

**Support to Community-Led Accelerated WASH in Ethiopia  
(COWASH)**

**Phase III Mid-Term Evaluation**

FINAL REPORT JULY 2018

Jeremy Colin, Yemarshet Yemane and David Toomey (Consultants)

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

The Government of Finland (GOF) has a long history of support to the water sector in Ethiopia, and COWASH is the successor to two earlier programmes: the Rural Water Supply and Environment Programme (RWSEP) in Amhara Region and FinnWASH in Benishangul-Gumuz Region. COWASH Phases I and II ran from 2011 to 2016. COWASH III began in July 2016 and is scheduled to end in July 2019, though GOF is considering a twelve-month cost extension for the federal TA component. The programme operates in 76 woredas (districts) of five regions: Amhara, Tigray, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples (SNNP), Oromia and Benishangul-Gumuz. In brief, it aims to achieve the following results:

- 625,370 water supply beneficiaries, through the construction of 4,669 new community water supply schemes or water points;
- 1 million people improving their access to, and use of, household sanitation via the efforts of the health sector; and
- 140,000 beneficiaries of new or improved institutional WASH facilities in schools and health centres (285 institutions).
- 26 WASH focused enterprises established as a pilot

The COWASH Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) located inside the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MOWIE) facilitates programme implementation and capacity building overall, while Regional Support Units (RSUs), whose staff are employed by the Regional Water Bureaus, facilitate planning and implementation at regional level and below. Woreda WASH Teams (WWTs) are responsible for COWASH implementation at community level.

GOF funding is used only for TA while the Government of Ethiopia (GOE) funds all hardware investments and scheme rehabilitation. Investment funds are transferred via a micro-finance institution (MFI) to beneficiary community or school/health facility committee as appropriate.

The Community Managed Project (CMP) Approach at the heart of COWASH makes communities fully responsible for the development, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, with some backup support or guidance from WWTs if needed. A modified version of the approach is applied when developing WASH facilities for institutions.

### Objectives and Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation

Terms of Reference for the review posed 34 evaluation questions in seven thematic areas: relevance; efficiency and VFM; effectiveness; impact; sustainability; programme design, management and implementation; and cross-cutting Issues: HRBA, gender, equity and inclusion. In addition, the consultants were to make recommendations for the remaining period of implementation, including whether and how TA should be extended for an additional year.

### Methodology

The methodology for the review comprised a review of relevant documentation; discussions, interviews and informal exchanges with programme stakeholders from federal to community level; direct observation at selected project sites, both community and institutional; and analysis of monitoring data, budgets, expenditure and unit cost data. The evaluation mission ran from May 7 to 18, 2018 and was conducted by a team of three comprising an international WASH specialist, a national WASH specialist and an international VFM specialist.

## **Key findings**

### *Relevance*

COWASH III is a component of the One WASH National Programme which was designed in support of the National Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) Strategy. COWASH has achieved a very high level of counterpart funding from government. The COWASH Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) participates actively in policy level debate and informally advises MOWIE on a wide range of issues beyond COWASH.

While the relevance of COWASH III to MOWIE is confirmed, a critical challenge is that government has proved unwilling to adopt the CMP Approach for scaling up beyond the current programme. Ownership by the ministries of health and education is also weak.

During Phase III, the introduction of GTP II standards raised the minimum level of service for rural water supply and signalled a shift towards greater provision of piped schemes with house connections. Some respondents cited this as evidence that the relevance of the CMP Approach is diminishing, since it is mostly used for the development of small, low-cost schemes without extensive distribution networks.

The relevance of COWASH III to beneficiary communities is confirmed by the level of demand for community water supply schemes in targeted woredas and the community contributions made towards investment costs.

### *Efficiency and value for money*

The FTAT encompasses a range of specialist functions including, for Phase III, dedicated posts to address inclusion for people with disability (PWD); the development of women-led WASH enterprises; and the scaling up of climate-resilient Water Safety Plans. Current funding would enable the FTAT to employ only one national long-term specialist beyond February 2019. This means that the new initiatives will have to end before tested, scalable approaches have been developed unless additional funding is identified.

The RSUs have most of the expected staff though not all Regional Water Bureaus have followed RSU staffing guidelines in full. There has also been some recent staff turnover. Comparing the capacity of the five RSUs is not straightforward since they were established at different times, local circumstances differ and they oversee different levels of activity.

On cost efficiency, the review was able to validate most COWASH cost data as accurately reported, reasonable compared to other agencies providing similar services and within the range of international benchmark costs. It also found that COWASH is advanced in its internal financial and results data analysis; the management structure has the capacity to manage and analyse cost data at a detailed level.

### *Effectiveness*

Overall progress is on track for new community water supply schemes, with substantial over-achievement in Amhara Region. COWASH also sets functionality targets and here the picture is very positive. The national level of non-functionality for rural water supply schemes was reported as just 10.9% in 2009 Ethiopian Fiscal Year (EFY) and programme data indicates that in COWASH woredas the level was lower still, at 9.3%.

The institutional WASH component of the programme is constrained by limited investments by the bureaus of health and education, reflecting the low priority afforded to this component in comparison to community water supply. COWASH is currently making one-off improvements in just a few institutions per woreda per year.

At the start of Phase III, 54% of programme kebeles were already verified as open defecation-free (ODF) and household latrine access stood at 44%. During the first year, the percentage of ODF kebeles rose to just under 57% while access reached 46% against a target of 48%.

### *Impact*

COWASH III is making a significant contribution to GTP water supply targets at local level, but it is difficult to establish how far the programme has contributed to progress in household sanitation. COWASH does not facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion interventions directly, but supports annual orientation and training for government staff and communities. There is also a requirement that, when a community makes an application for a new water point, at least half of the households should have a latrine already, with a commitment to reach 100% by the time the scheme is completed. This condition is not always enforced, however.

The CMP Approach is designed to ensure that none of the intended users of water supply schemes will be denied access if they cannot contribute towards investment or operation and maintenance costs. There are also measures to ensure that, where a scheme is developed on land controlled by a private individual, all of the intended users will have permanent, free access to the water point.

New initiatives related to equity and inclusion have been introduced for Phase III. Firstly, a stream of work is underway to ensure that new facilities address the needs of PWD. At the time of the review, the cascading of training down to the kebele WASH teams was in process and the FTAT expected to see concrete results once this had been completed. Secondly, the programme is piloting the establishment of WASH enterprises led by unemployed women. The review identifies a risk that these 'enterprises' might become grant-funded production centres rather than real businesses. We note that similar initiatives in Ethiopia under other programmes have struggled to make progress.

### *Sustainability*

Programme data shows that water point functionality in the programme regions is very good and slightly better in COWASH-supported kebeles. This said, FTAT personnel do not regard the functionality data as 100% reliable. However, sector stakeholders independent of COWASH confirm that the sustainability of schemes developed under the programme has generally been good.

The programme is rolling out a process known as social, environmental and climate risks screening and management whereby the WWTs assesses the environmental risks associated with a proposed water supply scheme and adopt a sub-catchment action plan to address them. The process is well established, but FTAT has expressed concern that the screening is not mandatory and there are no specialists in this area at regional or woreda level. There is insufficient evidence to assess the extent to which the 378 plans adopted so far have contributed to environmental sustainability.

The programme has also introduced Climate-Resilient Water Safety Planning (CR-WSP). This applies to existing water points and focuses more on water quality. This was a government initiative, but the WSP teams established by government at regional and woreda level are not yet active.

A comprehensive portfolio of orientation and training for programme actors from regional to community level has been developed over the course of COWASH Phases I to III. Orientation often has to be repeated due to the rapid turnover of staff and government officials in some locations.

The CMP Approach is predicated on community groups (WASHCOs) becoming motivated and capable to develop and manage their new water supply schemes. A standard WASHCO training package is therefore integral to the CMP Approach. Paradoxically, some government stakeholders cite this as a reason why the approach has not been adopted for wider use beyond COWASH, as government does not have the resources to provide the 'software' component. FTAT argue, however, that the software part is not very

onerous and in fact schemes COWASH schemes are often completed much faster than ones developed using other modalities under the OWNPN.

#### *Monitoring, evaluation and reporting*

The bulk of programme results data is based on self-reporting by the implementing teams. This is not unusual, but there is a lack of independent validation of programme claims concerning the effectiveness and sustainability of the CMP Approach. As COWASH nears its end it is important that robust evidence on the value of the CMP Approach is generated and that key lessons are captured and shared for their benefit of the sector.

#### *Human rights-based approach (HRBA), cross-cutting objectives*

COWASH III lays strong emphasis on equity and inclusion though (as noted above) some initiatives are quite new and good practices still being established. As evidence of attention to the needs of the poor, there is an explicit preference for working with small local contractors rather than larger commercial operators, and on establishing enterprises led by unemployed women.

#### *Programme design, management and implementation*

An independent baseline survey was commissioned for Phase III and a detailed report produced. It appears that the baseline was professionally designed and executed.

Following a Performance Audit in 2017, the FTAT appointed a senior financial consultant to help RSUs implement mitigation plans. The action required was not generally serious and related mostly to issues of capability in financial management. Most issues are now resolved.

Given the COWASH track record in applying the CMP Approach successfully via the government framework, it is something of a conundrum that GOE has not adopted the approach for wider use. MOFEC's stated reason is that government rules do not allow the transfer of public funds to communities via MFIs (or any other route). On the development partners' side, there is a view that the relevance of the CMP Approach is reducing since GTP II standards envisage increasing provision of house connections.

Some respondents outside of COWASH's suggested that the programme's most important legacy will not be the investment model per se but the lessons generated on sustainability. More could be done to document and disseminate these lessons.

## Recommendations

### For the remainder of Phase III (to July 2019)

Recommendation	Complete by	Lead
<b>Operations</b>		
1. With COWASH nearing its end, the FTAT should increasingly focus on how lessons from programme experience can be harnessed for the benefit of the sector generally.	[Continuous]	FTAT
2. Continue the work on disability and inclusion in rural WASH, to create a model for others to follow in future.	Continue into extension phase	FTAT
3. Complete the piloting of CR-WSPs, again to create a model of good practice that can be adopted at scale, complementary to (and aligned with) the established SECRSM process and associated action plans.	July 2019	FTAT
4. Continue the piloting of women-led sanitation marketing and water scheme maintenance enterprises as for items 2 and 3 above. Since it is likely to take time to establish both the supply and demand side of operations, continuation of the enterprises already initiated <sup>1</sup> into the extension phase is likely to be justified, however a final decision for each one should be taken at the end of the final implementation year based on performance to date and the prospects for establishing a viable enterprise supportive of programme objectives.	Continue into extension phase (subject to review by July 2019)	FTAT
<b>Planning, Administration and finance</b>		
5. In order to facilitate 2 and 3 above and, ensure that adequate resources are available for the FTAT to fulfil the tasks outlined above, and effectively support ongoing regional projects, up to the end of Phase III. ( <i>Note 1</i> )	Dec 2018	MFA
6. To help maximise output in the remaining time available, consider simplifying the core planning process so that regions can submit their annual plans for approval by GOF without first undertaking woreda consultation workshops. ( <i>Note 2</i> ).	Immediate action	MFA
7. Support regions in operationalising the approved O&M Strategic Framework and manual, in support of sustainability.	Ongoing; continue up to July 2019	FTAT

### 12-month extension (July 2019- July 2020)

Recommendation	Complete by	Lead
<b>Operations</b>		
8. Go ahead with the proposed €700,000 cost extension <sup>2</sup> for the FTAT, and a no-cost extension for the regions, since there are likely to be substantial unspent funds by July 2019. At regional level, activity should be limited to completing ongoing projects rather than starting new ones. A smaller FTAT would be sufficient to support the extension, though consultants would also be needed for the endline survey and knowledge management tasks.	July 2020	FTAT
9. Complete the work on disability and inclusion; review and document lessons learned and disseminate good practices for wider adoption in the sector.	July 2020	FTAT

<sup>1</sup> 26 were planned but it appears that the number going ahead is smaller; precise details unclear

<sup>2</sup> We understand that this is the approximate cost of operating the FTAT with current staffing levels for one year

10. Complete the WASH enterprises initiative; review and document lessons learned and disseminate them to enhance sector knowledge in this area.	July 2020	FTAT
11. Document and disseminate lessons learned from the application of SECRSM and CR-WSPs, again for wider adoption in the sector.	July 2020	FTAT
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>		
12. Complete a programme endline survey mirroring the baseline, so as to enable the assessment of final results. Ideally this should be conducted independently, however an acceptable compromise could be to have the survey independently supervised but with programme staff serving as enumerators, provided they do not survey their own implementation areas (for example, by deploying them in woredas where they have not previously worked).	Oct 2020	FTAT
<b>Knowledge management, advocacy and communications</b>		
13. Advocate for the CMP Approach to remain a component of the OWNPN, but also for the wider adoption of good practices from COWASH within ONEWASH generally – particularly in the areas of community management and sustainability. This could include workshops at national and regional level for sector stakeholders within and beyond COWASH.	July 2020	FTAT, MFA
14. In support of 10 above: Commission a series of ‘knowledge products’ documenting lessons from programme experience with relevance to the sector beyond COWASH. In addition to those outlined above, potential subjects could include, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with MFIs in WASH programmes</li> <li>• Establishing sustainable community management</li> <li>• Independent sustainability checks (<i>Note 3</i>)</li> <li>• Development of rural piped schemes using the CMP Approach</li> </ul> <p>We recommend that independent authors with relevant expertise are brought in to develop these products, working closely with programme staff. (<i>Note 1</i>)</p>	July 2020	FTAT
15. Ensure that the many reports and other data produced by COWASH remain available as a resource for the sector, either by arranging for another agency (e.g. the OWNPN Secretariat) to take over the programme website <a href="#">and /or database</a> , or by incorporating these resources into another sector website. (We note here that WaterAid is currently developing a website for MOWIE).	July 2020	FTAT

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and background</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview of the COWASH Programme .....	1
1.2	Sector context .....	4
1.3	Objectives and scope of the review .....	5
1.4	Methodology and approach .....	5
1.5	Limitations of the review .....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Key findings</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1	Relevance .....	7
2.2	Efficiency and value for money .....	8
2.3	Effectiveness .....	14
2.4	Impact .....	16
2.5	Sustainability .....	19
2.6	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting .....	22
2.7	Human rights-based approach, cross-cutting objectives .....	22
2.8	Programme design, management and implementation .....	23
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b> .....	<b>25</b>
3.1	Overall performance .....	25
3.2	Recommendations .....	26
	Annex 1. Detailed cost analysis .....	29
	Annex 2. Summary of Responses to MTE questions .....	38
	Annex 3. Mission Itinerary .....	43
	Annex 4. List of Persons Met .....	46
	Annex 5. Select Bibliography .....	49
	Annex 6. Terms of Reference .....	50

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

BOFED	Bureau of Finance and Economic Development
CDD	Centre for Disability and Development
CLTSH	Community-led Total Sanitation and Hygiene
CMP	Community Managed Project
CR-WSP	Climate-Resilient – Water Safety Plan
COWASH	Community-led Accelerated WASH
CWA	Consolidated WASH Account
EFY	Ethiopian Fiscal Year
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FTAT	Federal Technical Assistance Team
GOE	Government of Ethiopia
GOF	Government of Finland
JPO	Junior Professional Officer
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Government of Finland
MFI	Microfinance Institution
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOFEC	Ministry of Finance and Economic Co-operation
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOWIE	Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity
ODF	Open Defecation-free
PWD	People with Disability
RPS	Rural Piped Scheme
SECRSM	Social, Environmental and Climate Risk Screening and Management
SME	Small and Micro-Enterprises
SNNP	Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples
SPD	Spring Development
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WIF	WASH Implementation Framework
WoFED	Woreda Office of Finance and Economic Development
WWT	Woreda WASH Team

# 1 Introduction and background

## 1.1 Overview of the COWASH Programme

The Government of Finland (GOF) has a long history of support to the water sector in Ethiopia beginning in the 1990s. COWASH is the successor to two earlier GOF-funded programmes: the Rural Water Supply and Environment Programme (RWSEP) in Amhara Region, which ran from 1994 to 2011 and FinnWASH in Benishangul-Gumuz Region, which ran from 2008 to 2015.

COWASH Phase I ran from July 2011 to September 2014, and Phase II from October 2014 to June 2016. COWASH III began in July 2016 and is scheduled to end in July 2019, though GOF is considering a possible twelve-month cost extension for the federal TA component, while the regional projects could potentially have a no cost extension for the same period. If the RSUs do not continue into this extension period, then FTAT will need a direct line of communication with focal persons from the respective Bureaus and Offices.

COWASH Phase III operates in 76 districts (woredas) of five regions: Amhara, Tigray, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples (SNNP), Oromia and Benishangul-Gumuz. This represents roughly 10% of the total rural woredas in the country. Most of these woredas were also supported in earlier Phases, though not every kebele – COWASH aims to cover entire woredas over the course of the programme, but does not work in every kebele continuously.

COWASH Phase III is very much a continuation of Phases I and II, but includes a number of new sub-components including the establishment of women-led enterprises focussing on sanitation marketing and (in some cases) the operation and maintenance of water supply schemes; measures to address the WASH needs of people with disabilities; and two related initiatives in social, environmental and climate risk screening and management (SECRSM) and the introduction of climate-resilient water safety plans (CR-WSPs). The project document sets out four main expected outcomes, each of which is to be delivered via an associated set of outputs. These were revised early in the programme and currently read as follows:

*Outcome 1: Increased Climate-Resilient Community and Institutional Water Supply Access Coverage (GTP II standards, including water quality) in the target Woredas in 5 Project Regions by 2019*

Associated Outputs:

- 1.1: Human capacity to implement community and institutional water supply enhanced
- 1.2: New safe and climate-resilient community water supply schemes constructed as per GTP II service level
- 1.3: New safe and climate-resilient school water supply schemes constructed
- 1.4: New safe and climate-resilient health facility water supply schemes constructed
- 1.5: New water supply schemes screened for technical, social, environmental and climate risks (TSECR)
- 1.6: Water quality of woreda rural water Supply schemes measured

*Outcome 2: Increased community, institutional sanitation and hygiene access coverage (GTP II) in the target woredas in 5 project regions by 2019*

Associated Outputs:

- 2.1: Human capacity to implement sanitation and hygiene enhanced
- 2.2: Access to improved household and institutional latrines Increased

*Outcome 3: Increased functionality and sustainability (O&M) of built WASH facilities through improved service delivery in the target woredas in 5 program regions by 2019*

- 3.1: Water supply schemes rehabilitated
- 3.2: Stakeholders' human capacity enhanced for technical O&M of water supply schemes
- 3.3: O&M supply chain and maintenance service for water facilities developed

*Outcome 4: Women's empowerment and leadership achieved through WASH-related activities in the 5 project regions by 2019*

Associated Outputs:

- 4.1: Women-led service providers in the water supply maintenance, spare part supply, sanitation marketing and construction in selected woredas established
- 4.2: Women's leadership as WASHCO members in COWASH Phase III woredas enhanced
- 4.3: Stakeholders' capacity to mainstream gender and disability-in WASH planning and implementation enhanced

*Outcome 5: Project implementation effectively managed*

Associated Outputs:

- 5.1: Capacity of COWASH Phase III stakeholders to implement COWASH Phase III enhanced by the FTAT
- 5.2: COWASH Project lessons and best practices documented and communicated
- 5.3: M&E and supportive supervision missions conducted
- 5.4: Project Annual Plans prepared and implemented
- 5.5: Funds transferred
- 5.6: Management meetings facilitated

Programme targets and indicators, plus revised outcomes and outputs, are set out in a Results Framework and Performance Monitoring Plan. This is very detailed and disaggregates targets by region and year. Where possible and relevant, project monitoring and reports distinguish between results that are attributable to COWASH specifically, and changes which have occurred across woredas as a whole. In brief, following an update to the Results Framework, the programme aims to achieve the following:

- 625,370 water supply beneficiaries, through the construction of 4,669 new community water supply schemes or water points;
- 1 million people improving their access to, and use of, household sanitation via the efforts of the health sector; and
- 140,000 beneficiaries of new or improved institutional WASH facilities in schools and health centres (285 institutions).
- 26 WASH focused enterprises established as a pilot

The programme is steered at federal and in each supported region by a multi-stakeholder WASH Steering Committee chaired by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MOFEC) and its regional equivalent the Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BOFED).

