
- Ivory Coast seminar October, 1994
- Philippines seminar, June 1995
- Honduras seminar, June 1995
- Spain/France study tour, October 1995
- Jordan seminar, November 1995
- Kenya seminar, January 1996
- Argentina study tour, June 1996
- Senegal WRM seminar, June 1996
- Johannesburg conference, July 1996
- Argentina seminar, December 1996
- Yemen seminar, December 1996
- Cambodia seminar, March 1997

The respondents designated these 16 activities (out of the 30 seminars and workshops listed on the questionnaire) as those they had attended. These activities represent 39 percent of the 41 programs offered from 1993 to 1997 through WPRP. Overall, these 16 seminars are a good representation of the program, since they offer a broad spectrum of the activities completed.

Evaluation Design and Methods

A primary data source for the tracer evaluation was a questionnaire developed by the WPRP team and the external evaluator with the assistance of the Evaluation Unit. Additionally, the Evaluation Unit offered assistance in sending the questionnaire to the 100 participants and in analyzing the completed participant responses as they were returned.

According to the wording on the questionnaire, the survey was “intended for participants in any of the activities organized by Economic Development Institute (EDI) of the World Bank around its Water Management Policy Reform Program. The main goal of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness, the relevance and the impact of this particular program. EDI also seeks your guidance on the Program’s future development.”

A questionnaire was chosen as the preferred method for this tracer evaluation because it was believed that it would be the most efficient and beneficial means of gathering evaluative data on the participants of the water program. Moreover, many participants were scattered throughout the world and were difficult to reach by phone or had little time to complete a phone interview. During the final planning stages of the tracer evaluation, the questionnaire was reviewed by the managers and consultants of EDIEN and by members of the Evaluation Unit to ensure its reliability and validity.
Evaluation Constraints

Both teams faced several evaluation constraints during the evaluation. Since WPRP is aimed at senior policymakers, the evaluator from EDI's Evaluation Unit attempted to compare the results of this tracer evaluation with the historical results of the end-of-seminar data from all EDI senior policy seminars (SPS), in order to compare and assess the results of this tracer evaluation with those of previous SPSs. However, this was not feasible, because the questionnaire designed for the WPRP evaluation was very different from the standard end-of-seminar questionnaire for senior policy seminars (the former focused on the specific objectives of the overall program, rather than on the individual activities themselves). There were no closely related questions on which to base comparative judgments. Therefore, the quantitative evaluative results from this tracer evaluation cannot be compared with those of previous senior policy seminars.

Another evaluation constraint was that the 100 selected participants were scattered throughout the world and had often changed or switched positions in their respective governments. Some had also moved to other countries or had accepted positions in the private sector. This transience made contacting them much more difficult. Because of this situation, some questionnaires may have never reached the intended recipients. Other plausible explanations for the low response rate may be the participants' reluctance or time constraints.

Financial constraints existed as well. Due to the limited evaluation budget, it was impossible to conduct an extensive follow-up with those who were sent the original 100 questionnaires. It is believed that more follow-up might have increased the response rate.

Data Results and Analysis


One hundred questionnaires were sent to participants; 28 participants returned them. The numbers listed in each question indicate the number of responses provided by respondents. Some participants offered more than one response or no response to a question, which accounts for some responses not totaling 28. Total percentages may exceed 100, due to rounding.

Section 1: General Information

1.1) Which of the following describe(s) your organization?

20 Central government
6 Private sector
1 National NGO
1 Research
Twenty (71 percent) of the 28 participants indicated that they work for the central government in their countries. Six (21 percent) work for the private sector. This shows that WPRP is primarily targeted at persons in a position to influence policies in their countries; therefore, the high percentage of central government participants is not surprising. In addition, 71 percent fairly represents the total percentage of central government officials to whom the original 100 questionnaires were sent.

1.2) What is your current role in this organization? (check all)
   9 Water supply and sanitation
   7 President/chief executive officer (CEO)/director general (DG)
   4 Director
   4 Engineer
   2 Policy analyst
   1 Consultant
   8 Other management post

There were 35 responses to this question, because some of the participants have varied titles and responsibilities in their organizations. Nine participants (26 percent) work in the area of water supply and sanitation. Eight (23 percent) have management posts. Seven (20 percent) hold the title of president and CEO. Four participants (11 percent) are directors; another 4 are engineers. The results show that the questionnaire reached a number of water supply and sanitation officials as well as government members, which was its primary intention.