The COWASH Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) located inside the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MOWIE) facilitates programme implementation and capacity building overall, while Regional Support Units (RSUs), whose staff are employed by the Regional Water Bureaus, facilitate planning and implementation at regional level and below, a role which includes supportive supervision and capacity building at zonal and woreda level. Woreda WASH Teams (WWTs) are responsible for COWASH implementation at community level. The FTAT has a close working relationship with senior figures in the ministry and provides technical support and guidance which extends beyond the boundaries of the COWASH programme.

The ministries of water and health, while not playing a lead role in COWASH, each have a staff member designated as focal point for WASH and are represented on the federal Steering Committees, while their respective bureaus do the same at regional level.

### **Programme funding**

Notable features of the programme funding model are that:

- a) GOF funding is used only for technical assistance (including capacity development) while the Government of Ethiopia (GOE) funds all hardware investments and the rehabilitation of existing WASH infrastructure. (Benishangul-Gumuz Region is a partial exception to this arrangement, as GOF supports some infrastructure costs).
- b) At federal level, the competent authority for COWASH is MOFEC but GOF has entered into a dedicated financing agreement with each of the five supported regional governments via BOFED, which is the competent authority at that level. In each region, capacity building funds from GOF are transferred directly to BOFED, which in turn passes them on to the relevant implementing authorities<sup>3</sup> plus finance offices at zonal and woreda levels.
- c) GOE investment funds are transferred via a micro-finance institution (MFI) to the beneficiary community or school / health management committee in the case of institutional facilities.

The share of programme costs (following the devaluation of the Birr in Autumn 2017 and some carry over of unspent funds from Phase II) is as follows: GOE €23.3 million (for hardware investments and rehabilitation and some operational costs); GOF €14.1 million (for technical assistance and capacity building) plus €4 million capital cost contribution by beneficiary communities<sup>4</sup>. This gives a total programme budget of €41.4 million of which GOE provides roughly 56% of programme costs, GOF 34% and beneficiaries 8%.

## **Operational strategy**

### *Community water supply*

The Community Managed Project (CMP) Approach at the heart of COWASH was originally developed, and then expanded, under RWSEP (in Amhara Region) and FinnWASH (in Benishangul-Gumuz Region). The approach had, therefore, been tested and refined over an extended period prior to Phase III. Under the CMP Approach, communities are fully responsible for the water supply development process; this includes planning, financial management, procurement and construction management. Thereafter they are responsible for the operation and maintenance of their scheme, though the WWT is, in principle, available to provide backup technical support and guidance if needed.

COWASH supports the installation of mostly simple, low-cost technologies for rural water supply including protected springs, hand dug wells with handpumps and shallow wells (less than 50m), also with handpumps. The programme is not restricted to these options, however, and has also developed a number of rural piped schemes in the past with another 41 planned in the current year out of approximately 1500 water points/schemes in total. Programme strategy for Phase III is that, provided the application of the CMP Approach is viable, technology choice is only limited by the funds available, hence the number of rural piped schemes is necessarily small compared to other point sources which typically have lower unit costs.

COWASH operates in locations where the adoption of simple low-cost technologies is viable, which generally means places with plentiful shallow ground water or springs. The programme does not operate in semi-arid locations where community water supplies can only be provided through deep drilling and/or the development of extensive piped networks. Some respondents for this review argued that this limitation has equity implications, as the CMP Approach cannot be applied in the most water-scarce parts of the country. Programme staff challenge this view however, on the basis that the CMP Approach has not been tested in semi-arid areas, and COWASH has developed a manual for its application to high cost technology options.

---

<sup>3</sup> Regional bureaus of water, education and health and women and children affairs; the Micro and Small Enterprises Development Agency; Technical, Vocational and Enterprises Development Agency; Urban Food Security and Job Creation Development Agency; plus Labour and Social Affairs.

<sup>4</sup> Taken from the FTAT Performance Report 07.07.17 to 31.03.18. Slightly different figures appear in other reports and presentations.

### *Household sanitation*

COWASH funds training and orientation on Community-led Total Sanitation and Hygiene (CLTSH) for woreda and kebele staff and targeted communities, on an annual basis. However, it does not directly facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion interventions, which are implemented by the woreda health bureaus using their own funds.

### *Institutional WASH facilities*

A modified version of the CMP Approach is applied when developing water supply and sanitation facilities for schools and health facilities / institutions. In this case, facility design is based on designs and service norms adopted by the health and education ministries. As with community facilities, a significant community contribution is expected towards capital costs, however operation and maintenance responsibility in this case lies with the institution rather than a village water, sanitation and hygiene committee (WASHCO).

New initiatives in sanitation marketing and water scheme maintenance; SECRSM; CR-WSP; and inclusive WASH for people with disabilities are reviewed in section 2.4 below.

## **1.2 Sector context**

Beyond COWASH, the WASH sector in Ethiopia is moving toward a sector-wide approach via the One WASH National Programme (OWNP), which is the main framework for achieving sector goals and those of Ethiopia's poverty reduction strategy, the Growth and Transformation Plan 7/2015 – 6/2020 (GTP II). One WASH has four main components covering urban, rural and institutional WASH plus capacity building. The CMP Approach is one of four modalities for rural water supply defined in the OWP and the WASH Implementation Framework (WIF) adopted March 2013, the others being NGO-managed projects, woreda-managed projects and self-supply.

For woreda-managed projects, a basket funding mechanism known as the Consolidated WASH Account (CWA) has been established with funds from GOE and a number of donors and bilateral agencies, the main external support agencies being the World Bank, African Development Bank and DFID. In addition, UNICEF and GOF have (so far) made relatively modest contributions (€2million in the case of GOF). CWA funding is substantial: currently over \$400 million for the period of 2015-2020, ten times the funding allocated to CMP via COWASH, the only programme implementing this investment modality.

While the sector is moving towards greater alignment of planning, funding, implementation and monitoring mechanisms, the 'ones' of One WASH are currently more of an aspiration than reality, and at regional and woreda level, WASH activity remains heavily 'projectised' with a range of interventions operating in parallel, each having its own planning and monitoring systems and technical support arrangements. It is evident at regional level that many government personnel view the CWA as being the entirety of One WASH rather than just a component.

An important change at policy level that was not anticipated in the design of COWASH Phase II was the introduction of GTP II targets, which have raised the minimum level of service for rural water supply, amongst other things. The minimum acceptable provision has been raised from 15 to 25 lpcd and household access is now defined as having a water point within 1km of the home, whereas before it was 1.5 km. The new minimum service levels represent a major challenge for the sector, given especially the low population density and dispersed arrangement of many rural communities; this also complicates sector monitoring since much of the available access data (not least the national water point inventory from 2011) are based on the former criteria.

Looking beyond WASH, both Oromia and Amhara regions were heavily affected by political instability in the last two years and on occasion this restricted access to some woredas in these locations. The introduction (and later extension) of a State of Emergency was a further complicating factor in that it

resulted in most cabinet members at federal, regional, zonal and woreda levels being changed; COWASH then had to provide orientation and training on COWASH for the new incumbents. At the time of the review mission, a new SOE was in place but the situation was calm and programme operations were not severely affected. In Amhara, for example, access was restricted to only one of the 40 programme woredas<sup>5</sup>.

### **1.3 Objectives and scope of the review**

Terms of Reference for the review (see Annex 6) mentioned relatively few specific issues or challenges facing the programme but were nevertheless comprehensive and required an investigation of all aspects of COWASH. Some 34 evaluation questions were posed (with partial overlap between some of them), organised into seven thematic areas drawing on the OECD-DAC criteria. These were:

- Relevance
- Efficiency and VFM
- Effectiveness
- Impact
- Sustainability
- Programme Design, Management and Implementation
- Cross-cutting Issues: HRBA, gender, equity and inclusion

In addition, the consultants were expected to make recommendations for the remaining period of implementation, including whether and how the TA should be extended for a further twelve months from July 2019.

### **1.4 Methodology and approach**

The methodology for the review was in line with the consultants' proposal and was fairly straightforward. It comprised the following:

- a) A review of relevant documentation both from the programme and the sector overall. This included consideration of the extent to which the programme is aligned with, and supportive of, the policy and institutional framework within which it operates – not least the OWNPN.
- b) Focus Groups Discussions, Key Informant Interviews and informal exchanges with programme stakeholders at each tier from federal through to regional, woreda and community level. Time permitting, sector specialists not directly involved in the programme would also be consulted to gain some independent perspective on COWASH's contribution to meeting sector goals.
- c) Direct observation at selected water supply and sanitation project sites, both community and institutional – particularly schemes that were completed and operational. The small number of field visits would not be statistically representative of the programme as a whole in those woredas, but would deepen the team's understanding of COWASH operational approaches and the challenges involved in establishing effective community management.
- d) Analysis of monitoring data, budgets, expenditure and unit cost data for the programme as a whole and by region. In the case of unit costings, comparisons with other programmes within and beyond Ethiopia would also be made.

The MTE mission lasted two weeks from May 7 to 18, 2018 and was conducted by a team of three comprising an International WASH Specialist, a national WASH Specialist and an International VFM Specialist (the latter was in-country for week one only, then completed the unit costing analysis remotely).

The itinerary for the mission is provided in Annex 5. In addition to national level meetings and interviews, the consultants visited three regions: Amhara, Oromia and Benishangul-Gumuz. The choice of regions was largely influenced by logistical considerations given the limited time available and the ongoing State of

---

<sup>5</sup> Update: subsequent to the review mission, the SOE was removed on June 7, 2018.

Emergency; Benishangul-Gumuz was also flagged by FTAT as a challenging region in that limited government funding was affecting implementation.

Each regional visit included meetings with the RSU and regional government partners plus a visit to one woreda where the consultants met with members of the WWT and visited a number of ongoing and completed project sites. The mission ended with a de-briefing meeting in the capital with the FTAT, federal government partners and bureau heads (water and finance) from Benishangul-Gumuz and Oromia regions. At the meeting, the consultants presented and discussed their preliminary findings and recommendations with the stakeholders present. Feedback from that meeting has informed the drafting of this report.

## **1.5 Limitations of the review**

The consultants appreciate the wealth of information and logistical support received from FTAT and other programme stakeholders at national, regional and woreda level. Amongst other things, this included a raft of presentations on programme achievements and challenges. The programme has extensive and well-organised data and documentation on planning and implementation processes, activities undertaken and achievements against the programme results framework, most of it easily accessible via the programme website. This said, there was relatively little analytical or reflective documentation on lessons learned from the programme or the significance of the CMP Approach (or COWASH generally) to the sector.

In terms of government respondents, the consultants were unable to meet any senior officials from the ministries of health, education or finance and economic co-operation. This was a significant gap, especially in terms of understanding why the programme has not been able to fulfil its potential in relation to institutional WASH facilities, or why the CMP Approach has not been formally endorsed by government for scaling up beyond COWASH. On the latter point, the consultants did at least receive a short, written response from MOFEC which was useful to some extent.

During the mission the FTAT monitoring and evaluation officer was out of office and there was insufficient time to view the programme monitoring system at national or sub-national level. However, substantial results data was shared plus a report on the independent baseline survey conducted at the start of Phase III.

Lastly, an obvious but important limitation was that, in the time available, the consultants could visit only a small number of woredas and projects sites. These visits provided valuable insights on how the programme operates, and associated issues and challenges, but the number was too small to enable the review to draw to general conclusions on some important matters such as the quality of programme outputs.

## **2 Key findings**

The following sections address the evaluation questions set out in the TOR. For the sake of brevity and to avoid repetition (there being some overlap between questions) the findings are presented collectively for each thematic area of the TOR, rather than answering each question individually. A table summarising the findings against each question is, however, provided in Annex 2.

## 2.1 Relevance

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- Is the Project consistent with the needs, priorities and possibilities of the final beneficiaries and other stakeholders such as Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education?
- Is the project consistent with the Government of Ethiopia's policy, strategy and priorities as well as to the Government of Finland's development co-operation policies?
- What is the level of contribution of the COWASH III towards the policy, strategy and priorities of the Government of Ethiopia?
- Have any policy/strategy changes occurred, and if yes, how should the Project respond to these?
- How well the project is owned by the health and education sectors?

COWASH III is well aligned with the GOE's policy, strategy and priorities, being a component of the OWP which was itself designed in support of the GTP Strategy. As evidence of the programme's relevance to government, GOE has invested considerable sums for new investments and rehabilitation, and in fact covers more than half of the total programme costs. **This level of counterpart funding in Ethiopia is rare** and is a significant achievement of the COWASH programme.

In addition, the FTAT participates actively in policy level debate and is used heavily by MOWIE as a source of technical support and guidance on a wide range of sector issues extending far beyond the boundaries of COWASH; similarly, the RSUs provide technical support to bureaus. A number of government respondents at national and regional level noted that a range of planning and implementation processes developed under COWASH and preceding GOF-funded programmes (for example, desk and field appraisal) have been adopted by government and some other donor-funded projects. It is particularly significant that the CWA implementation manual draws heavily on the CMP Approach for woreda-managed projects, though some respondents noted that the manual is not, in practice, being followed closely at present.

The programme objective for at least one other organisation to adopt the CMP Approach has now been achieved, as the Organisation for Rural Development of Amara (ORDA) is now implementing it in one woreda of Amhara with support from Plan International. While this is encouraging, replication at scale has proved elusive; UNICEF piloted the approach a few years ago but did not continue with it for a number of reasons (see 2.8 below). A more fundamental challenge for the programme, however, is that government has proved unwilling to adopt the CMP Approach for scaling up beyond COWASH.

A second challenge has been that COWASH ownership by the ministries of health and education is weak, and neither has allocated sufficient funds for the programme to make a significant impact on access to institutional WASH facilities. This is discussed further in section 2.3

Regarding policy changes during Phase III, the broad sector framework remains the same, however the introduction of GTP II standards was significant in that it raised the minimum level of service for rural water supply and signalled a shift towards greater use of piped schemes with house connections. Some respondents cited this as evidence that the relevance of the CMP Approach is diminishing, since it is mostly (though not exclusively) used for the development of small, low-cost schemes that do not have the potential to provide house connections.

The relevance of COWASH III to beneficiary communities is confirmed by the level of demand for community water supply schemes in targeted woredas and the associated contributions (in cash or kind) made towards project costs. Having said this, COWASH only offers schemes that can be developed using the CMP Approach, and there is substantial anecdotal evidence that both WWTs and many communities would welcome a higher level of service if funds were available.

Regarding alignment with the Government of Finland's development co-operation policies, GOF is the only external donor supporting COWASH and therefore had considerable influence over the programme

design. Alignment with the 2015 Ministry for Foreign Affairs' Guidance Note entitled 'Human Rights Based Approach in Finland's Development Cooperation is particularly evident in that COWASH Phase III features explicit measures to:

- reduce inequalities by, amongst other things, ensuring that WASH facilities and services meet the needs of people with disability (PWD);
- mainstream gender in planning and implementation, not least by supporting the establishment of WASH enterprises led by unemployed women and pursuing gender equity in the composition and leadership of WASHCOs; and
- address the issue of climate resilience in developing and maintaining new water supply schemes.

## 2.2 Efficiency and value for money

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- Is the Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) and are the Regional Support Units (RSUs) appropriately resourced and able to support efficiently the COWASH implementation? Are there any differences between the regions regarding the RSU's support needs from FTAT and on how the RSUs are resourced and functioning? Have the different RSU arrangements had an impact on the efficiency?
- How does the efficiency (e.g. in terms of unit costs per capita of safe water and sanitation provision) of the CMP approach compare with the other key implementation methodologies in Ethiopia and with international references. How does the efficiency differ between supported regions? What are the causes of differences of unit costs in different regions?

The FTAT composition encompasses a range of specialist functions including, for Phase III, dedicated posts to address inclusion for PWD; the development of small, women-led WASH enterprises; and the scaling up of climate-resilient Water Safety Plans. In addition to their specialist functions, some team members have also been designated as focal person for a particular region so as to enable efficient communication between federal and regional levels and avoid duplication of effort. This also means that these staff have to adopt a holistic approach to their dialogue with RSUs and regional governments – they cannot deal only with their area of professional interest.

The programme website is also well organised and contains a substantial amount of programme data and documentation, plus documents on OWNIP, in fact in the absence of a dedicated One WASH website, the COWASH website is currently the main repository of sector documents relating to the national programme.

While the programme overall is well funded, there are some **challenges in the financing of the FTAT** and this partly explains the absence of a dedicated sanitation and hygiene specialist, though there is one team member who focuses on sanitation marketing and another who provides technical support to MOH on a regular basis. MFA has indicated that a twelve-month cost extension is likely to be available for the FTAT when the main implementation period ends in July 2019 but, as highlighted in the FTAT presentation to the MTE kickoff meeting, there is a mismatch between programme staffing levels and the FTAT budget, with projections indicating that the team will only be able to retain one national long-term specialist beyond February 2019. It is beyond the scope of the MTE to investigate the contractual and administrative issues that gave rise to this situation, but the review team consider that ending the new initiatives on small enterprises, inclusive WASH and water safety planning before tested, scalable approaches have been developed would be a false economy. If at all possible, therefore, a solution needs to be found so that this work can continue at least until July 2019.

The RSUs are well established and have most of the expected staff, though there has been some recent turnover and not all Regional Water Bureaus have followed RSU staffing guidelines in full. Not all, for example, have a sanitation and hygiene specialist - some bureaus preferred to appoint an additional engineer instead. A related challenge for COWASH is that RSUs, being staffed with government

appointees, are often expected to carry out work that falls outside of the COWASH remit, and vehicles are sometimes commandeered by the bureau for other tasks. Amhara RSU is something of an exception in that it has a greater degree of operational autonomy than the others, and a dedicated budget line within government (though its funding comes from GOF). Amongst other things, this autonomy allows the RSU to undertake its own procurement; the other RSUs have to use the government system for anything other than small purchases, and this can be very slow (for example, up to ten months to buy a laptop).