1.3) In what ways do you currently participate in, or can you presently influence, water management policy in your country? (Please specify)
There were 27 responses. Nine persons (33 percent) work on national committees for water reform. Eight respondents’ (30 percent) work includes preparation and implementation of government policies for water management. Three persons (11 percent) provide technical advice and support on water quality management issues (1 is the principal advisor to the Ministry of Electricity and Water). Two persons (7 percent) are consultants in private industry. Two persons’ work involves inventory of water resources and information management. One (4 percent) is in charge of PIM policies, and command area development and ground border policies programs. One person claims no influence on water management policy. One person is an influential economic editor of a newspaper.

Taking into account these responses, 93 percent of the respondents work for or with various government officials in water policy reform. The remaining 7 percent work for private industries. This lends credence to the conclusion that the questionnaire did reach high-ranking and influential officials who work for water policy reforms in their countries, primarily through the government. These were the type of participants whose views were originally intended for the evaluation.

1.4) For how many years have you been involved or interested in water management policy?
There were 9 responses to this question (19 participants did not respond). Three persons (33 percent) have been involved between 1 and 5 years. One person (11
percent) has been involved for 6 to 10 years. One person has been involved for 11 to 15 years. One person has been involved between 16 and 20 years. Two persons (22 percent) have been involved for 21 to 25 years. One person has been involved for more than 30 years.

1.5) a. Please indicate which activities you attended:

1994
2 Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe; June 1993 (Water Resources in Southern Africa)
2 Cebu, Philippines; July 1994 (Water Sector Reform in the Philippines)
2 Tanga, Tanzania; September 1994 (Water Resources Management in Tanzania)
1 Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire; October 1994

1995
1 Manila, Philippines; May–June 1995 (Private Sector Participation on Water Supply and Sanitation)
2 Ma'in, Jordan; November 1995 (Public–Private Partnerships in Water Supply and Sanitation in Jordan)

1996
1 Nanyuki, Kenya; January 1996 (Integrated Water Resources Management in Kenya)
1 Dakar, Senegal, March, 1996
1 Dakar, Senegal, June 1996
2 Johannesburg, South Africa; July 1996 (Conference on Institutional Options in the Water Supply and Sanitation Sector)
1 Sana'a, Republic of Yemen; December 1996 (Seminar on Yemen National Water Strategy)
2 Delft, Netherlands; December 1996 (Second UNDP Symposium on Water Sector Capacity Building)

As demonstrated above, some participants attended more than one activity.

1.6) b. How did you learn about the EDI/World Bank activity?
17 World Bank staff on mission, or task manager
11 Your institution
7 Direct invitation

There were 35 responses to this question. Seventeen participants (49 percent) learned about the activity they attended through a World Bank staff member (this result is not surprising as the WPRP works in partnership with the Bank's Operational staff). Eleven (31 percent) learned about the activity from their institution. Seven (20 percent) learned about the activity by direct invitation.
1.7) What prompted you to attend the EDI/World Bank activity?

- 18 Direct invitation
- 6 Directive from higher manager
- 4 Your own decision
- 2 Other: Assisted in its organization

There were 30 responses to this question. Eighteen participants (60 percent) were prompted to attend the activity by direct invitation. Six (20 percent) were directed to attend by their managers. Four participants (13 percent) said it was their own decision.

1.8) What was your main personal objective in attending the EDI activity? (Check all answers that apply.)

- 18 To learn new methods in water management policy that can be applied in my field of work
- 16 To discuss issues with recognized experts in the area
- 15 Networking: to meet other individuals involved or interested in this industry
- 13 General interest of the topic
- 8 To gain knowledge
- 4 Personal growth
- 1 Other: to share experiences with others

Of the 75 responses, 18 participants (24 percent) said that their main objective in attending was to learn new methods in water management policies that were applicable to their jobs. Sixteen participants (21 percent) said their objective was to discuss issues with recognized experts in the area. Fifteen (20 percent) stated that networking was a personal objective. Thirteen (17 percent) said that they had general interest in the topic. Eight (11 percent) listed gaining knowledge as an objective.

Section 2: Seminar Evaluation

This section of the questionnaire concerns your evaluation of the seminar you attended.

2.1) Based on your expectations toward the activity, please indicate whether you are

- 10 Completely satisfied
- 17 Satisfied
- 1 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Of the 28 participants who responded, the above chart shows that 17 (61 percent) were satisfied with the seminar they had attended, while 10 (36 percent) were completely satisfied. One (3 percent) was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

2.2) What aspect of the EDI activity has proven to be most useful to you? Of the 22 who responded to this question, 12 (55 percent) stated that learning about
the experiences of other countries was most useful (8 said that meeting people from different countries was very helpful). Two persons (9 percent) stated that the relevance of the topics in the seminars and workshops was helpful. Two persons (9 percent) found useful new methods in water management and an institutional framework. Two persons (9 percent) mentioned that the privatization of water supply was useful. One person (5 percent) found the contents of the seminars useful, while another was pleased with all aspects of the EDI activities. One person (5 percent) said that legal frameworks were useful. One person found the materials and documents beneficial. Another person said that the information about natural disasters and occurrences (such as droughts in certain regions) was helpful.

2.3) What aspect of the EDI activity has proven to be least useful to you?
Eight participants responded to this question. Three (38 percent) found all aspects of the activities useful. Two persons (25 percent) indicated that country presentations (that is, presentations concerning their own country) were least useful. One respondent (13 percent) felt that the private sector's and French water undertakings' presentations were least helpful. One person (13 percent) regretted that there was not a presentation of the downside of PSPs. Another person (13 percent) mentioned that mutually beneficial partnerships needed to be established.

2.4) Please rate each of the following aspects of the activity you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Speakers' knowledge of seminar content (overall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Speakers' approach (overall)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Importance given to participants' involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Management and organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Choice of national partner or sponsor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Quality of audio-visual material</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Quality of documents distributed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Speakers' adaptation to participants' competency level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Duration of the activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart shows that the highest ratings were attributed to the importance that was given to participants' involvement in the activity—16 participants of the 27 (59 percent) who responded rated this feature as “very good.” The other feature given 16 high scores was the management and organization of the activity they had attended; 16 of 27 participants (59 percent) rated this feature as “very good.” Lower ratings were attributed to the duration of the activities (19 percent of the participants rated this as “only fair,” while 18 percent gave varying ratings to the speakers’ overall approach to the seminar. The chart also shows that a predominant number of responses are in the “good” and “very good” categories.

2.5) Did the activity give you knowledge that can be used in your current job or in influencing policies?

22 Very much
6 Some

Twenty-two (79 percent) of the 28 participants felt that the activity gave them knowledge that was useful “very much.” Six (27 percent) said that “some” information was useful.

2.6) Did the activity succeed in motivating you to consider new ways of doing things?

19 Very much
9 Some

Nineteen (68 percent) said “very much,” while 6 (32 percent) said “some.”

2.7) As a result of the activity, have you extended your network of people with whom you can communicate about sector issues?

16 Very much
10 Some
1 Less than I expected

2.8) List new contacts with whom you have communicated since the activity.

Of the 25 participants who responded to this question, 9 persons (36 percent) said that they had met with many government representatives, including those from Mexico and the Philippines, while others stated that they had met other government officials and participants (minister of water resources, minister of planning, advisory board members, and so on). Five persons (20 percent) said that they had communicated with many experts from international organizations and private sectors. Four persons (16 percent) said that they had communicated with World Bank staff and keynote speakers, with 1 person mentioning that he had communicated with World Bank staff involved in sector projects in West Africa and collaborative councils in water and sanitation. Three persons (12 percent) said they had communicated with other participants from Morocco, Sub-Saharan Africa, Pakistan, and the Netherlands. One person (4 percent) had communicated with academicians; 1 mentioned meeting many water operators. One person stated that the
activity helped him a great deal in the process of discussing the implementation of Lake Victoria management project. One person (a participant in PIM activities) noted that he had communicated with people from academia, NGOs, the Ford Foundation, and officials from state governments and foreign governments, including Pakistan and Mexico.

2.9) How satisfied are you with the relevance of the discussed topics in improving the water management policy in your country?
   5 Completely satisfied
   18 Satisfied
   3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   1 Dissatisfied

Of the 27 responses to this question, 18 (67 percent) were satisfied with the relevance of the topics discussed. Five participants (19 percent) were completely satisfied. Only 1 person (4 percent) was dissatisfied.

2.10) How satisfied are you with the actions identified during the activity for improving water management policy in your country?
   5 Completely satisfied
   19 Satisfied
   2 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   1 Dissatisfied

Nineteen (70 percent) of the 27 respondents to this question were satisfied that some actions for water management had been identified during the sessions. Five (19 percent) were completely dissatisfied. Two (7 percent) were neither, while 1 (4 percent) was dissatisfied.