Comparing the needs and capacity of the five RSUs is not straightforward since they have not all been in place for the same length of time, local circumstances differ and they oversee different levels of programme activity. For example:

- Amhara accounts for 40 out of 76 programme woredas, has long experience with the CMP Approach and the regional government has made the greatest financial commitment;
- Benishangul-Gumuz also has a long history of GOF support but is an emerging (under-developed) region with limited resources across all sectors, and has the lowest level of investment funding;
- Oromia RSU has been subject to rapid staff turnover, primarily because it is based in Addis where there are relatively good employment opportunities for technical personnel;
- Oromia is the largest region with some 360 woredas, but COWASH targets only 12; and
- both Oromia and Amhara have been severely affected by political unrest in the last two years.

### Cost efficiency analysis

The costing and cost efficiency section of the TOR asks: ‘How does the efficiency (e.g. in terms of unit costs per capita of safe water and sanitation provision) of the CMP approach compare with the other key implementation methodologies in Ethiopia and with international references. How does the efficiency differ between supported regions? What are the causes of differences of unit costs in different regions?’

#### *Cost Efficiency of water and sanitation provision*

The projected requirements for water and sanitation coverage is substantial in the five regions in Ethiopia where COWASH is active as detailed in Table 1.

**Table 1 Projected unserved WASH needs**

Region	Projected pop by 2020	Total projected unserved population by 2020	Population to be served by 2020 to meet GTP2 targets
Amhara	18,025,467	4,741,989	2,038,189
BSG	888,278	386,678	253,437
SNNP	16,903,089	8,801,542	6,266,079
Oromia	32,179,185	13,903,605	9,076,728
Tigray	3,934,359	1,373,796	783,642

*Source: One Wash National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018*

To strengthen planning and achieve maximum value for money, the government of Ethiopia and donors need to know the relative cost-efficiency of selected WASH inputs, across implementing partner and regions.

Tables 2,3, and 4 detail costs across agencies implementing hand dug wells, shallow wells, and capped springs in Ethiopia.

**Table 2 Partner comparative costs: hand dug well**

Unit rate analysis for rural water			USD per capita									
3. Dug well with Hand Pump												
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHDCDC	Average excluding OWINP 2013	
Tigray	24	16	17	18		73	14		22		27	
Gambella	38	26	53						24		34	
B. Gumuz	38	30							31		30	
Harari	32	24							13		19	
Somali	43	7							32		20	
Amhara	21	9		9		73	14		26		26	
Afar	43								21		21	
SNNPR	21	18		6		73	14		16		25	
Oromia	21	11	9	11		73	14		20		23	
<b>Average</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>73</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>25</b>	

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018<sup>6</sup>

COWASH costs, detailed above, have been verified using internal programme data with recalculations by the author and triangulated with limited regional raw cost data obtained independently. COWASH unit costs as reported and validated are comprised of total capital construction costs including the community cash contribution. Note that COWASH reported costs detailed here do not include the average 4% microfinance fee that is an integral part of the COWASH CMP approach. Thus, true unit costs for COWASH are 4% higher than shown.

COWASH may have a cost-advantage for hand dug wells, utilising mobilised local labour at lower costs than labour hired by for-profit contractors.

Further, unit cost variations for COWASH hand dug wells (and likely other outputs) appear to be driven, in part, by wide variance of beneficiary estimates used by COWASH vs other providers in the same region. For example, COWASH beneficiary estimates in SNNP are nearly double that of the average beneficiary estimate of other implementing partners.

COWASH unit costs cluster more closely together with partners when beneficiary estimates are adjusted toward an average of all other implementing partners.

**Table 3 Partner comparative costs: shallow well with hand pump**

Unit rate analysis for rural water			USD per capita									
4 Shallow well with hand pump												
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	World Vision	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHDCDC	Average excluding OWINP 2013
Tigray	32	23	24	23	40			91	43	66		44
Gambella	47	41	189						54			95
B. Gumuz	50	40	33						50			41
Harari	42	161	13						39			71
Somali	56	401							89			89
Amhara	28	53	25	18	40			91	46	45		45
Afar	57	50							61			56
SNNPR	28	35	388	27	40			91	42	45		47
Oromia	28	22	5	38	40			91	47	45		41
Dire Dawa		215							38			127
<b>Average</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>26</b>		<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>66</b>

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

Average COWASH unit costs for shallow well with a hand pump vary from USD 18-38 and are generally average to lower than average. Again, the COWASH microfinance 4% cost is not included. There are notable outlier data points among other implementing partners in regional plans and from CWA.

<sup>6</sup> Tables from the One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018 were only available as images in this unpublished document. Highlighting in the images in Tables 1-3 are by the ONE WASH author, not by this evaluation.

COWASH regional cost variation do not generally correlate directly to the cost variation of other providers in the same regions nor with regional plans.

Interestingly, the COWASH unit cost in Oromia is the highest of all implementing partners. This is likely due to a lower estimate of beneficiaries by COWASH for Oromia (187 vs an average beneficiary estimate 281 for all other providers excluding WaterAid as an outlier<sup>7</sup>). This is unlike most COWASH beneficiary estimation. The FTAT have explained here that the average number of users per scheme is relatively low in Oromia due the scattered settlement pattern of households in project kebeles.

While this review did not have access to the raw data used to calculate unit costs for this output for other WASH partners, it is evident that the COWASH unit cost in Oromia would cluster closely to the average unit cost of all other providers if an average beneficiary estimate of 281 were used.

**Table 4 Partner comparative costs: capped spring<sup>8</sup>**

Unit rate analysis for rural water			USD per capita									
8. Capped Spring												
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	World Vision	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHDCDC	Average excluding OWNPN 2013
Tigray	24	14		17	13	23	48	11	19			21
Gambella	38	13	49			43			16			30
B. Gumuz	38	32				43			18			31
Harari	32	128				43			11			27
Somali	43					43						43
Amhara	21	14	11	240	13	23	48	11	15			19
Afar	43	16				43						30
SNNPR	21	12		10	13	23	48	11	12			19
Oromia	21	9	28	7	13	23	48	11	21			20
Dire Dawa									10			10
Addis A												#DIV/0!
Average	31	30	29	69	13	35	48	11	15	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: One Wash National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

The variation in cost data in COWASH for capped springs in Amhara region is an outlier and should be excluded for planning purposes. We were not able to use raw data to corroborate regional data for capped springs. When the cost data for Amhara is considered an outlier and excluded, COWASH unit costs (adding the microfinance 4%) correspond to the average data for other implementing partners.

Table 5, below, summarises regional cost variances for improved water supply by region and technology. These costs were further validated by raw cost data spot checks using COWASH internal reporting.

**Table 5 COWASH water point costs by region and technology (USD)**

Technology <sup>9</sup>	Amhara	BSG	SNNPR	Tigray	Oromia
HDW	1,894	2,154	2,324	2,286	1,491
SPD	2,372			2,194	2,112
SW	8,280	5,889	5,262	5,600	4,870
RPS	4,238			3,104	6,617
Expansion	5,883				2,112

The evaluation was not able to determine the factors contributing to variable costs for water points by well type. The cost basis for shallow wells is not understood in Amhara.

<sup>7</sup> WaterAid beneficiaries were estimated at 66 per well, well below all other providers.

<sup>8</sup> FTAT have commented that the COWASH Amhara unit cost shown in this table is incorrect and should in fact be 240 Birr. We note this but have accurately presented the data as reported by One WASH.

<sup>9</sup> HDW = Hand dug well; SPD= Spring development; SW = Shallow Well; RPS = Rural piped scheme

### *Factors for regional cost variations*

The evaluation spot checked regional cost data, beneficiary data, and well specifications, and was unable to definitively conclude what accounts for the variance in regional costs.

When water point unit costs are calculated by user or beneficiary, there is evidence that COWASH generally higher beneficiary estimates do contribute to somewhat lower unit costs (Annex Notes on Table 3).

When costs are established by water-point, technology drives cost (annex Table 6). It was noted with surprise that well depth does not correlate directly with cost (Annex Tables 7,8).

Still, water point costs of the same technology type do vary across the programme, and not with any consistent logic (more difficult to reach region, well depth, etc.). Interestingly, wells of one type may be less expensive in a region than a well of another type. This seems surprising since higher costs of one well type might be expected to be paralleled in other well types.

### *COWASH Water point cost efficiency conclusions*

The unit costs for water access per water point facility presented by COWASH are generally valid. Water point unit costs by assumed or estimated beneficiary are based on more variable data, particularly beneficiary numbers.

Despite concerns about the data underpinning of COWASH unit costs, we generally find COWASH costs to be average to slightly below average, and the data concerns are not greater with COWASH than with other implementing partners.

### *Sanitation cost efficiency*

Annex Tables 11-14 detail institutional latrine construction costs summarized in Table 6 below.

**Table 1 Regional cost variations: institutional sanitation facilities**

Latrines	Amhara	SNNPR	Tigray	Oromia
<b>School</b>	11,076	11,984		10,142
3 blocks (10 seats)			12,272	
2 blocks (8 seats)			9,818	
1 block (4 seats)			4,909	
<b>Health Post</b>	2,649	NA	6,121	3,803

We did not find evidence to draw conclusions regarding costs of institutional sanitation facility. In the one province (Tigray) where size of facility was detailed, there is a clear correlation between costs and facility size.

COWASH costs for sanitation facility were not validated by independent data, though the costs are consistent with internal COWASH data which was verified through spot-check re-calculation of internal cost data.

We can validate that the costs for sanitation facilities are supported by internal COWASH documentation.

### *WASH International Cost-benchmarking*

Limited international cost benchmarks are available in WASH. Several weaknesses of international benchmarks are noted:

1. It is not always possible to identify cost components, defined in the same way, that comprise each cost benchmark. Where components or component definition vary, a cost comparison is less valid.

2. Cost comparison across countries do not take different operational contexts into account, and often do not disaggregate or specify water scheme typology which is a major cost driver in any water project.
3. There is no standard beneficiary estimation for village populations or for population served by each water point across country programmes. Still, the estimation of beneficiaries has a profound effect on the usefulness of international cost-comparisons. This has also been noted as a factor contributing to COWASH lower unit costs within Ethiopia.

Table 7 details the available international cost comparisons.

**Table 2 International WASH cost comparison**

	OPM 6 Country	IRC 4 Country USD	COWASH
<b>Small scheme &lt;1000; borehole and handpump</b>	21-79 <sup>10</sup> (21-31)	20-61	6-38 <sup>11</sup>
<b>Recurrent annual</b>	10-12%	3-6	
<b>Latrine (pit)</b>	7-23	7-26	NA <sup>12</sup>
<b>Latrine concrete slab</b>		36-358	NA <sup>13</sup>
<b>Recurrent annual (pit)</b>		1.5-4	
<b>Recurrent annual (concrete slab)</b>		2.5-8.5	

Source: IRC WASH cost Info sheet 1, October 2012; Value for Money analysis of DFID funded WASH programmes in six countries 2015

COWASH inputs for waterpoint construction, regardless of type, are in the average to slightly below average range of all water supply implementing partners in Ethiopia. When the microfinance charge is included with construction costs, it is reasonable to assess COWASH costs as in the mid-range of all providers in Ethiopia. Since detailed financial and operational data are not available, it is not possible to determine the causes for COWASH unit costs with certainty. Several factors are noted:

- COWASH appears to use higher beneficiary estimates than many other providers of similar water point construction services. Higher beneficiary numbers reduce unit costs.
- The package of community training and mobilisation may result in greater construction efficiency using less costly local labour and reducing costs. The combined trainings for water management and construction may also increase efficiency.
- The capacity building and training costs in the CMP approach are not included as data for comparison with other partner programmes. COWASH budget project current Phase III capacity building and training costs are 17,750 <sup>14</sup>ETB or about USD 567 per water scheme regardless of type. If total water scheme beneficiaries range between 250 and 500, the total training costs are an additional USD 1 or USD 2 respectively. In other words, training and capacity building costs increase COWASH total costs slightly, while such costs remain average to slightly below average across partner programmes.

In sum, we can validate most COWASH inputs as accurately reported, reasonable compared to other agencies providing similar services, and within the range of international benchmark costs. We also note that COWASH is advanced in its internal financial and results data analysis; the management structure has the capacity to manage and analyse cost data at a detailed level.

<sup>10</sup> The higher unit cost is for a larger more complex water scheme. Excluding this scheme, the range is between USD 21-31

<sup>11</sup> Excluding reported costs for capped springs in Amhara of USD 240 which was excluded as an outlier.

<sup>12</sup> Comparative costs are for household access to improved sanitation; COWASH costs are for institutional access for which comparative data could not be found.

<sup>13</sup> Comments as for 6

<sup>14</sup> Source: COWASH internal document "Average COWASH region cost P1-2009EFY"

## 2.3 Effectiveness

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- How well is the Project on track to reach its targeted impact, outcomes and outputs? In case of deviations to the plans, what are the causes and implications, what corrective measures are proposed?
- Are there any regional disparities in the effectiveness? Why?
- What are key problems that affect the increase of institutional water, sanitation and hygiene coverage and usage? How well is the project addressing WASH in schools and health facilities? Could the project do more or do something differently?

The first annual report for COWASH Phase III highlighted that the programme was behind schedule in many areas. Across the three regions visited, reasons cited related to, amongst other things: the delayed approval of annual plans by GOF; turnover in woreda WASH teams; and low community contributions, particularly for institutional facilities. By the time of the review, **overall progress was on track for community water supply** (see Table 8) with substantial over-achievement in Amhara, though others had under-achieved somewhat and Benishangul-Gumuz (BSG) Region had already reduced its targets significantly from what was originally planned in the light of inadequate investment funding from the regional government. A number of regional respondents (including RSU staff) expressed the view that this shortfall reflected a genuine shortage of regional government funds rather than a lack of commitment to COWASH; as an emerging region, BSG has little scope for generating its own revenue and it also fares badly under the federal government's formula-based approach to allocating funds to the regions. This said, the region has not so far used its SDG budget (every region has one) to support COWASH investment costs.

**Table 8. COWASH community water supply construction output in 2009 (2016-17)**

Project Region	No. of Community Water Supply Schemes		% Achieved	Population having access within 1 km radius of the WPs
	Plan in 2009 EFY	No. of Community Water Supply Schemes Constructed		
Amhara	827	1,242	150.2	222,510
Tigray	155	102	65.8	17,274
SNNPR	230	164	71.3	27,774
Oromia	309	290	93.9	51,302
BSG	23	19	82.6	2,612
<b>All Woredas (76)</b>	<b>1,544</b>	<b>1,817</b>	<b>117.7</b>	<b>321,472</b>

Source: FTAT presentation to MTE mission, May 2018

While the community water supply component is performing quite well overall, the institutional WASH component of the programme has been, and remains, challenging given the limited investments by the bureaus of health and education in this area, which in part reflects the low priority afforded to this component as compared to community water supply. This has happened against a backdrop of low baseline coverage rates in the programme woredas: FTAT data indicates that an average of 35% of schools had water supply at the start of Phase III, 18% of health posts and 21% of health centres. For institutional sanitation, just 29% of schools had latrines, while for health facilities and institutions it was 47% and 57% respectively. Annual programme **targets for institutional WASH have been unavoidably small** in Phase III (just one or two of each category per woreda), and even then they were not met in the first year; see Table 9. One effect of this is that the programme is unable to achieve its aim of providing comprehensive WASH improvements in each supported community, covering both domestic and institutional facilities.

**Table 9. Institutional WASH construction output in 2009 (2016-17)**

Category	2009 EFY planned	Achieved
School water supply schemes	135	89
School latrine	60	22
Health institution water supply schemes	135	45
Health institution latrine	135	38

Source: FTAT presentation to MTE mission, May 2018

Turning to household latrine access, this stood at 44% on average in the programme woredas at the start of Phase II, with 54% of kebeles already verified as ODF. The target for year one was to increase access to 48%, though the programme does not operate in every kebele in its target woredas. In the event, 46% was achieved and the percentage of ODF kebeles rose to just under 57%. It is important to note here that COWASH only provides training and orientation on sanitation promotion for kebele staff and target communities; it does not directly support promotional campaigns.

The programme mostly works in woredas that were included in previous phases of COWASH, meaning that the RSUs have established working relationships with the WWTs, and that the targeted kebeles are technically suitable for the development of simple, low-cost technology options such as protected springs, hand dug wells and shallow wells. The number of programme woredas varies considerably between the five regions, however, and there are other significant differences between them as outlined above. These differences go some way to explaining the different levels of achievement across the five regions in the area of community water supply. For institutional WASH, however, most have struggled to make headway, with only Amhara meeting some of its targets. Here a number of contributing factors were identified by the review:

1. COWASH is primarily a MOWIE programme and neither the health or education ministries have a strong sense of ownership of the programme, though each has designated a focal person for COWASH at national and regional levels. No FTAT staff are located in the ministries of health or education at national level, and at regional level the RSUs are hosted by the Water Bureaus. One RSU (Oromia) had a sanitation and hygiene specialist deployed in the health bureau, but this has not made a significant difference to the level of interest and commitment to COWASH by that bureau.
2. The health and education sectors are under-funded by government, and in an environment of scarce resources neither ministry has prioritised the provision of institutional WASH facilities.
3. Projects are initiated on a demand-responsive basis and demand for institutional WASH among both WWTs and communities is much lower than for community and household facilities.

There are no obvious solutions to the relatively low priority given to institutional WASH by the health and education ministries and regional bureaus. Respondents from MOFEC emphasised that federal government cannot directly intervene to resolve the low levels of government contributions since these decisions are devolved to regional level.

Having made these points, one potentially useful development is that a new national School WASH Strategy has been developed and is due to be launched shortly (details not seen). Since the strategy is owned and led by the Ministry of Education, this should result in a greater level of commitment to, and funding for, School WASH facilities than has been the case in recent years, though this remains to be seen. For now, however, one result of the low priority given to school and health facility WASH is that COWASH is making **one-off improvements in just a few institutions per woreda per year**, which is insufficient to trigger real engagement by the local health and education bureaus in tackling institutional WASH systematically and putting systems in place to ensure the effective use and maintenance of the facilities constructed. This is a significant gap because, unlike community water supply schemes,

institutional facilities are not expected to be maintained by the users but by the institutions in which they are located.

COWASH sets targets not only for access but also for the **functionality of water supply schemes**. Here the picture is **very positive** in that the national level of non-functionality for rural water supply schemes was (according to the One WASH Annual Report) just 10.9%<sup>15</sup> in 2009 EFY. Programme data indicates that in COWASH woredas the level was lower still, at 9.3%. The annual programme target was to reduce this to 4.9%, and 5.3% was achieved, with just 1.1% reported in Benishangul-Gumuz. Though short of the target, this is nevertheless impressive. Factors contributing to sustainability are discussed in section 2.5 below.

## 2.4 Impact

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- How the project has so far contributed to achieving Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan II (GTP II) targets for the WASH sector in terms of water, sanitation and hygiene access coverage and quality of services in selected rural areas by using Community Managed Project (CMP) approach.
- Who have benefitted from the achievements and are there any groups, incl. vulnerable groups, who have not benefitted? If yes, why not?
- How has the project contributed to social and environmental sustainability? Have any unexpected or negative impacts occurred (e.g. social or environmental)?
- Are there any indications on impact on health/occurrence of water borne diseases?

### **Contribution to GTP targets**

COWASH III is making a significant contribution to GTP targets at local level, particularly for community water supply. The national target is to achieve 80% access by 2019, and FTAT data indicates that, if programme targets are met, this will be achieved in the BSG and Tigray woredas, with access at 74% overall across the 76 programme woredas. Programme results data shows both the increase in access to water supply across targeted woredas as a whole, and the specific contribution that COWASH interventions have made to that result. On average, **COWASH contributed 35% of the growth in access in 2009 EFY**.

In the case of household sanitation, it is very **difficult to determine the extent to which COWASH support has made a difference to the rate of change in access to improved sanitation**. To illustrate the point, the review team visited Bambasi woreda, where the WWT reported that, during the last year, 15 kebeles supported by COWASH had become ODF, as had 25 other kebeles outside of the COWASH project area. This appeared to be a major achievement, but the WWT explained that they had been working on CLTSH since 2007 and the recent achievements were the culmination of that long-term effort; it was not clear whether there had been a recent intensification (or revitalisation) of sanitation and hygiene promotion due to COWASH specifically.

The COWASH sanitation component is relatively light, the main intervention being support to annual orientation and training for woreda and kebele staff and communities. In addition, there is a requirement that, when a community or cluster of households makes an application for a new water point, at least half of the households must have a latrine already, and the group commits to achieving 100% by the time the scheme is completed. The FTAT has found, however, that this condition is not always enforced.

A complicating factor in assessing COWASH's contribution to rural sanitation is that considerable human and financial resources were devoted to CLTSH in Ethiopia over the last ten years, as a result of which many communities and kebeles were officially certified as ODF. There was broad consensus among stakeholders met at all levels during the review that interest in CLTSH has waned in recent times and that **many communities previously declared ODF are now reverting to open defecation**, while insufficient

<sup>15</sup> This seems remarkably low by regional and international standards, however the definition of functionality used in Ethiopia is somewhat different to that used elsewhere, hence simple comparisons cannot be made

new latrines are being built to cope with population growth. One reported factor in this is that most households built only temporary structures in response to CLTSH and these either fell into disrepair or were not emptied or replaced when they became full. Sanitation marketing initiatives launched under COWASH Phase III and by other programmes are a response to the need to strengthen both demand for, and the supply of, more durable and hygienic - yet affordable - latrines in rural areas.

### **Equity and inclusion – who has benefitted**

The CMP Approach is designed to ensure that the development of new schemes is both demand-responsive and meets the needs of all intended users. Applications are not accepted from individuals but from groups of users, with each household being a signatory to the application. As a guideline, a minimum 20% community contributions is expected towards capital costs (in cash or kind), but the programme generally uses relatively low-cost technologies, apart from which none of the intended users are excluded if they are unable to pay or to contribute labour. The same applies to the (very modest) monthly contributions which users make into an operation and maintenance fund after the scheme is completed.

The implementation approach also ensures that, where a new scheme is developed on land which is owned or controlled by a private individual, **all of the intended users will have permanent, free access to the water point**. This is done by compensating the landowner where necessary, and entering into a written agreement with them confirming that access has been granted for the long term.

Two other initiatives related to equity and inclusion have been introduced for Phase III. Firstly, a stream of work is underway to **ensure that new water and sanitation facilities address the needs of people with disability**. The programme is approaching this systematically; a JPO was assigned specially for this task, and rather than simply introducing new facility designs, began by consulting widely among sector NGOs and other organisations working with PWD to clarify where things currently stood in the sector and associated needs and opportunities. It emerged that, while the needs of PWD were being addressed in principle, in practice WASH programmes were not doing very much. For example, MOH and MOE standard designs already included some relevant options, but these were rarely installed.

Following this consultation, FTAT collaborated with the Ethiopian Centre for Disability and Development (CDD) to produce two sets of guidelines for the programme, one for higher level government stakeholders and partners, and a simplified one for use at community level. Training and awareness raising workshops have been given to all stakeholders at federal, region, zone, woreda levels. The FTAT is also helping COWASH is also collaborating with WaterAid and the Open University in Ethiopia on the development of a training module known as 'Count Me In'. There is now an element addressing the needs of PWD, and ensuring their participation, in each step of the CMP cycle. At the time of the review, the cascading of training down to the kebele WASH teams was in process and the FTAT expected to see concrete results once this had been completed.

During field visits it was evident that the needs of PWD are now on the agenda in COWASH projects, as wheelchair ramps had been incorporated into a number of new water points and toilet blocks seen during field visits. However, it was also apparent that there is some way to go to establish adequate provision suited to particular contexts. For example:

- a health centre toilet block had a wheelchair ramp but the toilet compartments were not adapted for wheelchair users, neither were the doorways wide enough to allow a wheelchair to enter; and
- the apron of a hand dug well with handpump had a wheelchair ramp allowing access to the pump handle but not to the spout, hence the user would be unable to place and retrieve a jerrycan.

While it is good that the needs of PWD were considered to some extent in these examples, it may be that people with limited mobility would not, in reality, be expected to collect water from a handpump, though they might play another active role in a WASHCO or School Health Club. Part of the challenge here is that many communities and schools in rural areas do not currently have wheelchair users, hence it is not

obvious what appropriate consultation and provision entails. It will no doubt take some time for this to be worked out and mainstreamed in the operation of WWTs and there is, therefore, a strong case for continuing this aspect of the programme's work up to July 2019 and ideally into the proposed extension period. The World Bank estimates that PWD account for 17% of the rural population in Ethiopia, excluding children, so the needs are substantial.

The second new initiative related to equity is that the programme is collaborating with regional bureaus concerned with technical and vocational training<sup>16</sup> in the establishment, on a pilot scale, of a number of **sanitation and water supply maintenance enterprises**, each led by a group of previously unemployed women. The operational and financial model for this initiative is to a large extent determined by government rules, based on which programme guidelines have been developed<sup>17</sup>. Government rules require that the participants are unemployed youths (at least 40% of them female); the chair and finance positions are held by women; and that the enterprises focus on the inclusion of persons with disabilities. While these rules are very positive in many respects, they effectively rule out working with established sanitary suppliers or other entrepreneurs who have their own capital and can take financial risks. Instead, the programme will provide skills enhancement and entrepreneurship training plus premises, equipment and startup capital, with the intention that this will enable the operations to become self-sustaining in the longer term. At the time of the review none of the enterprises was operational, but preparatory work was underway in several woredas.

In each supported region, the government technical and vocational training body (TVET) delivers the orientation and training for candidates. This initiative is currently at a pilot stage, with participants only recently trained (or still being trained) and premises under construction. In some cases, the sanitary marts will also sell water supply spare parts and/or offer operation and maintenance services for water supply schemes, subject to the permission of the small enterprise bureau.

There are evidently some **risks around this approach to sanitation marketing**, not least that the 'enterprises' might become grant-funded production centres rather than real businesses. This would not render them unable to provide a useful service, as there is evidently a need to improve the supply of affordable sanitary components and skilled labour in rural areas so that low-income households can build improved, durable toilets. However, unless a very high level of demand was established, it seems doubtful that these operations could become financially self-sustaining, given also that most of them are (we understand) going to be based in towns and will therefore be some distance from their intended customers. Already some of the prospective enterprises are asking for extra programme support to cover the costs of transporting slabs and other components to the villages in areas with difficult topography.

There have been a number of earlier sanitation marketing initiatives in Ethiopia, including one supported by UNICEF and led by iDE, which has extensive global experience in the area. There have, however, been very few success stories in developing self-sustaining enterprises. Evidently there are no easy answers and it will be important for the FTAT and RSUs to monitor closely the progress of these enterprises, in particular the prospects for them remaining viable after programme funding is withdrawn.

Turning to **health impact**, the programme is attempting to measure this by including questions on the incidence of childhood diarrhoea in the independent programme baseline survey and (presumably) the corresponding endline survey. The review team wish to sound a note of caution around the usefulness of this assessment. While the link between WASH and diarrhoeal disease is well established, it is notoriously difficult to establish whether a particular intervention has had an impact on morbidity in targeted communities. The reason is that there are many causes of diarrhoeal disease and WASH interventions only address some of them. Therefore, any changes in morbidity detected in communities targeted by COWASH could not be attributed directly to the programme. It is worth noting here that

---

<sup>16</sup> Bureau of Technical, Vocational and Enterprises Development (in Amhara and Benishangul Gumuz Regions); Micro and Small Enterprises Development Agency (in Oromia and Tigray Regions); and Urban Food Security and Job Creation Development Agency (in SNNPR)

<sup>17</sup> The COWASH guideline for women-led MSEs development is based on two national documents: (i) Ministry of Urban Development and Housing, Second Edition March 2012, edit April 2016. Micro and Small Enterprise Development Policy and Strategy. Addis Ababa; and (ii) Ministry of Health. June 2013. National Sanitation Marketing Guideline. Addis Ababa

some large WASH programmes have spent huge amounts of money on professional health impact monitoring only to find that there was no discernible change at the end of the programme intervention. One example was UNICEF’s SHEWA-B Programme in Bangladesh, which operated in roughly half of the districts in the country, providing a holistic package of WASH interventions. At the end of the programme, a slight drop in diarrhoeal morbidity was detected, but the same drop was also found in communities where there had been no programme intervention.

*Note:* social and environmental sustainability is addressed in section 2.5 below.

## 2.5 Sustainability

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- To what extent the communities and its various groups have ownership of the construction and maintenance activities of the water supply systems and sanitation facilities? Do the communities have sufficient capacities (human, technical, institutional and financial) for long-term operation and maintenance? Have the communities developed ownership feeling to their WASH schemes? Are the supportive roles of WASH authorities clear and do they provide the necessary support for the communities and relevant institutions such as schools and health institutions?
- Are there any geographical disparities in the sustainability of the project? What are the causes for disparities and how to address them?
- Concerning the technologies adopted for WASH infrastructure building: Have the sustainability aspects of the chosen implementation mechanisms and technology (such as durability, easy to operate, spare parts available) been considered adequately in community WASH and institutional WASH?
- Has the environmental sustainability been considered adequately?<sup>18</sup>
- Has introduction of the social, environmental and climate risks screening and management approach has any impact on the sustainability of the water schemes?
- How well has the implementation of water safety planning and water quality monitoring progressed?
- Are the training accorded to the relevant personnel? To what extent has the training contributed to the sustaining of the water schemes?
- Financial sustainability. Are there mechanisms in place to ensure availability of funds for operation, maintenance and future re-investment during the project and after it has ended?

### **Water point sustainability**

COWASH III applies a model for sustainability through community management which has been developed and refined over several years. Water points are developed on a demand-responsive basis and the implementation process puts the beneficiary community in charge of project finances, procurement and construction, with technical backup where necessary from the WWT which in turn is supported by the RSU. Most of the schemes use simple, low-cost technology for which the operation and maintenance demands are straightforward and spare parts are relatively cheap and easy to obtain, though sometimes this is via government rather than the private sector since there is not always sufficient local demand for spare parts (for example, Afridev handpump spares) to make it commercially viable for local shops to sell them. One notable innovation has emerged in Benishangul-Gumuz whereby WASHCOs have associated into a legally registered Water Users Association and set up their own procurement and distribution system for spare parts.

It is a condition of COWASH support that WASHCOs open an account with the MFI through which programme funding is routed to them, and post-construction users are encouraged to open a second account and make regular payments into it so as to establish an operation and maintenance fund. At some of the sites visited during the review, WASHCO members showed their account book which confirmed that they had a significant sum in their account. Typical monthly payments are small - as low

<sup>18</sup> Environmental sustainability covers land use, watershed management, source protection (pollution, siltation, flooding, etc.), and preparedness for possible climate change-related impacts (especially impacts on water availability).

as 1 ETB per household in some cases - but it seems likely that, provided the WASHCO remains active, additional contributions could be collected should the need arise.

COWASH also constructs a number of rural piped schemes for which the management demands are somewhat more onerous in terms of revenue generation, management and maintenance. The evaluation team visited one recently completed small scheme comprising spring protection plus a small reservoir and modest distribution network serving a school, a community tapstand and a tapstand at the village health facility. The scheme was reported to be functioning fairly well, though the yield was somewhat low due to it being the dry season. In some places the programme has built or rehabilitated much larger schemes, including the Ali Spring scheme in Benishangul-Gumuz. The team were unable to visit this in the time available, but it is well known in the sector and we understand that it has remained operational for several years under community management.

Since COWASH has remained in the same woredas for some years, it has been possible to maintain some degree of contact with communities served earlier and the functionality of these schemes is known, or at least checked annually by the WWT, which locally updates the independent water point inventory established in 2011. Woredas typically have more than ten staff working in WASH, each of whom oversees a cluster of communities. Compared to many other countries in the region, this is a fairly high level of staffing and makes annual checks doable in all or most woredas, according to programme stakeholders. Programme data shows that the general level of **water point functionality in the programme regions is very good and slightly better in COWASH-supported kebeles**. This said, the annual checks are based on self-reporting by the same staff responsible for COWASH implementation, and FTAT personnel do not regard the functionality data as 100% reliable.

The implementation model also includes a social sustainability dimension whereby long term free access to communal points is assured, as discussed earlier.

Sector stakeholders independent of COWASH confirm that the sustainability of schemes developed under COWASH has generally been good, and that there is much to learn from the CMP Approach that could be applied to other rural water supply schemes.

### **Environmental sustainability**

Environmental sustainability is one of the criteria considered when reviewing applications for new water points. During COWASH Phase III the programme has rolled out a process known as social, environmental and climate risks screening and management or **SECRSM**. Under this arrangement, the WWT assesses the environmental risks associated with a proposed scheme - particularly in terms of water resources management - and adopts a sub-catchment action plan to address them. While the screening itself relates to a specific new water point or scheme, the action plan may require action over a wider area to protect water resources in that sub-catchment, for example blocking gulleys or planting trees so as to reduce runoff and encourage ground water recharge. Where such an action plan is put in place, it is managed by kebele staff though the affected WASHCOs may have specific tasks within it.

FTAT reports that, in the first year of COWASH Phase III, SECRSM was undertaken for 1870 water supply schemes, and led to the adoption of 378 SECR plans. More 3,500<sup>19</sup> screenings are planned for the current year. This suggests that the process is well established, though FTAT has raised a concern that screening is not mandatory and there are no specialists in this area at regional or woreda level. The evaluation does not have enough evidence to comment on the results to date of SECRSM and associated plans and the extent to which they have contributed to environmental sustainability. A potential risk is that, in trying to establish a scalable process for screening and planning, the programme may have oversimplified the subject of climate resilience which is actually a very complex topic. Nevertheless, the actions typically included in SECR plans (tree planting and reducing surface water runoff) are undoubtedly a useful contribution to water resources management at local level.

---

<sup>19</sup> We are unsure why this number is so high given that the planned number of water points is approximately 1500

As a complement to SECRSM, in Phase III the programme has also introduced Climate-Resilient Water Safety Planning or **CR-WSP**. Whereas SECRSM is applied at the project appraisal stage and focuses on WRM, CR-WSP is applied to existing water points and focuses more on water quality. This initiative is currently at a pilot stage, with the first 14 WSPs completed in 2009 EFY. The programme is currently working out how best to scale up water safety planning and what is the most appropriate and useful type of plan. As with action plans under SECRSM, the intention is that plans will be adopted at a sub-catchment level and overseen by the kebele authorities, with specific responsibilities for each WASHCO.

FTAT has flagged a concern that, while the introduction of CR-WSPs was government initiative, there is little commitment to it and the WSP teams established at regional and woreda level are not (so far) active. There are also minimal government resources allocated to water quality testing, which is closely related to water safety planning. There is, therefore, some uncertainty as to **whether this initiative will be scaled up by government beyond COWASH**.

A related observation here is that having both a SECRSM action plan and a CR-WSP could be confusing for kebele staff and WASHCOs; while the former is introduced at the planning stage of a new water point and the latter applies to all existing water points in a sub-catchment, local stakeholders might not fully understand the difference and know when the transition occurs from one to the other. This is something to keep in mind in the process of piloting CR-WSPs and working out what is the most appropriate way forward.

### **Training by COWASH**

A comprehensive portfolio of orientation and training for programme actors from regional to community level has been developed over the course of COWASH Phases I to III. The FTAT has established quality standards for training and has twice conducted training impact assessments, the findings of which informed modifications and improvements to the training offered.

Orientation for regional, woreda and kebele officials on what the programme offers, and associated planning and implementation processes, often has to be repeated due to the rapid turnover of staff and government officials in some locations. This echoes the findings of both training impact assessments, which found that around 30% of former trainees were no longer in post. Another challenge identified by these assessments was that government departments do not always allow (or equip) staff to carry out some of the tasks for which they have been trained under COWASH - sometimes because it is not in their existing Job Description. Similarly, post-training follow-up and mentoring is reportedly weak or absent in many locations, something which is not helped by the absence of sanitation and gender specialists in most of the RSUs.

FTAT typically adopts a cascading approach to training, beginning with the training of trainers at regional level. One challenge with this cited by FTAT respondents was that training delivered to government agencies at a lower level was often shorter than had been anticipated, and/or the trainee groups much larger, so as to reach a greater number of people. This also raises concerns around the impact of the training received.

The CMP Approach is predicated on community groups (WASHCOs) being adequately trained and supported so that are motivated and capable to develop and operate their new water supply schemes. A standard capacity development package for WASHCOs is therefore integral to the CMP Approach. Paradoxically, this is also cited by some government stakeholders as one of the reasons why government has not adopted and scaled up the approach beyond COWASH; they do not have the resources to provide this 'software' component alongside new water supply investments. FTAT argue, however, that the software component is not very onerous and in fact **schemes developed using the CMP Approach are often completed much faster** than ones developed using other modalities under the OWNPN.

## 2.6 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Terms of Reference for the MTE did not include any questions on programme monitoring apart from one on the validity of programme baseline data, which is answered in 2.7 below. It is nevertheless useful to mention here a strategic issue relevant to the review. While the programme has a wealth of data and reports, most of them on the programme website, it is clear that the bulk of the results data is based on **self-reporting** by the teams that implement the programme. This is not unusual, but there is a noticeable lack of independent validation of programme claims concerning the effectiveness of the CMP Approach including the long-term sustainability of water supply schemes developed. This comment is not intended to cast doubt on reported results, but as COWASH nears its end **it is important for the sector that robust evidence on the value of the CMP Approach is generated** and that key lessons - especially on achieving sustainable rural water supplies - are captured and shared, even if the CMP Approach itself is not going to be scaled up by government. Recommendations in this area are offered in section 3.

It is important to note here that sector monitoring is weak, with no national MIS though one is currently under development with DFID support. In the absence of a national system, monitoring and reporting remains very project-specific with a multitude of systems operating in parallel. GTP sets national targets and indicators, and COWASH Phase III has been designed in support of these, but the introduction of new minimum levels of service under GTP II has complicated the calculation of access levels and rendered much existing access data invalid.