2.11) Realistically, within what time frame do you believe a decision could be taken to implement the actions identified during the activity?
   7 Less than one year after the activity
   10 Between one and two years after the activity
   10 Between two and five years after the activity (seminar, conference, or tour)
   1 More than five years after the activity

All 28 participants responded to this question. Ten (36 percent) realistically believed that changes in their countries could be made between 2 and 5 years. Another 10 believed it would take between 1 and 2 years. Seven (25 percent) believed changes would take less than a year. One (4 percent) believed it would take more than 5 years.
2.12) Based on your experience, should the EDI Program be more or less focused on the following approach? Please rate each one of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much less focused</th>
<th>Less focused</th>
<th>Not more, not less focused</th>
<th>More focused</th>
<th>Much more focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Case study discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Discussions with experts</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Tour of facilities/field visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Concrete recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) New technologies, for example, Web sites, Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent responses revealed that 16 (59 percent) of the 27 participants believed that WPRP needs to be "more focused" on concrete recommendations, while 7 (26 percent) said that it needed to be "much more focused." Fifteen participants (56 percent) stated that the program should be "more focused" on seminars, while 5 (19 percent) said they needed to be "much more focused." Fourteen participants (52 percent) noted that the program should be "more focused" on case study discussions, while 8 (29 percent) said it needed to be "much more focused." Twelve participants (44 percent) stated that the program needed to be "less focused" on theory, while 10 (37 percent) were neutral, saying it needed to be "not more, not less focused" on theory.

These results demonstrate that the EDI programs on water policy need to be less focused on theory and more focused on case study discussions, seminars, concrete recommendations, field visits, and new technologies. Clearly, more "hands on" and "in person" experiences and better case study discussions are needed. This also implies that frequent opportunities to interact and establish partnerships with other participants may be helpful.

2.13) Would you be willing to recommend that your organization contribute to the cost of similar EDI activities in the future?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Certainly, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Probably, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Certainly not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 25 responses to this question. Nine participants (36 percent) said that "certainly, yes" they would recommend that their organizations contribute to the cost of similar EDI activities in the future. Only 3 (12 percent) responded "certainly, not" to this question.

Section 3: How the situation has changed

This section of the questionnaire is based on your perception of how the situation has changed in your country since the EDI activity was held.

3.1) Has the level of involvement of the private sector or user groups evolved since the activity took place?

28 Yes

If yes:
11 Highly increased
17 Slightly increased

0 No

All 28 participants (100 percent) agreed that the level of involvement of the private sector or user groups evolved since they attended the activity. Seventeen (61 percent) said involvement had "slightly increased," while 11 (39 percent) said it was "highly increased."

3.2) What reforms in the area of water management policy in your country have been initiated as a result of the EDI activity? (If so, please specify. If not, please go to question number 3.4.)

Of the 27 participants who responded to this question, 11 (41 percent) indicated that privatization of water reforms had begun. Four persons (15 percent) said that new participatory approaches for water resources were created. Three persons (11 percent) said that more timely aspects of ongoing sector reform were implemented. Two persons (7 percent) stated that there was improved coordination between different stakeholders. Two mentioned that there had been an elaboration of guidelines. Two persons (7 percent) commented on the creation of government agencies to manage water resources. One person (4 percent) noted that the awareness of PIM had increased and implementation had started whereas only three years ago it was an abstract idea. One person (4 percent) indicated that accepting the need for reform proved important. One person said that better training and communication were implemented in his country.

These results demonstrate that the Water Policy Reform Program has evidently had an impact on its participants. Clearly, all 27 who responded to this question have seen some form of new policies or reforms implemented in their respective countries. Privatization of water reforms (41 percent) appears to be a popular approach adopted by most participant countries.
3.3) To what extent did the EDI activity in which you participated influence the policy improvements?

- Completely
- In major part
- In minor part
- Don’t know

Fourteen (54 percent) of the 26 participants who responded to this question attested that EDI activities had influenced policy improvements in their countries in a “major part.” Nine (35 percent) said in “minor part.”

3.4) How satisfied are you with the reforms in the area of water management policy that your country has initiated since the activity took place?

- Completely satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied

Of the 27 participants who answered this question, 17 (63 percent) said that they were satisfied with the water management policy reforms occurring in their country since they took the EDI course. Six participants (22 percent) were neutral. Only 3 (11 percent) were completely satisfied.

3.5) What efforts has your country initiated to ensure environmentally sustainable water policies?

There were 28 responses to this question. Thirteen participants (46 percent) stated that their countries had either developed or revised new water laws and tariffs or new policies for public offices in water management such as new environmental laws. Four persons (14 percent) said that their respective nations created high commissions or authorities on water supply and management, while 2 (7 percent) more respondents noted the creation of high commissions or task forces on natural resource management in their countries. Two persons mentioned that their countries formed committees on sustainable development with training activities. One person (4 percent) indicated that EIA is now mandatory in his country. Another respondent listed the following efforts initiated in his country: establishment of a national water resource authority in 1996, preparation of a cabinet paper, and, endorsement of sector reform in urban water supply and sanitation. One individual indicated that an IMP program will be completed in two more years and that river-based councils are being created all over the country. Another person wrote that PIM has put an emphasis on ground water quality maintenance and prevention of overexploitation of ground water. One person wrote that his country has placed more emphasis on implementing regulations on discharging effluence. Another person noticed greater involvement with stakeholders. One person stated that his country had a better awareness of problems. Finally, one person said he did not know what efforts were made in his country.