## 2.7 Human rights-based approach, cross-cutting objectives

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- Has the COWASH III succeeded to incorporate the Human Rights Based Approach (HBRA) and cross-cutting objectives in its implementation? If not, how should this be improved?
- How well are different right-holders represented in COWASH? Who benefits first and foremost from COWASH? Who is possibly left behind and why?
- Are there clear accountability relationships between the different stakeholders trusted with the project implementation? If not, how should the accountability be enhanced?
- Gender: How is gender and social equality integrated into all project operations?
- How well has the women leadership, inclusion of persons with disabilities and development of women-led micro and small enterprises progressed?
- Social equality: How is the participation of marginalized groups, specifically disabled, been integrated into all project operations?
- Climate resilience and Disaster Risk Management: Have the technologies and implementation mechanisms used in COWASH taken adequately into account the climate resilience? If not, how should they be developed?
- What are the key challenges in empowerment of women through WASH-related activities?
- Has the project succeeded to enhance the empowerment of women in communities through WASH-related activities? How well is the menstrual hygiene addressed and what is recommended?
- The MTE is also expected to review the governance of the programme in terms of risks related to corruption and integrity issues that may have been already identified or potential factors that may encourage corruption.

A number of these questions have been addressed in preceding sections.

Since there is no universally-agreed definition of a 'Human Rights-based Approach' in the context of WASH programming, the review team avoided using this term directly in interviews. Furthermore, while use of the terms 'rights holders' and 'duty bearers' is increasingly common in the sector, rarely do international development agencies adopt an advocacy position based on a view that government is denying citizens their rights to water and sanitation. For the purposes of this review, the consultants have interpreted HRBA simply as one which lays strong emphasis on equity and inclusion with particular

reference to gender mainstreaming and to meeting the needs of the poor, marginalised groups and people with disabilities; and to environmental sustainability.

From the findings discussed in preceding sections it is evident that **COWASH III lays strong emphasis on these aspects of WASH programming**, though some initiatives are quite new and good practices for scaling up are still being established. It has also proved a struggle in some locations to achieve some basic gender-related targets, not least gender balance in WASHCO membership<sup>20</sup>. There is, however, an established emphasis on the needs of the poor as evidenced by the preference for small local contractors rather than larger commercial operators, and on establishing small social enterprises led by unemployed women.

One challenge to the equity focus of the programme voiced by some respondents (as noted in section xx above) was that the CMP Approach is only applicable at scale in locations where ground water supplies are relatively good; it cannot be used in semi-arid locations and therefore excludes some of the most under-served sections of the rural population.

On the issue of MHM the review team did not have an opportunity to view how this was addressed in practice since the only school facilities seen were under construction. We understand that the programme does encourage schools to provide MHM facilities and that this need is addressed in the design manuals used. However, COWASH cannot enforce the inclusion of such facilities as toilet blocks are developed on a demand-responsive basis and schools generally ask only for basic facilities rather than a holistic WASH package including 'software' components (hygiene promotion, WASH club activities, etc.). To help address this, COWASH capacity building for the woreda health office includes training and awareness raising on MHM for teachers and school WASH and girls' clubs.

On corruption risks – see section 2.8 below.

## 2.8 Programme design, management and implementation

### *Evaluation questions addressed in this section*

- What are the key results of CMP-approach in the landscape of water supply in Ethiopia?
- What are the key bottlenecks of CMP approach?
- What are the key lessons learned from CMP so far?
- What has been the CMPs impact to ODF and community-led sanitation and hygiene?
- Has the CMP approach contributed to the climate resilience? Is it adequate or should CMP be further developed to address the climate resilience and disaster risk reduction aspects better? How?
- Based on the KPMG Performance Audit carried out in 2017 and the consequent COWASH audit mitigation plans, what are the lessons learned from using CMP financial management system? Is it possible to extract best practices for scaling-up?
- How strong is the project ownership in health and education sector bureaus in the 5 COWASH regions? Are Regional Support Units covering the work sector bureaus should do?
- Is the COWASH III baseline data satisfactory? What time should the COWASH end-line data to be collected?

This section of the TOR contains some specific questions but also some generic ones relating to COWASH performance overall. The responses below begin with narrower questions and move on to the broader ones. Findings relating to the programme's impact on ODF; climate resilience; and institutional WASH facilities were discussed in the preceding sections and are not repeated here.

<sup>20</sup> In addition to gender balance in WASHCO membership, COWASH performance monitoring plan includes % of WASHCOs with women holding one or two of the three or all three leadership/management positions (chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary)

## Financial management

Following the KPMG Performance Audit carried out in 2017, the FTAT appointed a senior financial consultant (himself an auditor) for one year on a part-time basis to help the RSUs implement their mitigation plans.

A reading of the audit report suggests that **the problems found in each region were not generally serious**, and while it was important to resolve them they related mostly to issues of capability in financial management rather than the misuse of funds. Furthermore, the finance specialist is of the opinion that personnel responsible for the management of programme finances at sub-national level are of an appropriate cadre but simply needed further training and guidance in order to complete their financial management tasks effectively. FTAT adopted a simple RAG system for tracking progress against each action in the mitigation plans and by the time of the review, the great majority of the issues had been resolved.

This matter relates closely to the question of how programme governance manages risks relating to corruption and integrity (see 2.7 above). Our understanding is that no serious incidences of corruption have been identified during Phase III. Moreover, the nature of the programme funding mechanism means that the **opportunities for anything more than petty corruption are few**: the funds transferred to each community are fairly modest and are managed in a transparent manner, while procurement is mostly via small contracts with local artisans for single installations rather than large contracts for multiple schemes.

## Adequacy of baseline data

An independent baseline survey was commissioned for Phase III and a detailed report produced. The survey included questions on the incidence of diarrhoeal disease in target communities, as noted above. Notwithstanding the risks around attempts to measure health impact, it appears that the baseline was professionally designed and executed, and this review found no areas of concern.

Regarding endline data collection, this should begin during the proposed extension period, after the original implementation period has ended. Ideally this should also be independently conducted, to mirror the baseline.

## Achievements, limitations and lessons relating to the CMP Approach

Since it was first introduced in the 1990s via COWASH's predecessor programmes, the CMP Approach has been thoroughly tested and its potential for delivering affordable and sustainable rural water supply services is widely recognised. This review found both RSU and woreda staff to be strong advocates of the approach and many would welcome the option to continue COWASH into a fourth phase.

Given that COWASH has a successful track record in applying the CMP Approach via the government framework, and monitoring data indicates that the functionality of schemes developed under the programme is better than the national average for rural water supply, it is something of a conundrum that government has not adopted the approach for wider use. MOFEC's specific reason for not endorsing the approach is that government financial systems do not extend below woreda level and it cannot therefore permit the transfer of government investment funds to communities via MFIs or any other route (COWASH recently proposed an alternative mechanism whereby funds would be routed via the Commercial Bank and woredas rather than MFIs).

It is noted here that UNICEF did trial the approach for some time but later dropped it; in 2014 they reported that the main obstacle was that, like government, their internal rules prevented them from channelling funds through MFIs. More recently, the focus of UNICEF support to rural water supply in Ethiopia has shifted towards the development of large, multi-village piped schemes managed by under professional rather than community management, on the basis that this offers a sustainable, climate-resilient solution for under-served rural locations, particularly semi-arid areas, with the potential also to reach the service levels envisaged by GTP II and the SDGs. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to review UNICEF's own strategy, but suffice to say that their current position is that the CMP Approach as

an investment model cannot meet the challenges of GTPII and climate resilience, though it offers valuable lessons for the sector on how to achieve the sustainable operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes already installed.

In the absence of early adopters, and given MOFEC'S continued reluctance to endorse the approach, it now seems unlikely that the CMP Approach will be scaled up by others when COWASH ends.

While there are clearly some reservations in the sector around the future value of the CMP Approach for the development of new schemes, sector respondents outside of COWASH were very positive about the programme's success with establishing effective community management - something which has eluded countless rural water supply programmes in the past. Some suggested that **COWASH's most important legacy will not be the investment model per se, but the lessons it provides on routes to sustainability.** We note here that the other modalities approved under OWNP (NGO-managed projects, woreda-managed projects and self-supply) are primarily concerned with the development of new schemes, though they envisage community management on completion. Should further GOF support to the sector be approved, therefore, a successor programme could provide valuable support by sharing and facilitating the application of lessons from COWASH to both planned and existing rural water supply schemes. Some aspects of the CMP Approach have already been incorporated into the CWA manual, though so far they have not been implemented at scale.

A related finding here is that, while the programme has done a considerable amount of learning-by-doing and developed a raft of training materials and operational guidelines (for example the set of Operation and Maintenance Manuals launched in 2018), much more could be done to document and disseminate the lessons on sustainability that have been generated from COWASH experience since its inception. FTAT had in fact planned to produce 12 documents during the first year of Phase III on lessons and best practices of the CMP Approach, but was unable to do so due to the resignation of the Communication and Knowledge Management Specialist. That person was subsequently replaced and the current postholder works partly for FTAT, partly for IRC, but to date the FTAT - IRC collaboration has focussed more on publicity than knowledge management.

### 3 Conclusions and recommendations

#### 3.1 Overall performance

Since its inception, COWASH has played a valuable role in the rural WASH sub-sector in Ethiopia, not only in terms of the people benefiting from improved access to water and sanitation services, but also by demonstrating how effective community management can be established while working within the government framework – a significant achievement. Furthermore, the programme has become a valuable resource of technical assistance and strategic guidance to MOWIE (in which the FTAT is located) and regional governments, even though the CMP-Approach was ultimately not adopted for wider use. The programme's influence at regional level has been particularly strong, as evidenced by the high levels of counterpart funding achieved.

An important factor contributing to the programme's achievements is that it has avoided tokenistic efforts to address the various development agendas which have come to the fore in recent years (not least climate resilience, equity and inclusion) and instead tackles them thoroughly in an attempt to find viable approaches that are manageable at local level.

Institutional WASH has clearly been a challenge but the constraints here lie beyond COWASH control as they relate to the resources, strategies and priorities of the health and education ministries, neither of which plays a lead role in the programme. Even with the introduction of a new national School WASH Strategy it is doubtful that this situation will change significantly in the next twelve months and there would, therefore, be little justification in intensifying efforts to scale up this programme component in the final year. Were a COWASH Phase IV being considered, we would recommend that institutional

WASH be tackled via a woreda-wide strategy led by the relevant government agencies rather than installing a few facilities per year on a demand-responsive basis.

With Phase III now approaching its end, and GOF having signalled that any future support to the sector might be in a different form, the focus of programme attention needs to shift towards COWASH' legacy, in particular capturing and disseminating lessons and good practices that could benefit the sector in the longer term. With this in mind, a number of recommendations are offered below. Inevitably the final year and/or extension will involve a considerable amount of winding down, preparation of completion reports etc. It is assumed that such activities will go ahead as per MFA standard practice, so they are not detailed here.

### 3.2 Recommendations

#### For the remainder of Phase III (to July 2019)

Recommendation	Complete by	Lead
<b>Operations</b>		
1. With COWASH nearing its end, the FTAT should increasingly focus on how lessons from programme experience can be harnessed for the benefit of the sector generally.	[Continuous]	FTAT
2. Continue the work on disability and inclusion in rural WASH, to create a model for others to follow in future.	Continue into extension phase	FTAT
3. Complete the piloting of CR-WSPs, again to create a model of good practice that can be adopted at scale, complementary to (and aligned with) the established SECRSM process and associated action plans.	July 2019	FTAT
4. Continue the piloting of women-led sanitation marketing and water scheme maintenance enterprises as for items 2 and 3 above. Since it is likely to take time to establish both the supply and demand side of operations, continuation of the enterprises already initiated <sup>21</sup> into the extension phase is likely to be justified, however a final decision for each one should be taken at the end of the final implementation year based on performance to date and the prospects for establishing a viable enterprise supportive of programme objectives.	Continue into extension phase (subject to review by July 2019)	FTAT
<b>Planning, Administration and finance</b>		
5. In order to facilitate 2 and 3 above and, ensure that adequate resources are available for the FTAT to fulfil the tasks outlined above, and effectively support ongoing regional projects, up to the end of Phase III. <i>(Note 1)</i>	Dec 2018	MFA
6. To help maximise output in the remaining time available, consider simplifying the core planning process so that regions can submit their annual plans for approval by GOF without first undertaking woreda consultation workshops. <i>(Note 2)</i> .	Immediate action	MFA
7. Support regions in operationalising the approved O&M Strategic Framework and manual, in support of sustainability.	Ongoing; continue up to July 2019	FTAT

#### 12-month extension (July 2019- July 2020)

Recommendation	Complete	Lead
----------------	----------	------

<sup>21</sup> 26 were planned but it appears that the number going ahead is smaller; precise details unclear

	by	
<b>Operations</b>		
7. Go ahead with the proposed €700,000 cost extension <sup>22</sup> for the FTAT, and a no-cost extension for the regions, since there are likely to be substantial unspent funds by July 2019. At regional level, activity should be limited to completing ongoing projects rather than starting new ones. A smaller FTAT would be sufficient to support the extension, though consultants would also be needed for the endline survey and knowledge management tasks. ( <i>Note 1</i> )	July 2020	FTAT
8. Complete the work on disability and inclusion; review and document lessons learned and disseminate good practices for wider adoption in the sector.	July 2020	FTAT
9. Complete the WASH enterprises initiative; review and document lessons learned and disseminate them to enhance sector knowledge in this area.	July 2020	FTAT
10. Document and disseminate lessons learned from the application of SECISM and CR-WSPs, again for wider adoption in the sector.	July 2020	FTAT
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>		
11. Complete a programme endline survey mirroring the baseline, so as to enable the assessment of final results ( <i>Note 3</i> ). Ideally this should be conducted independently, however an acceptable compromise could be to have the survey independently supervised but with programme staff serving as enumerators, provided they do not survey their own implementation areas (for example, by deploying them in woredas where they have not previously worked).	Oct 2020	FTAT
<b>Knowledge management, advocacy and communications</b>		
12. Advocate for the CMP Approach to remain a component of the OWNP, but also for the wider adoption of good practices from COWASH within ONEWASH generally – particularly in the areas of community management and sustainability. This could include workshops at national and regional level for sector stakeholders within and beyond COWASH.	July 2020	FTAT, MFA
13. In support of 10 above: Commission a series of ‘knowledge products’ documenting lessons from programme experience that have relevance to the sector beyond COWASH. In addition to those outlined above, potential subjects could include, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with MFIs in WASH programmes</li> <li>• Establishing sustainable community management</li> <li>• Independent sustainability checks (<i>Note 4</i>)</li> <li>• Development of rural piped schemes using the CMP Approach</li> </ul> We recommend that independent authors with relevant expertise are brought in to develop these products, working closely with programme staff. ( <i>Note 1</i> )	July 2020	FTAT
12. Ensure that the many reports and other data produced by COWASH remain available as a resource for the sector, either by arranging for another agency (e.g. the OWNP Secretariat) to take over the programme	July 2020	FTAT

<sup>22</sup> We understand that this is the approximate cost of operating the FTAT with current staffing levels for one year

website and /or database, or by incorporating these resources into another sector website. (We note here that WaterAid is currently developing a website for MOWIE).		
--	--	--

### Notes on recommendations

1. For the final year of implementation (to July 2019) we anticipate that the complete FTAT team will be needed since the full range of programme activities is set to continue. During the extension year, however, no new projects would be developed hence there would be no need to retain the capacity building or CMP Specialists, and the work related to CR-WSPs would be mostly related to documentation hence the specialist would only be needed on a short-term basis. There would, however, be considerable work in monitoring and evaluation; communications and knowledge management; and gender, equity and inclusion including sanitation marketing.

In addition to full-time staff, we recommend the use of consultants to oversee the endline survey and lead the production of knowledge products, not because the FTAT lacks expertise in these areas, but in order to provide a level of independence in the analysis which should enhance the credibility of the outputs when shared with a wider audience. It is important to emphasize here that what are proposing is a series of analytical pieces that probe programme components and results in some depth, rather than publicity materials. If done well, these would go some way to meeting the purposes of a final evaluation.

2. Under established procedures, RSUs are required to undertake a fairly broad 'core planning' exercise annually at regional level in order to secure GOF funding for the year. Detailed planning at woreda level then follows. Normally the detailed planning exercise involves a workshop with woreda representatives, but it takes time to organise and complete these workshops, as a result of which the release of GOF funds is sometimes delayed and the effective implementation period reduced. As the programme enters its final year of implementation, planning is likely to be straightforward and allowing the regions to complete the core planning without these workshops would help to ensure that there are no delays in the transfer of GOF funds.

3. The programme baseline survey assessed some indicators from the Results Framework that cannot be tracked through routine monitoring, not least hand washing practice and the use of toilets. An endline survey would enable progress against the full range of programme targets to be assessed. Ideally this should be conducted before the final evaluation (if any) so that the results data are available as a point of reference.

4. Advocacy for the wider adoption of the CMP-Approach - or at least elements of it - will be enhanced if robust independent evidence is available of sustainable results. The relatively long history of programme involvement in many woredas puts COWASH in a good position to revisit schemes of varying ages, and undertaking sustainability checks could be one way of generating evidence both on the sustainability of individual schemes and the extent to which an enabling environment for sustainability has been created at local level. While there is increasing use of sustainability checks in the sector (not least by UNICEF) there is no standard methodology, in fact they range from simple assessments at scheme level to sector-wide studies, hence a methodology could be devised to suit programme needs and resources. As a starting point, see

[https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/2013\\_wp6\\_sustainabilityassessmenttools.pdf](https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/2013_wp6_sustainabilityassessmenttools.pdf)

## Annex 1. Detailed cost analysis

### Costing and comparative cost -efficiency of COWASH programming

The costing and cost efficiency section of the Terms of Reference asks: 'How does the efficiency (e.g. in terms of unit costs per capita of safe water and sanitation provision) of the CMP approach compare with the other key implementation methodologies in Ethiopia and with international references. How does the efficiency differ between supported regions? What are the causes of differences of unit costs in different regions?'

In response to questions of clarification, MFA stated that" *...It is anyhow recommended that consultant will review the COWASH unit costs reliability and see also the regional variability before accepting these for the use. There is also some unit cost information available for the WASH facilities constructed by others in Ethiopia within COWASH. It is expected that the consultant shall verify these costs with others and assess also their reliability and comparability before taken into use.'*

#### *Qualifications to and acceptance of the TOR*

Broadly the TOR is accepted with these qualifications. Globally and in prior studies in Ethiopia the use of unit costs for comparison is subject to some debate. There are several reasons. First, the components of programming that are used unit costs are derived from the aggregate costs of hardware, software and sometimes percentage shares of programme administration costs. The way such component costs are aggregated are not consistent, thus leading to unit costs that are derived from different cost inputs. It is not always possible to disaggregate those costs nor is it possible in the time allotted for this evaluation.

The primary qualification is to use unit costs, within Ethiopia and internationally, with caution. A second qualification is that while cost comparison among agencies within Ethiopia have been verified by the consultant, some reported unit cost data included in the national unit cost study appears to be inaccurate. There are instances, both in COWASH and in other partner programmes, where cost figures for one project or region are hundreds of percent higher or lower than most partners' reported costs. In such cases we exclude such outlier costs when re-calculating averages of all partners for comparisons. The national study does not exclude such outlier costs from overall averaging leading to some differences with our analysis (which excludes outlier data that tends to skew averages).

#### *Challenges faced when validating WASH programming costs in Ethiopia*

There is relevant evidence detail the context of WASH programming in Ethiopia from studies<sup>23</sup> summarised in a Learning Note<sup>24</sup>

'Most of the VFM studies done in the WASH sector to date are limited to the analysis of construction costs and number of people with access to services. Few examine service levels which hinders comparisons.

Capital expenditures (CAPEX) for hardware (direct construction costs) and software (design and feasibility studies, training and capacity building, community engagement) are analyzed differently across programmes and projects, potentially affecting the credibility of comparison of similar outputs.'

### **One WASH**

The One WASH National Program (OWNP) operationalises the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the WASH Implementation Framework (WIF) signed by the Ministries of Water and Energy, Health, Education and Finance and Economic Development in November 2012 and March 2013, respectively. The Program is the Government of Ethiopia's (GOE) main instrument for achieving the goals set out in the

---

<sup>23</sup> Defere, E. and Paba, M. 2016. Build Capacity-Build Transfer (BCBT): Piloting an innovative contracting arrangement for urban water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). ONEWASH Plus Programme Learning Note. IRC Ethiopia, Addis Ababa. One WASH National Programme brochure. 2016. NWCO, Addis Ababa.

Trémolet, S., Prat, M., Tincani, L., Ross, I., Mujica, A., Burr, P and Evans, B.. 2015. Value for Money analysis of DFID-funded WASH programmes in six countries. Synthesis Report. OPM, Oxford.

<sup>24</sup> Assessing Value for Money of WASH services in small towns; ONEWASH Ethiopia, undated.

Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP). In the GTP, targets for access to safe water supply are 98%, 100% for rural and urban areas, respectively.

Recently OneWASH has conducted a unit cost analysis of water point outputs across types and service providers in Ethiopia<sup>25</sup>. This document, in draft form, provides the basis for cross programme cost comparison in Ethiopia.

Table 1 outlines the water supply needs and projections in the draft national ONE WASH cost study.

**Table 1 Rural water supply coverage projections**

Unserviced Rural Design population								
	Region	Baseline population for Phase II in year 2017	Water supply coverage in year 2017	Projected Population By the year 2020	Served population	Unserviced Population	GTP2 target rural %age	Population to be served by 2020
1	Tigray	3,847,000	66.6%	3,934,359	2,560,563	1,373,796	85%	783,642
2	Afar	1,466,000	44.6%	1,545,951	653,836	892,115	85%	660,222
3	Amhara	17,453,000	76.1%	18,025,467	13,283,478	4,741,989	85%	2,038,169
4	Oromiya	30,113,000	60.7%	32,179,185	18,275,580	13,903,605	85%	9,076,728
5	Benishangul	836,000	60.0%	888,278	501,600	386,678	85%	253,437
6	SNNP	15,992,000	50.7%	16,903,089	8,101,547	8,801,542	85%	6,266,079
7	Gambela	288,000	73.6%	305,292	211,968	93,324	85%	47,530
8	Harar	109,000	65.0%	117,053	70,850	46,203	85%	28,645
9	Somali	4,911,000	66.7%	5,308,238	3,275,637	2,032,601	85%	1,236,365
10	Diredawa(35l/c/d)	173,000	81.0%	188,298	140,130	48,168	85%	19,923
	National		68.5%	79,395,210	47,075,189	32,320,020		20,410,739
	Note							
		Source: WS Coverage Prepared from data from Fig 8, draft GTP II Report, MoWIE, 2009EFY						

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

Table 2 details the projected service needs in the region served by the COWASH National programme

**Table 2 Population projections and WASH targets to meet GTP2 goals**

Region	Projected pop by 2020	Total projected unserved population by 2020	Population to be served by 2020 to meet GTP2 targets
Amhara	18,025,467	4,741,989	2,038,189
BSG	888,278	386,678	253,437
SNNP	16,903,089	8,801,542	6,266,079
Oromia	32,179,185	13,903,605	9,076,728
Tigray	3,934,359	1,373,796	783,642

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

<sup>25</sup> OWP Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning; unpublished study 2018

### Water Supply: Comparative unit costs in One WASH

Several actors are delivering water supply infrastructure through government structures. The following tables 3-5 disaggregate the unit costs for of all types of water supply per implementing partner including COWASH, by type of water point.

Table 3 details comparative unit costs for a dug well with handpump.

**Table 3 Dug well with Hand Pump: comparative cost**

Unit rate analysis for rural water				USD per capita							
3. Dug well with Hand Pump											
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHDCDC	Average excluding OOWNP 2013
Tigray	24	16	17	18		73	14	22			27
Gambella	38	26	53					24			34
B. Gumuz	38	30						31			30
Harari	32	24						13			19
Somali	43	7						32			20
Amhara	21	9		9		73	14	26			26
Afar	43							21			21
SNNPR	21	18		6		73	14	16			25
Oromia	21	11	9	11		73	14	20			23
<b>Average</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>73</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>23</b>			<b>25</b>

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

#### Costing Notes: Table 3

COWASH average unit costs for a dug well with handpump vary from USD 6-18 per beneficiary compared to regional plans which vary from USD 7-30; other agency unit costs range between USD 9 and 43. COWASH costs were verified with primary and secondary data provided by COWASH. COWASH unit costs are generally average to lower than average among different agencies and service providers.

Since hand dug wells require substantial labor, the CMP approach of COWASH may offer a comparative cost advantage by mobilizing local labor for local work, eliminating some of the costs of for profit contractors.

SNV costs appear to be an outlier and should be disregarded for planning purposes.

Beneficiary estimates appear to be a significant influence in estimated unit costs. In SNNP and Amhara, lower COWASH unit costs correlate directly to higher beneficiary estimates that the beneficiary estimates made by other providers. In SNNP, the beneficiary estimate used by COWASH is nearly double the beneficiary estimates of other agencies delivering WASH outputs.

COWASH may have a cost-advantage for hand dug wells, utilizing mobilised local labour at lower costs that labour hired by for profit contractors.

Provincial unit cost variations for COWASH hand dug wells (and likely other outputs) may be rooted in wide variance of beneficiary estimates used by COWASH vs other providers in the same region. For example, beneficiary estimates in SNNP are nearly double that of the average beneficiary estimate used by other providers of similar water point service. COWASH unit costs cluster more closely together with other providers when beneficiary estimates are adjusted.

Table 4 details comparative unit costs for a shallow well with handpump.

**Table 4 Shallow well with hand pump: comparative cost**

Unit rate analysis for rural water			USD per capita									
4 Shallow well with hand pump												
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	World Vision	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHCDC	Average excluding OWNP 2013
Tigray	32	23	24	23	40			91	43	66		44
Gambella	47	41	189						54			95
B. Gumuz	50	40	33						50			41
Harari	42	161	13						39			71
Somali	56	401							89			89
Amhara	28	53	25	18	40			91	46	45		45
Afar	57	50							61			56
SNNPR	28	35	388	27	40			91	42	45		47
Oromia	28	22	5	38	40			91	47	45		41
Dire Dawa		215							38			127
<b>Average</b>	41	104	97	26		#####	#####	91	51	50	#DIV/0!	66

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

*Costing Notes: Table 4*

COWASH average unit costs vary from USD 1-38 and are generally average to lower than average apart from Oromia.

COWASH regional cost variation do not generally correlate directly to the cost variation of other providers in the same regions nor with regional plans.

The variation per capita unit costs in Oromia is likely due to the lower estimate of beneficiaries by

COWASH for Oromia (187 vs an average beneficiary estimate 281 for all other providers excluding WaterAid as an outlier<sup>26</sup>). While this review did not have access to the raw data used to calculate unit costs for this output for other WASH partners, it is evident that the COWASH unit cost in Oromia would cluster closely to the average unit cost of all other providers if an average beneficiary estimate of 281 were used.

In other words, the higher regional cost variation in Oromia for shallow well with hand pumps is the likely result of lower estimated beneficiaries.

In Amhara, the COWASH unit cost (USD 18) is lower than all other providers. COWASH beneficiary estimates are 38% higher (500 vs. an average of 313 beneficiaries for other providers). Higher beneficiary numbers create lower unit costs. If the COWASH unit costs were increased by 38% to reflect the average beneficiaries of other providers, the unit cost of USD 24.8 would cluster more closely with other providers in Amhara.

In sum, a major factor in lower COWASH unit costs in Amhara is likely due to higher beneficiary estimates by COWASH. Even when beneficiary estimates are reduced to the average of all other providers, COWASH unit costs appear average to lower than average among all providers.

Table 5 details comparative unit costs for a capped spring with handpump.

<sup>26</sup> WaterAid beneficiaries were estimated at 66 per well, well below all other providers.

**Table 5 Capped spring water point: cost comparison<sup>27</sup>**

Unit rate analysis for rural water				USD per capita								
8. Capped Spring												
Region	OWNP 2013	Regional plans 2017	CWA 2017	COWASH	World Vision	CRS	SNV	CARE	Unicef Supported Project	Water Aid supported project	EKHCDC	Average excluding OWINP 2013
Tigray	24	14		17	13	23	48	11	19			21
Gambella	38	13	49			43			16			30
B. Gumuz	38	32				43			18			31
Harari	32	128				43			11			27
Somali	43					43						43
Amhara	21	14	11	240	13	23	48	11	15			19
Afar	43	16				43						30
SNNPR	21	12		10	13	23	48	11	12			19
Oromia	21	9	28	7	13	23	48	11	21			20
Dire Dawa									10			10
Addis A												#DIV/0!
<b>Average</b>	31	30	29	69	13	35	48	11	15	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: One WASH National Program Phase 2 Completion Implementation Planning, unpublished draft document, 4-19-2018

**Costing Notes: Table 5**

Excluding the outlier SNV, the unit costs for capped springs generally cluster near the average of all providers in Tigray, SNNPR, and marginally below average in Oromia. The unit cost in Amhara is a clear outlier and is questionable. The unit cost variance in Amhara is not linked to differences in beneficiary estimates. The source document notes that:

‘There is reasonable agreement between figures from various sources and the OWINP 2013 figures except for regional plan figure for Harari and COWASH figure for Amhara; unless good reason can be found then these figures should be rejected as untypical for overall budgeting use.’

In summary, the review does not find significant provincial variance for capped spring unit costs that is explained by any data sources available to the evaluation. The substantial unit cost variance reported for Amhara is likely incorrect.

Tables 6 compares water point construction by province and type.

**Table 6 Water point unit cost by region and type**

Technology <sup>28</sup>	Amhara	BSG	SNNPR	Tigray	Oromia
HDW	1,894	2,154	2,324	2,286	1,491
SPD	2,372			2,194	2,112
SW	8,280	5,889	5,262	5,600	4,870
RPS	4,238			31,104	6,617
Expansion	5,883				2,112

Source: COWASH documents, 18 May 2018; author calculations

**Notes on Table 6**

The FTAT have explained that, in the above table, ‘the variation in RPS and expansion unit cost from regions depends on the size of the RPS (pipe diameter and length, reservoir capacity, number of fountains etc.) and type of the RPS source (spring with gravity, spring with motor or deep well)’.

<sup>27</sup> FTAT have commented that the COWASH Amhara unit cost shown in this table is incorrect and should in fact be 240 Birr. We note this but have accurately presented the data as reported by One WASH.

<sup>28</sup> HDW = Hand dug well; SPD = Spring development; SW = Shallow well; RPS = Rural piped scheme

Hand dug well unit costs vary by more than 55% but cluster around USD 2,200 if Oromia unit cost data is considered an outlier.

Tables 7 and 8 compare water point construction costs in two different woreda in Benishangul Gumuz Region (BGR). Little correlation is found between cost and well depth when the same technology is used.

**Table 7 Bambasi Woreda, BGR: Water point costs by depth when well technology is standardised**

Name of water point	Technology type	Well depth (m)	Well cost per depth (m)
Qeshmanedo Quter 1 Gott 2	1	6	7,456
Qeshmanedo Quter 1 Gott 3	1	6	7,751
Qeshmanedo Quter 1 Gott 4	1	11	4,541
Mender 40 Gott 4	1	18	3,622
Mender 48 Gott 12	1	12	4,360
Mender 49 Gott 4	1	12	4,342
Mender 55 Gott 2	1	8	6,203
Keshmando Kuter 1Gott 3	1	11.5	3,913
Sisa Kuter 2 Gott 3	1	8	6,088

*Source: BGR water point detailed data, COWASH, 2018, author calculations*

**Table 8 Oda Woreda, BGR: Water point cost by depth when technology is standardised**

Name of water point	Technology type	Well depth (m)	Well cost per depth (m)
Belaganda Asho gott	SW	38	3,978.94
Bedessa HC	SW	35	4,223.74
Godere HC	SW	34	6,039.71
Bedessa primary school	SW	27	5,034.60

In a small sample from Gumay Woreda, Oromia, data leads to a similar conclusion that well depth is not a driver of cost variances.

**Table 9 Gumay woreda water point cost by depth when technology is standardised**

Name of water point	Technology type	Well depth (m)	Actual total construction cost (ETB)	Cost per depth (m)
Kere	SW	76	152154.31	2,002
Jano Wagami	SW	56	131130.57	2,342
Danburi	SW	64	138900.77	2,170
Samoniya	SW	72	153715.77	2,135

Similar findings showing limited correlation between well depth and cost per well are found in the analysis of a larger sample from Kersa Woreda, Oromia. No well depth data was found for Tigray.

Cost and well depth data was available for a limited sample in SNNPR. Interestingly, in two Woreda the costs were identical for different wells of similar depth. Identical data raises questions about either a) record keeping or b) contracting. We assume the identical data are related to a fixed price contract during procurement.

In summary, there is no clear data link between well-depth and well-cost across or within regions.

The lack of correlation between well depth and cost may result from batch contracting to achieve supplier scale (thus different well depths may be co-mingled in a single contract).

Table 10 details average well costs per region by well type. As expected there is cost variance by well type, with higher technology water points attracting higher costs. The regional cost variance is also disaggregated by well type so that the user can infer a future cost “premium” by region and well type.

**Table 10 Average well cost by type and regional variance from average**

Region	Woreda	Technology type	ETB to Euro Oct. 1, 2017 (27.75)	COWASH Average	Regional cost variation
<b>Amhara</b>					
	Region average	HDW	<b>1,723.86</b>	1,776	<b>97%</b>
	Region average	SPD with 2m <sup>3</sup> CC	<b>2,159.62</b>	1,980	<b>109%</b>
		SW	<b>NA</b>		
<b>Tigray</b>					
	Ofla	HDW	<b>2,178.59</b>	1,776	<b>123%</b>
	Ofla	SPD with 2m <sup>3</sup> CC	<b>2,043.32</b>	1,980	<b>103%</b>
	Ofla	SW	<b>NA</b>		
<b>SNNPR</b>					
	Chencha	HDW	<b>1,797.37</b>	1,776	<b>101%</b>
	Chencha	SPD with 2m <sup>3</sup> CC	<b>2,067.53</b>	1,980	<b>104%</b>
	Duna	SW	<b>8,753.87</b>	5,671	<b>154%</b>
<b>Oromia</b>					
	Kersa	HDW	<b>1,359.42</b>	1,776	<b>77%</b>
	Gumay	SPD with 2m <sup>3</sup> CC	<b>1,860.90</b>	1,980	<b>94%</b>
	Kersa	SW	<b>6,493.51</b>	5,671	<b>114%</b>
	Gumay	SW	<b>5,188.32</b>		
<b>BGR</b>					
	Bambasi	HDW	<b>1,818.38</b>	1,776	<b>102%</b>
	Bambasi	SPD with 2m <sup>3</sup> CC	<b>1,766.38</b>	1,980	<b>89%</b>
	Oda	SW	<b>5,768.61</b>	5,671	<b>102%</b>

Source: COWASH data, May 2017, author calculations

#### *Summary: Water Supply comparative cost data*

In this study, water point comparative costs are only available for community-based water supply.

Available data shows convincingly that COWASH does have a cost advantage when the water points uses local labour that is mobilized by the implementing partner (hand dug wells). It further appears that COWASH costs for other well types are average to lower than average than other implementing strategies in Ethiopia.

#### **Latrine Construction: Comparative unit costs in COWASH**

The following Tables 11-14 detail provincial variations in latrine construction costs in Phase II by school, and health post or health centre.

**Table 11 Amhara Region institutional latrine construction costs**

Amhara					
Technology	Number of Latrines			Total USD	Latrine Unit Cost (USD)
	2007	2008	Total		
School	13	11	24	265820.26	11,076
Health post	20	12	32	84754.29	2,649
Health centre					
<b>Total</b>			<b>56</b>		

1USD = 27.78 ETB

Source: COWASH data, May 2018, author calculations

**Table 12 SNNPR Institutional Latrine construction costs**

SNNPR					
Technology	Number of Latrines			Total USD	Latrine Unit Cost (USD)
	2007	2008	Total		
School	2	10	12	143,808	11,983
Health post	0		0		
Health centre			0		
<b>Total</b>			<b>12</b>		

Source: COWASH data, May 2018, author calculations

**Table 13 Tigray Region Institutional latrine construction costs**

Tigray					
Technology	Number of Latrines			Total USD	Latrine Unit Cost (USD)
	2007	2008	Total		
School					
3 blocks (10 seats)	5		5	61,362	12,272.49
2 blocks (8 seats)	15	2	17	166,906	9,817.99
1 block (4 seats)	4	11	15	73,635	4,909.00
Health post	7	3	10	61,208	6,120.79
Health centre				-	

Source: COWASH data, May 2018, author calculations

**Table 14 Oromia Institutional latrine construction costs**

Technology	Number of Latrines			Total USD	Latrine Unit Cost (USD)
	2007	2008	Total		
School	3	6	9	91,274.36	10,142
Health post	1	4	5	19,014.44	3,803
Health center			0		
<b>Total</b>			<b>14</b>		

Source: COWASH data, May 2018, author calculations

Table 15 summarises provincial cost variations for latrine construction.

**Table 15 COWASH Latrine construction provincial comparison (USD)**

Latrines	Amhara	SNNPR	Tigray	Oromia
<b>School</b>	11,076	11,984		10,142
3 blocks (10 seats)			12,272	
2 blocks (8 seats)			9,818	
1 block (4 seats)			4,909	
<b>Health Post</b>	2,649	NA	6,121	3,803

Source: COWASH documents; 18 May 2018; author calculations

#### Notes on Table 15

There is general correlation between school latrine costs in Amhara, SNNPR and Oromia. Costs in Tigray are disaggregated by size latrine and when averaged cluster near costs for other provinces. There is greater variation in costs for latrines in Health Posts. We did not have data to further determine possible cost variance factors. COWASH leadership states that ‘the reasons for health post latrine variation in regions is the location of the health posts for transportation of materials and also the mode of implementation of the latrines. Some health post committees give full contract to contractors (excluding community contribution) and some give only labour contract to artisans and the committee procures the materials which minimizes the overhead and profit of contractors.’