These results demonstrate that the situation for water policy reforms is changing for the better in many participant countries. This trend is most evident in the development or revision of water laws and tariffs or new policies for water reform.
in many government offices. It is hoped that the WPRP and its participants were influential in achieving these positive trends.

3.6) How satisfied are you with the efforts your country has initiated to implement environmentally sustainable water policies?

2 Completely satisfied
14 Satisfied
4 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
3 Dissatisfied
1 Completely dissatisfied
3 No opinion

Of the 27 participants who responded to this question, 15 (52 percent) said that they were satisfied with the efforts of their countries. Four participants (14 percent) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Only 3 (11 percent) were dissatisfied.

3.7) What efforts have your country initiated to implement socially responsible water policies? (e.g. addressing gender issues and ensuring service to the poor)

There were 23 responses to this question. Four persons (17 percent) noted the creation of programs for water services for the poor. Four persons (17 percent) stated that new water reform policies existed in their countries, with 2 of the 4 mentioning that national programs on rural water supply were created. Four persons (17 percent) were unaware of any efforts. Two persons (9 percent) said that their nations had addressed gender and population issues, such as participatory approaches with women. Two persons (9 percent) noted the occurrence of public investments in water supplies in their countries. Two persons (9 percent) wrote that resolutions were adopted to involve women in water management. Two persons (9 percent) said that few or no efforts had occurred in their countries. One person (4 percent) commented on new partnerships with private corporations for urban water reform. One person (4 percent) said that there was greater stakeholder participation and ownership in his country. One person stated that a resolution was adopted and a national conference on PIM in India was held to involve women in PIM.

A clear trend is evident here. New programs for water reform are being implemented by participants of the EDI seminars and workshops, and many have finally addressed the issue of gender by allowing women to participate in these reforms. The training of women for water policy reforms is being implemented in many more countries than before.

3.8) How satisfied are you with the efforts your country has initiated to implement socially responsible water policies?

2 Completely satisfied
15 Satisfied
5 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 Dissatisfied
1 Completely dissatisfied
3 No opinion
All 28 participants responded to this question. Fifteen (54 percent) were satisfied with the efforts of their country. Five (18 percent) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Four (14 percent) were dissatisfied.

3.9) Overall, do you believe the measures undertaken by your country are sustainable?

1. Yes, very sustainable
23. Yes, somewhat sustainable
2. No, not very sustainable
1. No, not sustainable at all

Of the 27 responses to this question, 23 (85 percent) believe that the measures undertaken by their countries are “somewhat sustainable.” Only 2 (7 percent) said that they were not “very sustainable.”

Section 4: The situation in your country

4.1) How satisfied are you with the present policies on water supply in your country?

2. Completely satisfied
17. Satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
7. Dissatisfied
2. Completely dissatisfied

There were 31 responses to this question, evidencing the participants’ ambivalent attitudes toward their country’s water policies. Seventeen (55 percent) said they were satisfied with their country’s water policies, while only 7 (23 percent) were dissatisfied. Three participants (10 percent) said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

4.2) How satisfied are you with the present policies on irrigation and drainage in your country?

1. Completely satisfied
10. Satisfied
5. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
8. Dissatisfied
1. Completely dissatisfied
4. No opinion

There were 29 responses to this question. Ten participants (34 percent) said they were satisfied with their country’s current policies on irrigation and drainage. Eight participants (28 percent) were dissatisfied with these policies. Five (17 percent) were neutral. Four (14 percent) had no opinion.

4.3) How satisfied are you with the present policies on sanitation in your country?

1. Completely satisfied
10. Satisfied
There were 29 responses to this question. Twelve participants (41 percent) were dissatisfied with their country’s current policies on sanitation. Ten participants (34 percent) said they were satisfied. Three (10 percent) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

4.4) How satisfied are you with the quality of the decisionmaking in the water policy sector in your country?

There were 29 responses to this question. Seventeen participants (59 percent) were satisfied with the quality of their country’s decisionmaking on water policies. Five (17 percent) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Only three (10 percent) were dissatisfied.

4.5) Do you believe the quality of the decisionmaking in the water sector has improved since the activity was held?