Data from Tigray Region disaggregates cost by latrine type. Costs vary by latrine size, as expected, and the cost variance correlates closely to facility size.

In sum, school latrine costs appear to cluster consistently across provinces; health post latrine cost varies more widely.
--

## Annex 2. Summary of Responses to MTE questions

Evaluation Questions	Comments
<b>Programme Design, Management and Implementation</b>	
1. What are the key results of CMP approach in the landscape of water supply in Ethiopia?	COWEASH has demonstrated the value of establishing strong community ownership of WASH facilities, with associated impact on sustainability. Some planning and implementation processes developed under COWASH have been adopted by other programmes including OWNPN.
2. What are the key bottlenecks of the CMP Approach?	While there is strong support for the CMP Approach at regional and woreda/kebele level, GOE has not formally adopted it for scaling up. MOFEC say the main obstacle is that government rules prevent the transfer of public funds via MFIs to community organisations, though a temporary exemption was approved for COWASH woredas. FTAT has proposed a modified funding model via the Commercial Bank and woredas, but this too has not been approved by federal government. Another bottleneck lies with institutional WASH, for which a modified CMP Approach is used; a community contribution is required towards capital costs but maintenance responsibility lies with the institution. Neither the health nor education bureaus have prioritised the funding of these facilities, hence very little is being done in each programme woreda.
3. What are the key lessons learned from CMP so far?	The programme has been operating for some years and learning has been incremental. Learning in Phase III relates primarily to CR-WSPs and equity/inclusion, in particular how to ensure that WASH facilities meet the needs of PWD and how to establish women-led WASH enterprises focussing on sanitation marketing. More could be done on documenting lessons generated during COWASH Phases I-III. Many of the lessons - especially on routes to sustainability – will be relevant to OWNPN as a whole, not just COWASH.
4. What has been the CMP's impact on ODF and community-led sanitation and hygiene?	It is difficult to establish the extent of COWASH' contribution to ODF as the programme does not support sanitation and hygiene promotion directly; instead it provides orientation and training for government staff and communities. The review was unable to determine whether progress on sanitation and hygiene was better in COWASH-supported kebeles than in other kebeles in the same woreda. There is broad consensus in the sector that, following several years of CLTSH in Ethiopia, many communities earlier declared ODF are now reverting to open defecation. The programme has a condition that for each new water point, all beneficiary households must have a latrine by the time the scheme is completed. This is not always enforced, however, and could not in any case ensure that real behaviour change is achieved.
5. Has the CMP approach contributed to climate resilience? Is it adequate or should CMP be further developed to address the climate resilience and disaster risk reduction aspects better? How?	SECRSM is well-established as a means of protecting local water resources, though FTAT has expressed concern that the screening is not mandatory and there are no specialists in this area at regional or woreda level. There is insufficient evidence to assess the extent to which the 378 action plans adopted so far have contributed to environmental sustainability. Such plans typically include measures to reduce runoff and encourage ground water recharge, for example by planting trees around water points and blocking gullies. The programme has also introduced Climate-Resilient Water Safety Planning (CR-WSP). This applies to existing water points and focuses more on water quality. This was a government initiative, but the WSP teams established by government at regional and woreda level are not yet active.

Evaluation Questions	Comments
6. Based on the KPMG Performance Audit carried out in 2017 and the consequent COWASH audit mitigation plans, what are the lessons learned from using CMP financial management system?	Following the audit, FTAT appointed a senior financial consultant to help RSUs implement mitigation plans. The action required was not generally serious and related mostly to issues of orientation and training in financial management. Most issues are now resolved.
7. How strong is the project ownership in health and education sector bureaus in the five COWASH regions?	Ownership is weak at national and regional level. In a context of limited resources, the health and education bureaus are not prioritising the provision of institutional WASH facilities.
8. Is the COWASH III baseline data satisfactory? When should COWASH endline data be collected?	An independent baseline survey was commissioned for Phase III and a detailed report produced. It appears that it was professionally designed and executed. This said, the FTAT considers that routine monitoring data produced by WWTs is not entirely reliable.
<b>Relevance</b>	
9. Is the project consistent with the needs, priorities and possibilities of the final beneficiaries and other stakeholders such as Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education?	Communities participating in COWASH self-select and make significant contributions to both capital and maintenance costs, suggesting that the project is highly relevant to their needs and priorities. Data on water point functionality post-installation is also encouraging, and better than the national average. This said, there is anecdotal evidence of strong demand for a higher level of service (house connections) than is provided by most COWASH projects. While GTP II includes institutional WASH targets, neither the health or education ministries consider a priority at present, and they allocate very little funding for new facilities. As a result, this component of COWASH is under-performing, with only a handful of new installations being completed in each programme woreda per year.
10. Is the project consistent with the Government of Ethiopia's policy, strategy and priorities as well as to the Government of Finland's development cooperation policies?	COWASH III is a component of the One WASH National Programme which was designed in support of the National Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) Strategy. COWASH has achieved a very high level of counterpart funding from government. The FTAT participates actively in policy level debate and informally advises MOWIE on a wide range of issues beyond COWASH.
11. What is the level of contribution of the COWASH III towards the policy, strategy and priorities of the Government of Ethiopia?	See 10 above.
12. Have any policy/strategy changes occurred, and if yes, how should the Project respond to these?	GTP II standards were introduced in 2015 but did not come into force immediately. Amongst other things they have raised the minimum level of service for rural water supply (from 20 to 25 lpcd, and water points must now much be within 1km of the household, not 1.5km as before). The new standards were not taken into consideration in COWASH Phase III design.
13. How well is the project owned by the health and education sectors? (See Q7)	See 9 above.
<b>Efficiency and VFM</b>	
14. Is the Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) and are the Regional Support Units (RSUs) appropriately resourced and able to support efficiently the COWASH implementation?	Overall they are adequately resourced and effective. The FTAT encompasses a range of specialist functions including, for Phase III, dedicated posts to address the needs of PWD; the development of women-led WASH enterprises; and the scaling up of CR-WSPs. However, current funding would enable the FTAT to employ only one national long-term specialist beyond February 2019. RSUs have most of the expected staff though there has also been some recent staff turnover.
15. How does the efficiency (e.g. in terms of unit costs per capita of safe water and sanitation provision) of the CMP approach compare	The review was able to validate most COWASH cost data as accurately reported, reasonable compared to other agencies providing similar services and within the range of international benchmark costs. It also

Evaluation Questions	Comments
with the other key implementation methodologies in Ethiopia and with international references?	found that COWASH is advanced in its internal financial and results data analysis; the management structure has the capacity to manage and analyse cost data at a detailed level.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
16. How well is the Project on track to reach its targeted impact, outcomes and outputs?	The programme is mostly on target now, though institutional targets are unavoidably small compared to other original programme design.
17. Are there any regional disparities in the effectiveness? Why?	Regional comparisons are difficult because the RSUs were established at different times, some building on earlier programme achievements; local circumstances vary; and the scale of activity is not constant across the five regions. For example, Oromia is largest programme region with 360 woredas, but COWASH only works in 12 of them, while in Amhara the programme is active in 40 woredas out of a total of just over 100. Amhara has the highest level of regional government support, and Benishangul-Gumuz the least. However, B-G is an emerging region with limited local resources.
18. What are key problems that affect the increase of institutional water, sanitation and hygiene coverage and usage?	See 9 above.
<b>Impact</b>	
19. How has the project contributed so far to achieving Ethiopia's GTP II targets for WASH in terms of access, coverage and quality in selected rural areas by using the CMP approach?	See 10 above.
20. Who has benefitted from the achievements and are there any groups, including vulnerable groups, who have not benefitted? If so, why?	The CMP Approach is designed to ensure that none of the intended users of water supply schemes will be denied access if they cannot contribute towards investment or operation and maintenance costs. There are also measures to ensure that, where a scheme is developed on land controlled by a private individual, all of the intended users will have permanent, free access to the water point. New initiatives related to equity and inclusion have been introduced in Phase III. Firstly, a stream of work is underway to ensure that new facilities address the needs of PWD. Secondly, the programme is piloting the establishment of WASH enterprises led by unemployed women. Generally, the COWASH projects favour the employment of local artisans rather than large commercial contractors.
21. How has the project contributed to <u>social</u> and environmental sustainability?	Action on social sustainability includes measures to ensure that all community members will have long term unrestricted access to water points developed under the programme. On environmental sustainability, see 5 above.
22. Are there any indications of impact on health/occurrence of water borne diseases?	COWASH is attempting to measure health impact by including questions on the incidence of childhood diarrhoea in the programme baseline survey and (proposed) endline survey. The review team wish to sound a note of caution around the usefulness of this assessment. It is notoriously difficult to establish whether a particular intervention has had an impact on morbidity because there are many causes of diarrhoeal disease and WASH interventions only address some of them. Therefore, any changes in morbidity detected in communities targeted by COWASH could not be attributed directly to the programme.

<b>Sustainability</b>	
23. To what extent do the communities and their various groups have ownership of the construction and maintenance activities of the water supply systems and sanitation facilities?	See 1,9, 21 above.
24. Are there any geographical disparities in the sustainability of the project?	None were mentioned by respondents. The review team has not had sight of functionality data disaggregated by region or woreda.
25. Have sustainability aspects (such as durability, ease of operation, spare parts availability) been considered adequately in community and institutional WASH?	Very much so – this is integral to the CMP Approach. Technology choice is well matched to the technical and financial capacity of communities to operate and maintain.
26. Has environmental sustainability been considered adequately? <sup>29</sup>	Yes; see 5, 21v above.
27. Has introduction of the social, environmental and climate risks screening and management approach had any impact on the sustainability of the water schemes?	Not known at present – see 5. 21 above.
28. How well has the implementation of water safety planning and water quality monitoring progressed?	Work on CR-WSPs is ongoing (see 5 above) but government commitment is reported as sub-optimal. There appears to be limited action on water quality monitoring; there is a dearth of labs serving rural areas and RSUs do not have mobile testing kits.
29. Has training targeted the relevant personnel? To what extent has it contributed to the sustainability of the water schemes?	A comprehensive portfolio of orientation and training for programme actors from regional to community level has been developed over the course of COWASH Phases I to III. It includes a standard capacity development package for WASHCOs. There is insufficient evidence to assess how far training has contributed to sustainability, but FTAT has established quality standards for training and has twice conducted training impact assessments, the findings of which informed modifications and improvements to the training offered. Orientation for regional, woreda and kebele officials often has to be repeated due to the rapid turnover of personnel.
30. Are mechanisms in place to ensure the availability of funds for operation, maintenance and future re-investment during the project and after it has ended?	Yes, though COWASH cannot control what a community does post-installation. A WASHCO account is opened with the MFI at the planning stage for depositing community contributions towards capital costs, and a separate account opened later for an operation and maintenance fund, which the community is expected to contribute to for at least twelve months. COWASH has found that many WASHCOs accumulate a substantial fund, adequate to cover O&M costs though not re-investment costs.
<b>HRBA</b>	
31. Has COWASH III successfully incorporated the HRBA and cross-cutting objectives in its implementation? If not, how should this be improved?	COWASH III operates on a demand-responsive basis and lays strong emphasis on equity and inclusion, though initiatives on PWD and women-led enterprises are quite new, with good practices still being established. There is a long-established preference for employing local artisans rather than large commercial contractors for community water supply schemes and institutional WASH facilities.
32. Are there clear accountability relationships between the different	Institutional roles and responsibilities, and lines of communication, are clearly defined within and between

<sup>29</sup> Environmental sustainability covers land use, watershed management, source protection (pollution, siltation, flooding, etc.), and preparedness for possible climate change –related impacts (especially impacts on water availability).

stakeholders trusted with the project implementation? If not, how should the accountability be enhanced?	each tier of government from national to local level, and at community level. Since the RSU staff are appointed by Regional Water Bureaus rather than MFA, they are not directly accountable to the FTAT. Some programme staff cited this as a constraint, however the review considers the current arrangement to be appropriate given that GOE funds the bulk of hardware investments under the programme and it is implemented via the government framework. Having the RSU personnel on government contracts reinforces government ownership of the programme.
<b>Cross-cutting objectives</b>	
33. To what extent have cross-cutting objectives been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of COWASH?	See 31 above.
a) How is gender and social equality integrated into all project operations?	See 31 above.
b) Have the technologies and mechanisms used in COWASH taken adequately into account climate resilience? If not, how should they be developed?	See 5, 21, 26 and 27 above.
34. Review programme governance in terms of risks related to corruption and integrity that may have been already identified, or potential factors that may encourage corruption.	No serious incidences of corruption have been reported during Phase III. The funding mechanism means that opportunities for anything more than petty corruption are few: the funds transferred to each community are modest and managed in a transparent manner, while procurement is mostly via small contracts with local artisans for single installations rather than large contracts for multiple schemes.

## Annex 3. Mission Itinerary

JC = Jeremy Colin; YY = Yemarshet Yemane; DT = David Toomey

Date	Activity	Overnight	Notes
<b>Sun May 6</b>			
PM	JC, DT arrive Addis	Addis	
<b>Mon May 7</b>			
08.30	Evaluation team meet		
09.30	Introductions with MFA, FTAT		At Capital Hotel
10.30 -13.00	Kick off meeting with COWASH Stakeholders, followed by lunch. To include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introductions</li> <li>2. Consultants give short presentation on MTE objectives, scope of work and itinerary including financial tasks.</li> <li>3. FTAT / COWASH III Programme management give an overview presentation on current status of COWASH III including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress against targets;</li> <li>- Current issues and challenges;</li> <li>- Action in response to 2017 performance audit;</li> <li>- Expectations for the MTE</li> </ul>               Followed by Q&amp;A, open discussion.             </li> <li>4. Confirm / revise itinerary as appropriate.</li> </ol>		At Capital Hotel.  Regional government stakeholders will not join this meeting. Participants will be mostly from Federal Steering Committee and FTAT staff.
14.00 - 15.00 15.00 - 16.30	Follow-up discussions with MFA Follow-up discussions with FTAT including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logistics, appointments</li> <li>- Additional documentation</li> <li>- Process and next steps for unit costing tasks</li> </ul>	Addis	Continue at Capital Hotel.
<b>Tues May 8</b>			
<i>In parallel for the remainder of week one, DT works with FTAT on unit costings. He might also join JC and YY for meetings with MOFEC and some regional stakeholders.</i>			
08.30 - 10.00 10.30 - 11.30	MOFEC, Bilateral Co-operation Directorate MOWIE	Addis	Meeting Director and country desk Meeting State Minister, WSSD, PMU
13.30 - 14.30 15.00 - 16.30	OWNP Co-ordinator UNICEF (or World Bank).	Addis	Co-ordinator is based in MOWIE. For a third-party perspective on sector status and the CMP Approach.
<b>Weds May 9</b>			
AM	Fly to Bahir Dar Meeting with Amhara regional officials. BOFED co-ordinate a multi-stakeholder meeting including representatives of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Water Bureau (COWASH focal person);</li> <li>- Regional Support Unit (including M&amp;E)</li> <li>- Other relevant bureaus and agencies (e.g. TVET. MoLSA)</li> </ul> Begin with presentation(s) by Regional Water Bureau and/or RSU on COWASH III progress, issues and challenges.		Take first flights (07.10) BOFEC co-ordinates as they have signed the Finance Agreement with MFA. FTAT will request Water Bureau and RSU to prepare presentations for each regional visit. FTAT Chief and OWNP Co-ordinator may join this and/or other regional/field visits. During each regional visit, invite Heads of Finance and Water to

Date	Activity	Overnight	Notes
			attend de-brief in Addis at end of mission.
PM	Meeting continues and/or evaluation team have separate follow-up discussions as necessary with RSU or other agencies.	Addis	Evening flight to Addis (19.15)
<b>Thurs May 10</b>			
AM	Meetings with Oromia regional stakeholders in Addis. BOFED co-ordinate a multi-stakeholder meeting including representatives of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Water Bureau (COWASH focal person);</li> <li>- Regional Support Unit (including M&amp;E)</li> <li>- Other relevant bureaus and agencies (e.g. TVET. MoLSA)</li> </ul> <p>Begin with presentation(s) by Regional Water Bureau and/or RSU on COWASH III progress, issues and challenges.</p>		Same process as for Amhara.
PM	Meeting continues and/or evaluation team have separate follow-up discussions as necessary with RSU or other agencies. <p>Evening: DT, JC de-brief</p>	Addis	
<b>Fri May 11</b>			
AM	Drive Addis to Basona woreda, Amhara Meetings with woreda officials		Basona Woreda office is in Debre Berhan
PM	Field visit Drive to Debre Berhan	Debre Berhan	Two hours from Addis.
<b>Sat May 12</b>			
AM	DT departs JC, YY drive to Abichugnea woreda, Oromia Meetings with woreda officials.	Addis	
PM	Field visit Return to Addis	Addis	Two and half hours driving to Addis
<b>Sun May 13</b>			
AM			
PM	JC, YY fly to Assosa	Assosa	Afternoon flight (15.05)
<b>Mon May 14</b>			
AM	Meetings with Benishangul-Gumuz regional officials. BOFED co-ordinate a multi-stakeholder meeting including representatives of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Water Bureau (COWASH focal person);</li> <li>- Regional Support Unit (including M&amp;E)</li> <li>- Other relevant bureaus and agencies (e.g. TVET. MoLSA)</li> </ul> <p>Begin with presentation(s) by Regional Water Bureau and/or RSU on COWASH III progress, issues and challenges.</p>		Same process as for Amhara.
PM	Drive to Bambasi woreda Meetings with woreda officials, field visit Return to Assosa	Assosa	
<b>Tues May 15</b>			
AM	Evaluation team have separate follow-up discussions		

Date	Activity	Overnight	Notes
	as necessary with regional stakeholders.		
PM	Fly to Addis	Addis	Flight 13.05
<b>Weds May 16</b>			
08.30 - 09.30	Ministry of Health		
10.00 - 11.00	Ministry of Education		
13.30 - 14.30	World Bank (or UNICEF, WaterAid)		
15.30 - 16.30	IRC		
<b>Thurs May 17</b>			
AM	Catch-up meeting with MFA Additional meetings with FTAT, others as necessary		At Embassy of Finland MoWIE (FTAT office)
PM	Collate findings, prepare de-brief		
<b>Fri May 18</b>			
10.30 - 13.30	De-brief followed by lunch		Capital Hotel Federal SC members, FTAT and invited BoFEC, Water Bureau Heads
14.00 - 16.00	Final discussions with MFA, FTAT	Addis	Capital
<b>Sat May 19</b>			
AM	JC departs for UK		

## Annex 4. List of Persons Met

The list includes interviewees and participants in group discussions.