There were 27 responses to this question. Seventeen participants (63 percent) stated that the quality of decisionmaking on water sector reform had improved since they attended the activity. Six (22 percent) said that the quality had not improved. Four (15 percent) said that they did not know.

4.6) Has there been resistance to reforms of water policies?

If yes, what have been its sources?
Fear of losing jobs (6, or 35 percent)
Resistance from traditional interest groups and from real estate developers (4, or 24 percent)
Increased tariffs and higher prices (2, or 12 percent)
Parts of private sector losing power and influence (2, or 12 percent)
Lack of confidence from farmers (1, or 6 percent)
Corruption at the municipal level (1, or 6 percent)
4.7) Was the activity of any help in:
   a) anticipating resistance
      16  Yes
      8  No
   Of the 24 responses, 16 participants (67 percent) said “yes.” Eight (33 percent) said “no.”
   b) developing options for countering the resistance?
      14  Yes
      9  No
   One person noted that organization of seminars and workshops at regional and state levels to sensitize stakeholders would be helpful. Another respondent felt that the activity came too late.

4.8) What training programs would you consider necessary to implement effective and sustainable water management reform in your country? Please specify.
   All 28 respondents answered this question. Nine persons (32 percent) recommended training national staff and NGOs on pertinent issues, with one of these 5 additionally advocating programs to familiarize top members of Congress and senators on the various trends in the water sector, particularly with regard to private sector participation. Four persons (14 percent) felt that institutional building and learning lessons from other countries were necessary, with 1 of these 4 noting that traveling to nations where reforms have succeeded would be helpful. Three persons (11 percent) desired better understanding of tariffs and the pricing of water. Three respondents (11 percent) mentioned the need for technical and financial management and communication. Two persons (7 percent) desired more EDI short courses on policies of sustainable management. Two persons (7 percent) noted that better strategic planning and implementation were needed. One person (4 percent) stated an immediate need for training of trainers, training for irrigation extension, and innovation in irrigation management. One person (4 percent) would like to see programs oriented to enhance wells and technical capacity. One person (4 percent) advocated new programs in sanitation and wastewater management. One person (4 percent) lamented the difficulty in bringing together all of the stakeholders. One person did not know what programs were necessary.
   Again, training participants and their country members in many aspects of water reform is an apparent trend. This issue suggests that sustainability has also become a vital function for water reform in many countries. Clearly, training of staff and government officials (32 percent) was deemed as very important by those who responded to the questionnaire. In addition, 14 percent saw the need for institutional building and learning from other countries as important suggesting that member networks are also vital for sustainability and training.
4.9) What other EDI inputs would be needed to implement effective and sustainable water management reform in your country? Please specify. If none, why?

There were 22 responses to this question. Ten persons (45 percent) suggested that EDI conduct additional case studies and hold more workshops. More specifically, these respondents believed that participants should be encouraged to attend additional workshops and that EDI should sponsor seminars with local government officials to educate them on global water sector trends. Four persons (18 percent) recommended that EDI should publish methodological documents and guidelines and disseminate more information on PIM. Three (14 percent) stated that public awareness of these issues was vital. One respondent (5 percent) believed that better coordination between public and private sectors and stakeholders was required. One person (5 percent) mentioned the need for capacity building. Another person (5 percent) suggested that financial alternatives for institutional changes were needed. One person (5 percent) proposed unifying countries that share the same rivers. Finally, one person (5 percent) said it was not applicable in his case.

As stated previously by participants in this questionnaire, many (45 percent) see the need for improvement of case studies and more workshops as a means of helping them to achieve their goals. In particular, the participants suggested that EDI should hold a greater responsibility for policy reforms by sponsoring seminars with local government officials to educate them on global water sector trends. This demonstrates a growing awareness and importance of EDI's role in water reform worldwide.

Section 5: The role of the World Bank EDI

5.1) Do you believe the EDI should have a role in promoting reform in the water sector?
   27 Yes
   1 No

The responses to this question were nearly unanimous: 27 participants (96 percent) said “yes,” while only 1 (4 percent) said “no.”

5.2) Please indicate your top three priorities in terms of subjects that future EDI activities should emphasize in your country's water management sector.
   19 Strengthening of national institutions
   14 Increase national capacity for training of sector specialists
   9 Seminars on specific policy issues
   9 Greater coordination between players in the sector
   9 Overall national policy reform
   7 Raising awareness of policy issues among sector specialists
   7 Raising awareness of general public policy issues
   7 Assessment of national water resources
   3 Issues related to water sharing across national boundaries
There were 84 responses to this question. Nineteen participants (23 percent) said that strengthening of national institutions was a high priority. Fourteen (17 percent) stated an increase in national capacity for training of sector specialists was a high priority. Nine (11 percent) said that seminars on policy issues were vital, while another 9 stated that greater between players in the sector was important. Nine others stated that overall national policy reform was needed for their country’s water management sector.

5.3) What top three topics should be addressed in priority under the EDI Water Policy Reform Program?

15 Urban sanitation
14 Urban water supply
12 Watershed management
10 Rural water supply
 9 River basin management
 9 Irrigation and drainage
 8 Groundwater management
 5 Service to poor
 4 Rural sanitation

Of the 86 responses to this question, 15 participants (17 percent) said that urban sanitation needed to be addressed. Fourteen (16 percent) mentioned that urban water supply was a priority. Twelve (14 percent) said that watershed management was important. Ten (12 percent) emphasized the importance of rural water supply.

5.4) Thinking of helping EDI to focus on its future role, check the three priority impacts at which EDI should be aiming.

19 Increase implementation of sound policies aimed at a better management of the country’s water resources
13 Encourage environmentally sustainable development of water
13 Improve dialogue among sector stakeholders
12 Increase involvement by private sector businesses
10 Increase involvement of water user organizations
 9 Create awareness
 7 Increase investments in infrastructure
 6 Encourage socially responsible water policy
 5 Better application of commercial practices
 1 If other, please specify: Encourage self-help

There were 95 responses to this question. Nineteen participants (20 percent) stated that increased implementation of sound policies aimed at a better management of the country’s water resources was vital for EDI to consider for future courses. Thirteen (14 percent) said that EDI should encourage environmentally sustainable development of water, while another 13 mentioned that improved dialogue among sector stakeholders would be beneficial. Twelve participants (13 percent) stated the need for increased involvement by private sector businesses. Nine participants (9 percent) said that creating awareness was important.
These responses demonstrate that EDI should be focusing its impacts on increasing its implementation of sound policies for better management of water resources (20 percent). Development of environmentally sustainable water and improved dialogue between stakeholders was also deemed as a vital function that EDI should consider (both 14 percent). Additionally, 13 percent of the participants saw the need for privatization of water management for their countries rather than allowing their governments to manage it.

5.5) This questionnaire is a tool being used as part of an external evaluation of the EDI Water Sector Policy Reform Program. If you are interested, we would be pleased to send you a copy of the Executive Summary of the consultant’s report. Would you like to receive it?

28 Yes
0 No

Would you like to be placed on the mailing list to receive our quarterly publication *EDI Forum*, a review of development ideas and experiences?

28 Yes
0 No

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the report focuses on the results of the evaluation and makes several recommendations for program improvement. Further, it is divided according to the results of the five sections of the questionnaire: (1) general information, (2) seminar evaluation, (3) how the situation has changed, (4) the situation in the respondents’ country, and (5) the role of the World Bank and EDI. Overall, several notable results emerged from the data provided by the respondents in answering the questionnaire.

Section 1: General Information

A total of 28 responses were received to the 100 questionnaires mailed. These 28 respondents have a profile highly commensurate with the 100 participants who attended the various water policy reform programs conducted by EDI since 1993. This conclusion is based on the fact that all of the 28 respondents maintain influential roles in the water policy reforms in their respective countries (including the central government, or 71 percent), which was an important goal for the evaluation. Most respondents (60 percent) were prompted to attend the activity by direct invitation, suggesting that EDI played a prominent role in choosing the participants. The most important personal objective of the respondents (24 percent) was to learn new methods in water management policies that could be applied to their fields of work, while 22 percent wanted to discuss issues with recognized experts in
the area. These suggestions attest that the respondents were most interested in learning new methods that were applicable to their own work and also that they were interested in conferring with recognized experts in the field of water policy reform.

Section 2: Seminar Evaluation

Learning about the experiences of other countries was most useful to the respondents (55 percent). Ninety-six percent stated that they had “very much” or “somewhat” expanded the network of people with whom they could communicate about sector issues. Clearly, many respondents consider making contacts and establishing networks as very important.

Overall, respondent satisfaction with the seminars was very good. Sixty-one percent of the respondents were satisfied with the activity they had attended, while 36 percent were completely satisfied. The least useful aspect of the activity they had attended were the country presentations (25 percent). Respondents rated two activity aspects as “very good”: the importance given to participants’ involvement and management and organization of the activity (both 59 percent). Variable ratings were given to the duration of the activities: 19 percent of the respondents rated this as “fair”; however, 44 percent characterized it as “good” and 33 percent as “very good.” These responses suggest that the seminars were well organized, but may also imply that some participants believed that the duration of the seminars was either too long or too short (the questionnaire did not allow the participants to specify which was the case).