### NATIONAL LEVEL

#### 1. FTAT

Name	Position
Arto Suominen	Chief Technical Advisor
Yohannes Melaku	CMP Specialist, Oromia FP
Melaku Worku	Capacity Development Specialist, Tigray FP
Aino Himanen	Junior Expert
Melaku Tekola	Communication and Knowledge Management Advisor
Meaza Kebede	Gender and MSE Specialist
Paulos Basaznew	Financial Management Specialist
Mussie Hailegeorgis	Climate and Environmental Risk and Water Safety Specialist, Benishangul-Gumuz FP

#### 2. Federal Government

Name	Organisation	Position
Tamene Hailu	MOWIE	Rural WASH Sector Head, and Monitoring and Evaluation Expert
Tamiru Gedefa	MOWIE	CWA WASH Project Coordinator
Nuredin Mohamed	MOWIE	Water Supply and Sanitation Directorate Head
Abiy Girma	MOWIE	One WASH National Programme Co-ordinator
Abireham Misganaw	MOH	One WASH Coordinator
Dawot Azene	MOE	
Lewam Abebe	MOE	WASH Consultant
Zewdu Tamerat Sisay	MOFEC	Team Leader, European Countries Co-operation
Etsub Birhanu Degeti	MOFEC	Senior Co-operation Expert

#### 3. Development Partners, NGOs

Name	Organisation	Position
Dr. Anu Eskonheimo	MFA	Desk Officer, Ethiopia
Tina Byring-Ilboudo	MFA	Councilor – Water, Land, Agricultural Growth
Arto Valjas	MFA	Head of Co-operation, Head of Economic and Trade Affairs
Gezahegn Alemu	MFA	Water and Agricultural Growth Advisor
Dr. Sam Godfrey	UNICEF	Chief WASH
Jane Bevan	UNICEF	Rural WASH Manager
John Butterworth	IRC	Country Director

### REGIONAL AND WOREDA LEVEL

#### 4. Amhara Region

Name	Organisation	Position
Yimer Habte	BOWIE	Deputy Bureau Head
Abraham Kebede	RSU	Team Leader
Anmut Admassu	RSU	Financial Management Expert
Muluneh Genetu	RSU	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert
Asrat Kassei	BOWIE	WSS DD
Maru	BOWIE	One WASH Co-ordinator
Wassihun	BOE	Focal Person

#### 5. Basona Woreda, Amhara

Name	Organisation	Position
Eristu Teferi	Water Office	Head
Tadiwos Demssaw	Woreda Office Administration	Delegator
Muluneh Abeje	Zonal Adviser (Amhara RSU)	Zonal Advisor

Fitsum Ebssa	Educational Office	
Haymanot Fekade	Financial Office	Accountant
Lakech T/slassie	Health Office	Officer

## 6. Oromia Region

Name	Organisation	Position
Fetere Sisay	ORHB	Focal
Dr. Mengistu Bekele	ORHB	D/B/ Head
Dr. Alemu Sime	Water	Head
Tolessa Gedefa	BOFEC	Head
Tibebe Telela	OWMEB	
Girma Bayessa	OEB	Deputy Head
Kefyalew Kebede	RSU	FMgt Specialist
Dereje Paulos	COWASH	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
Melkamu Delju	RSU	RSU Team Leader

## 7. Abichopena Woreda, Oromia Region

Name	Organisation	Position
Girma Yadeta	Woreda Admi.	Admini.
Yirgaalam Birhaanuu	Agri.Office	Head
Dagme Abera	Education Office	Head
Gebryes Getu	Woreda water office	Supervisor
Seifu Tesfaye	Water office	Head
Dhuguma Taye	Health office	head

## 8. Benishangul-Gumuz Region

Name	Organisation	Position
Firehiwot Abebe	BOFED	Bureau Head
Adigo Amsaya	BWIERD (Water)	Bureau Head
Taye Habtie	BWIERD (Water)	Acting One WASH program coordinator
Attaib Mohammed	BWIERD (Water)	Deputy Head
Mufti Merekeni	BOFED	Deputy Head
Abdelmuniem Adem	BOE	Deputy Bureau Head
Abdulazi Alboro	BOH	Deputy Bureau Head
Askalech Aboro	BWACA	Deputy Bureau Head
Hajira Ibrahim	BOLSA	Bureau Head
Ambissa Becay	BOFED	Accountant
Feyera Kebeded	RSU	Sanitation and Hygiene
Melkamu Gemeda	RSU	Community Building Specialist
Fekadu Tessema	RSU	
Mohamednur Babeker	RSU	Team Leader
Genet Argata	RSU	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert
Tilahun Abebe	RSU	Financial Management
Solomon Nigussei	RSU	Cashier
Habtamu Getu	Bo	Procurement Director
Bizualem Birhanu	BWIERD (Water)	Public Relations
Alemgena Ketsela	BWIERD (Water)	WSS Directorate Director

## 9. Bambasi Woreda, Benishangul-Gumuz Region

Name	Organisation	Position
Atsebeha Kassa	Woreda Water Office	CMP supervisor
Mohammed Adugna	Woreda Administration Office	Deputy Woreda Administrator
Mussa Atsedik	Woreda Administration Office	Party Head
Sahle Ahmed	Woreda Education Office	Focal Person
Mubarek Asabir	Woreda Health Office	Health Head
Abdul feta Mohammed	Woreda WYC Affairs office	Focal Person



## Annex 5. Select Bibliography

1. Phase III Project Document  
[https://www.cmpethiopia.org/media/cowash\\_phase\\_iii\\_project\\_document](https://www.cmpethiopia.org/media/cowash_phase_iii_project_document)
2. COWASH III Result Framework and Performance Monitoring Plan, undated (updated version as supplied by FTAT).
3. 2009 EFY compiled Progress report  
[https://www.cmpethiopia.org/media/revised\\_2009\\_efy\\_compiled\\_annual\\_report](https://www.cmpethiopia.org/media/revised_2009_efy_compiled_annual_report)
4. COWASH Phase III Federal Level Nine Months Performance Report (07/07/2107 – 31/03/2018), FTAT.
5. COWASH Brochure Feb 2018  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2662>
6. Phase III Inception report  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2104>
7. COWASH III Baseline Report  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2569>
8. CMP and related guidelines  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2285>
9. Documents related to gender  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2242>
10. Documents related to disability inclusion  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2244>
11. Documents related to MSE development  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2245>
12. Documents related to Social, Environmental and Climate Risks screening and management  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/2270>
13. Documents related to the rural water supply operation and maintenance  
<https://www.cmpethiopia.org/page/1347>
14. FTAT Presentation to MTE Kickoff Meeting, 05.05.18
15. Performance Audit of the Support to Community-Led Accelerated Water, Hygiene and Sanitation, COWASH, July 2014 – July 2016. KPMG, 2017.

## Annex 6. Terms of Reference

### Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) Community Led Accelerated WASH in Ethiopia Project, Phase III (COWASH)

07.02.18

#### 1. BACKGROUND

Finland and Ethiopia have long term cooperation in water sector development that started in early 1990s. COWASH project has been implemented since 2011. The first phase was implemented 2011–2014 and the second phase 2014–2016. The COWASH III started in July 2016 (technical assistance project in August 2016). It is currently agreed that the project will end in July 2019. The technical assistance project is implemented by the consulting company Ramboll Finland Oy (in Consortium with Niras Finland Ltd.). The direct support to five regions (Amhara, Oromiya, Tigray, Benishangul-Gumuz and Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples) is sent from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. The Finnish support focuses on capacity building while Ethiopia supports investments for physical WASH infrastructure construction.

The target impact of COWASH III is to contribute to achieving Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan II (GTP II) targets for the WASH sector in terms of water, sanitation and hygiene access coverage and quality of service delivery in selected rural areas by using Community Managed Project (CMP) approach. The key feature of CMP funding mechanism is that it transfers funds and project management responsibilities for physical construction or rehabilitation of water schemes or sanitation facilities to communities or relevant institutions such as schools and health facilities. The transfer of investment funds (grant) is carried through regional micro finance institutions (MFIs). Ethiopia pays the investment funds, when Finland finances capacity building.

COWASH III has four expected outcomes:

1. Increased community and institutional water coverage (GTP II standards including water quality)
2. Increased community and institutional sanitation and hygiene coverage and usage (GTP standards)
3. Increased functionality and sustainability of built WASH facilities through improved service delivery
4. Women's empowerment through WASH related activities.

The budget of COWASH III, agreed in summer 2016 in euros, was recently affected by the devaluation of birr in autumn 2017 and the updated information about the carry over funds from the phase two in the regions. The updated Government of Finland budget of COWASH III is hence € 13 780 237, 13 (ETB 413 407 114), when exchange rate is calculated as 1 euro=30. The COWASH III has not undergone a MTE before; COWASH II was subject to MTE in 2015. KPMG conducted a Performance Audit of COWASH III in 2017. The recommendations from Audit are being incorporated into project implementation. The audit report will be made available for the MTE team after the assignment has started.

#### 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID TERM REVIEW

The Overall Objective of the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is to review the progress of the COWASH III and its potential to achieve its targets through programme cycle (planning, management, implementation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation). Based on the findings, the MTE is expected to make recommendations for the remaining period of the project implementation. MTE utilizes Development Co-operation Directorate (OECD-DAC) criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as applicable at this stage of implementation.

The MTE is expected to specifically recommend, whether the option for extending the technical assistance project for maximum of one year and with the maximum of 700 000 euros should be used and what type of expertise it should include.

#### 3. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE EVALUATION

The specific questions to be addressed by the Mid-term Evaluation:

### **3.1 Human Rights Based Approach**

- Has the COWASH III succeeded to incorporate the Human Rights Based Approach (HBRA) and cross-cutting objectives in its implementation? If not, how should this be improved?;
- How well are different right-holders represented in COWASH? Who benefits first and foremost from COWASH? Who is possibly left behind and why?
- Are there clear accountability relationships between the different stakeholders trusted with the project implementation? If not, how should the accountability be enhanced?

### **3.2 Cross-cutting objectives**

The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is expected to extent examine the success of COWASH in relation to cross-cutting objectives including promotion of gender and social equality, human rights and participation opportunities of marginalized groups, climate change and disaster risks.

The MTE is to review to what extent the cross cutting objectives have been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of COWASH. If not, what are the reasons and what are the recommendations for improvements to be included in to the programme.

- Gender: How is gender and social equality integrated into all project operations?
- How well has the women leadership, inclusion of persons with disabilities and development of women-led micro and small enterprises progressed?
- Social equality: How is the participation of marginalized groups, specifically disabled, been integrated into all project operations?
- Climate resilience and Disaster Risk Management: Have the technologies and implementation mechanisms used in COWASH taken adequately into account the climate resilience? If not, how should they be developed?
- What are the key challenges in empowerment of women through WASH related activities?
- Has the project succeeded to enhance the empowerment of women in communities through WASH related activities? How well is the menstrual hygiene addressed and what is recommended?

The MTE is also expected to review the governance of the programme in terms of risks related to corruption and integrity issues that may have been already identified or potential factors that may encourage corruption.

### **3.3 Relevance**

Relevance assesses whether the intended impact, outcomes and outputs of a project are in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries, and with the policy environment of the project. The MTE should review specifically the following questions:

- Is the Project consistent with the needs, priorities and possibilities of the final beneficiaries and other stakeholders such as Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education?
- Is the project consistent with the Government of Ethiopia's policy, strategy and priorities as well as to the Government of Finland's development cooperation policies?
- What is the level of contribution of the COWASH III towards the policy, strategy and priorities of the Government of Ethiopia?
- Have any policy/strategy changes occurred, and if yes, how should the Project respond to these?
- How well the project is owned by the health and education sectors?

### **3.4. Efficiency and value for money**

The efficiency of a project is defined by how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned. The MTE should specifically review:

- Is the Federal Technical Assistance Team (FTAT) and are the Regional Support Units (RSUs) appropriately resourced and able to support efficiently the COWASH implementation? Are there any differences between the regions regarding the RSU's support needs from FTAT and on how the

RSUs are resourced and functioning? Have the different RSU arrangements had an impact on the efficiency?

- How does the efficiency (e.g. in terms of unit costs per capita of safe water and sanitation provision) of the CMP approach compare with the other key implementation methodologies in Ethiopia and with international references. How does the efficiency differ between supported regions? What are the causes of differences of unit costs in different regions?

### **3.5 Effectiveness**

Effectiveness describes if the results have furthered the achievement of the goals of a project, or are expected to do so in the future. The MTE will specifically analyze the following:

- How well is the Project on track to reach its targeted impact, outcomes and outputs? In case of deviations to the plans, what are the causes and implications, what corrective measures are proposed?
- Are there any regional disparities in the effectiveness? Why?
- What are key problems that affect the increase of institutional water, sanitation and hygiene coverage and usage? How well is the project addressing WASH in schools and health facilities? Could the project do more or do something differently?

### **3.6 Impact**

- How the project has so far contributed to achieving Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan II (GTP II) targets for the WASH sector in terms of water, sanitation and hygiene access coverage and quality of services in selected rural areas by using Community Managed Project (CMP) approach.
- Who have benefitted from the achievements and are there any groups, incl. vulnerable groups, who have not benefitted? If yes, why not?
- How has the project contributed to social and environmental sustainability? Have any unexpected or negative impacts occurred (e.g. social or environmental)?
- Are there any indications on impact on health/occurrence of water borne diseases?

### **3.7 Sustainability**

- To what extent the communities and its various groups have ownership of the construction and maintenance activities of the water supply systems and sanitation facilities? Do the communities have sufficient capacities (human, technical, institutional and financial) for long-term operation and maintenance? Have the communities developed ownership feeling to their WASH schemes? Are the supportive roles of WASH authorities clear and do they provide the necessary support for the communities and relevant institutions such as schools and health institutions?
- Are there any geographical disparities in the sustainability of the project? What are the causes for disparities and how to address them?
- Concerning the technologies adopted for WASH infrastructure building: Have the sustainability aspects of the chosen implementation mechanisms and technology (such as durability, easy to operate, spare parts available) been considered adequately in community WASH and institutional WASH?
- Has the environmental sustainability been considered adequately?<sup>30</sup>
- Has introduction of the social, environmental and climate risks screening and management approach has any impact on the sustainability of the water schemes?
- How well has the implementation of water safety planning and water quality monitoring progressed?
- Are the training accorded to the relevant personnel? To what extent has the training contributed to the sustaining of the water schemes?
- Financial sustainability. Are there mechanisms in place to ensure availability of funds for operation, maintenance and future re-investment during the project and after it has ended?

### **3.8 Programme Design, Management and Implementation**

---

<sup>30</sup> Environmental sustainability covers land use, watershed management, source protection (pollution, siltation, flooding, etc.), and preparedness for possible climate change-related impacts (especially impacts on water availability).

- What are the key results of CMP-approach in the landscape of water supply in Ethiopia?
- What are the key bottlenecks of CMP approach?
- What are the key lessons learned from CMP so far?
- What has been the CMPs impact to ODF and community-led sanitation and hygiene?
- Has the CMP approach contributed to the climate resilience? Is it adequate or should CMP be further developed to address the climate resilience and disaster risk reduction aspects better? How?
- Based on the KPMG Performance Audit carried out in 2017 and the consequent COWASH audit mitigation plans, what are the lessons learned from using CMP financial management system? Is it possible to extract best practices for scaling-up?
- How strong is the project ownership in health and education sector bureaus in the 5 COWASH regions? Are Regional Support Units covering the work sector bureaus should do?
- Is the COWASH III baseline data satisfactory? What time should the COWASH end-line data to be collected?

#### 4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The MTE is to be implemented as a participatory, open and transparent process for all stakeholders including the final beneficiaries. The MTE team is to base their observations, analysis and recommendations on relevant documentation, interviews and other relevant methods. The assignment includes both desk study and field work. The Consultant is to propose the work methods in more detail in the technical tender and they will be finalized in the Inception Report.

#### 5. TIMETABLE AND REPORTING

The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is expected to take place in the months of March-June 2018.

#### 6. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Schedule	Actions
February	Invitation to tender
March	Tender evaluation Signing of the contract. Desk review Inception report (or in April)
April / May	Inception report, MTE mission in Ethiopia
May	Draft MTE report, with two weeks period reserved for MFA consolidated comment
June	Final MTE report

The MTE must provide evidence-based information and recommendations that are credible, reliable and useful to the implementers and decision-makers involved in the Project. Its conclusions and recommendations shall be formulated so that they will be easily understood by all parties and applicable to the remaining period of Project implementation.

#### 7. REQUIRED DELIVERABLES

##### Inception Report

The Inception Report needs to be prepared and accepted by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland before the field work. The report needs to include findings from Desk Review, work plan and time schedule. The Desk Review should include (but is not limited to):

- The Project Document, contracts, management structures, related agreements, Performance Audit and other relevant materials
- Annual Work Plans and Budgets
- Progress and Technical Reports, monitoring reports from Technical Assistance team, relevant government reporting and Development Partners reports, if any.

### **Power Point presentation**

The Consultant shall make a presentation of the key findings, conclusions and recommendations at the end of the field visit. It will be presented in the Embassy of Finland in Addis Ababa (with representatives of the key Ethiopian organizations) with a video link to Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) in Helsinki.

### **MTE Draft Report and MTE report**

The draft report will be prepared latest three weeks after the field mission and will be submitted through MFA (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland) for comments. The Final MTE Report shall be prepared within one week after receiving the consolidated comments from MFA. The tentative outline of the MTE report is presented in Annex 1 of this Terms of Reference.

## **8. REQUIRED EXPERTISE**

The evaluation team can include 2-4 members, including international team leader and at least one Ethiopian expert. The team should have experience in planning and evaluation of development projects, experience in community-based approaches in WASH sector, experience in developing Result Based Management in development projects and relevant experience in crosscutting issues: women and girls, people with disabilities, climate resilience.

The Team Leader will have the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the evaluation, writing of the report, and timely submission of the draft and final version. Detailed responsibilities of each team member should be determined at the beginning of the mission and outlined in the methodology.

## **9. BUDGET AND DELIVERABLES**

The total available budget for this MTE is maximum Euro 59 000 + VAT and this is inclusive of professional fees, logistics and all reimbursable costs. The consultant should present the work plan with detailed budget for the review.

## **10. MANDATE**

The team is entitled and expected to discuss matters relevant to this assignment with pertinent persons and organizations. However, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government of Ethiopia or Finland

## **ANNEX 1. Tentative Table of Content for Final Report**

### Executive Summary

- Overview of assignment and methodology
- Key findings
- Recommendations

### **1 Introduction and background**

- 1.1 Overview of COWASH
- 1.2 Objectives and scope of the review
- 1.3 Methodology and approach
- 1.4 Limitations of the review

### **2 Key findings**

- 2.1 Programme Relevance
- 2.2 Programme Efficiency
- 2.3 Programme Effectiveness
- 2.4 Programme Impact
- 2.5 Programme Sustainability
- 2.6 Programme management
- 2.7 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting
- 2.8 Cross-cutting issues

### **3 Conclusions and recommendations**

- 3.1 Progress to date/Overall performance
- 3.2 Lessons learned and Recommendations

### **Annexes**

- 1 De-briefing matrix with Findings, Conclusion, Traffic lights, Recommendations
- 2 Terms of reference
- 2 Mission itineraries
- 3 List of persons interviewed
- 4 Bibliography
- 5 Summary of responses to MTE questions