Based on their experiences, the respondents cited that EDI programs on water policy need to be less focused on theory and more focused on case study discussions, seminars, concrete recommendations, field visits, and new technologies. Clearly, more hands-on and in-person experiences and better case study discussions seem to be warranted. The most frequent responses revealed that 59 percent of the respondents believed that WPRP should be “more focused” on concrete recommendations, while 26 percent said that it needed to be “much more focused.” Fifty-six percent of the respondents stated that the program needs to be “more focused” on seminars, while 19 percent said it needed to be “much more focused.” Fifty-two percent of the respondents noted that case study discussions would help to make the program “more focused,” while 30 percent said that case study discussions would help the program be “much more focused.” Forty-four percent of the respondents stated that theory needed to be “less focused” on theory, while 37 percent were neutral, saying it needed to be “not more, not less focused” on theory. In sum, the WPRP needs to focus more clearly on seminars, case study discussions, and theories.

Section 3: How The Situation Has Changed

All 28 respondents (100 percent) agreed that the level of involvement of the private sector or user groups had evolved since they attended the activity, 39 percent say-
ing that it had highly increased. These results demonstrate that the Water Policy Reform Program has evidently had an impact on its participants. Twenty-seven of the 28 respondents (96 percent) stated that they had some form of new policies or reforms implemented in their respective countries since they had attended the seminar. Private sector participation in water supply and sanitation (41 percent) appears to be a popular approach adopted by most participant countries. Again, WPRP appears to have had viable impacts on this group.

The situation for water policy reforms appears to be changing for the better in many participant countries. This trend is most evident in the development or revision of water laws and in the creation of tariffs or new policies for water reform in many government offices (46 percent). This positive trend may be the result of the positive influence of the WPRP on its participants, as 54 percent of the respondents stated that EDI had influenced policy improvements in their countries in a "major part."

Section 4: The Situation in Their Country

Fifty-nine percent of the participants stated that they were satisfied with the quality of their country’s decisionmaking process on water policies, while only 10 percent were dissatisfied. This suggests that there may be evidence for only small improvements in many countries, or it may attest that the participants perhaps feared admitting that their country’s policies were poor. It may also suggest that participants fear retribution from their governments for rating their water policy reforms so low. Only 17 percent of the participants said that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their country’s water policies. This issue apparently needs some further clarification from the participants. Sixty-three percent of the participants, however, stated that there had actually been resistance to reforms of water policies and that fear of losing jobs (35 percent) and resistance from traditional interest groups and from real estate developers (24 percent) were the primary sources of resistance.

It was also revealed by training participants and their countries’ member partners in many aspects of water policies that reform is an apparent trend. This suggests that sustainability has also become a vital function for water reform in many countries. Evidently, training of staff and government officials (32 percent) was deemed very important by those who responded to the questionnaire. In addition, 14 percent saw the need for institution building and learning from other countries as important. This implies that member networks are also vital for sustainability and training.

Many respondents also offered suggestions to improve EDI’s water programs. Forty-five percent of those answering this questionnaire see improvement of case studies and more workshops as two means to help them achieve their goals. In particular, the respondents suggested that EDI focus its future seminars on the needs of local government officials in order to educate them on global water sector trends.
Section 5: The Role of the World Bank and EDI

Nearly all (96 percent) of the respondents who answered the questionnaire believe that EDI should play a role in promoting reform in the water sector. This attests to how many around the world view EDI programs as being relevant and important. There were, nevertheless, suggestions for improving EDI’s programs on water reform. The respondents suggested that EDI should focus its impacts on increasing implementation of sound policies for better management of water resources (23 percent mentioned this). This implies that the respondents want EDI to be more proactive in its work and perhaps to offer more suggestions on implementation methods, rather than simply offering policy advice. Development of environmentally sustainable water and improved dialogue between stakeholders were also deemed as vital functions that EDI should consider (both 14 percent), again suggesting that sustainable partnerships are very important for respondents. An additional 13 percent again saw the need to privatize water management for their countries, rather than allowing their governments to manage it.

In sum, the Water Policy Reform Program has been successful in meeting its overall objectives and has had tangible impacts on its participants and their countries since its inception. According to the data supplied by the 28 respondents in this tracer evaluation, a small but consistent number of responses suggests that the current structure of the WPRP is viable, but that it can be improved. The suggestions and efforts elicited by the respondents in this study offer several feasible means by which to enhance the program. Moreover, the suggestions offered by the respondents in this evaluation attest that EDI can play an influential role in assisting member countries with water reforms.