

**Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)**

**Evaluation of DFID’s Water, Sanitation and Hygiene programming in Sudan**

**Inception Report**

**Contents**

1. Introduction..... 2

2. Background ..... 2

3. Purpose of this review..... 5

4. Relationship to other evaluations/studies ..... 5

5. Methodology..... 6

6. Roles and responsibilities ..... 25

7. Management and reporting ..... 26

8. Expected outputs and time frame..... 27

9. Risks and mitigation..... 27

10. How will this review make a difference? ..... 29

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.

1.2 We have decided to review the Department for International Development's (DFID's) water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) programmes in Sudan. This Inception Report builds on the Terms of Reference to outline the purpose and scope of the evaluation and identify the areas for detailed assessment.

## 2. Background

2.1 Since independence in 1956, Sudan has been beset by protracted conflict that has contributed to years of underdevelopment and has resulted in some of the most severe humanitarian crises in recent history. In Darfur, one of the two main conflict zones, 4.5 million people have been directly affected by conflict and 1.9 million people remained displaced in 2011.<sup>1</sup> Following decades of civil war, a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed in January 2005, leading to the establishment of a government for South Sudan and its secession in July 2011. While Sudan and South Sudan are now two separate countries, the two governments have unresolved border issues, leading to continued conflict in the disputed areas of South Kordofan, Blue Nile and Abyei.

2.2 Sudan is resource-rich, endowed with oil, natural gas and minerals. The secession of South Sudan, however, where many of the oil fields are located, has deprived Sudan of three-quarters of its oil revenues, causing a spiralling budget deficit and foreign currency shortages that threaten macroeconomic and political stability.<sup>2</sup>

2.3 Conflict and population displacement have hampered the Government of Sudan's ability to deliver basic services, particularly to rural communities. Conflict has disrupted harvests and agricultural production. With most of the population dependent on agriculture, 46% of Sudan's 43 million people, including 57% of the rural population, live below the national poverty line.<sup>3</sup>

2.4 In 2009, Sudan was the world's ninth largest recipient of development aid (at US\$2.4 billion) and the largest recipient of humanitarian aid (at US\$1.3 billion).<sup>4</sup> In recent years, the UK has been the second largest Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) bilateral donor in Sudan (figures predate the secession of the South). Sudan received £31 million in UK aid in 2011-12. This will rise to £71 million in 2012-13, as a result of a large humanitarian programme and then fall back to £41 million by 2014-15.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Operational Plan 2011-2015*, DFID Sudan, May 2012, page 14, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/documents/publications1/op/sudan-2011.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> *Operational Plan 2011-2015*, DFID Sudan, May 2012, page 2, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/documents/publications1/op/sudan-2011.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> In July 2010, the national poverty line was equivalent to 73 Sudanese pounds or £20.32 per month: *Sudan Millennium Development Goals Progress Report 2010*, Republic of Sudan National Population Council, 2010, page 14, <http://www.sd.undp.org/doc/Sudan%20MDGs%20Report%202010.pdf>. Data from the World Bank at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC/countries/SD?display=graph>.

<sup>4</sup> Development Initiatives, *Sudan Aid Factsheet 1995-2009: Trends in Overseas Development Assistance*, <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Sudan-Aid-Factsheet-2011.pdf>.

## *DFID's work in Sudan*

2.5 DFID's *Sudan Operational Plan 2011-2015*<sup>5</sup> was refreshed in May 2012 following the secession of South Sudan. The plan aims to support Sudan during this transitional phase. DFID's intention is to move away from humanitarian assistance towards longer-term development initiatives. According to the plan, DFID objectives include:

- 'A gradual transition from life-saving humanitarian assistance towards support for sustainable livelihoods, particularly in conflict-affected areas';
- 'Peace-building between Sudan and South Sudan; in the East; in Darfur; and between Sudan and its neighbours, including through support to reduce the underlying causes of conflict and the community-level impact by improving access to services and enabling currently excluded groups to influence decision-making';
- 'Increased security, peace and justice; democratic accountable governance; and a reduction in corruption'; and
- 'More equitable and sustainable development through better use of the national budget; the extension of basic services; and a focus on economic diversification, increased livelihood opportunities, and employment.'

2.6 The *Operational Plan* seeks to deliver the following aggregate results by 2015:

- 800,000 people with access to clean drinking water;
- 20,000 young people receive education and training;
- 80,000 people and firms have access to financial services;
- 10,000 square kilometres of land returned to productive use;
- 250,000 women have improved access to justice;
- 3 million people have access to health and nutrition-related programmes; and
- 1.5 million people achieve food security and receive livelihood assistance.

2.7 DFID does not provide any assistance directly to the Government of Sudan, at either the federal or state level; it works through UN agencies and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs). DFID faces significant challenges in scaling up aid and delivering results, as operational partnerships are often constrained by insecurity and government restrictions on the work of humanitarian agencies in conflict-affected areas.

2.8 The security risks and highly challenging operating environment lead to persistent delays in implementation. As a result the operational costs and risks to the achievement of planned results are generally higher than in other settings. The financial and technical capacity of local authorities in areas such as water management and maintenance is often very low, making it difficult to ensure sustainable results.

## *Water, sanitation and hygiene aid in Sudan*

2.9 DFID is committed to helping developing countries to achieve their Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), including on water and sanitation. Around the world, it supports interventions aimed at providing poor communities with access to safe drinking water supplies, promoting access to and use of basic sanitation and encouraging behavioural change to reduce health risks associated with poor hygiene.<sup>6</sup>

2.10 Sudan is off-track on its water and sanitation-related MDGs. The limited data available suggest 61% of households have access to an improved water source (67% in urban areas and 58% in rural

---

<sup>5</sup> *Operational Plan 2011-2015*, DFID Sudan, May 2012, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/documents/publications1/op/sudan-2011.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> *Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Portfolio Review*, DFID, 2012, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/DFID%20WASH%20Portfolio%20Review.pdf>.

areas) and 28% have access to improved sanitation (65% in urban areas and 25% in rural areas).<sup>7</sup> There are wide regional discrepancies, however, with access to water and sanitation at 73% and 51% in Khartoum but at only 27% and 24% in Red Sea State. These figures are lower than the 1990 baseline, suggesting a deteriorating situation.<sup>8</sup>

2.11 DFID is one of a number of international development partners supporting WASH activities in Sudan, including Japan, UNICEF, the Islamic Development Bank, the Kuwait Fund and the African Development Bank. China and India are also active in the sector.<sup>9</sup> DFID has invested £14.4 million in WASH in Sudan and South Sudan over the past five years, representing about 4% of its overall investment in WASH.<sup>10</sup>

2.12 A large proportion of DFID expenditure has been in Darfur.<sup>11</sup> With growing water scarcity recognised as a major cause of conflict in many sub-Saharan African countries, DFID WASH programming also supports peacebuilding. In Sudan, more than 5 million people have been directly affected by conflict in Darfur region alone.<sup>12</sup> The importance of water to providing peace and secure livelihoods in Darfur was acknowledged in an international conference on Darfur (*Water for Sustainable Peace*) in Khartoum in June 2011, at which the Government of Sudan and the United Nations requested international support of nearly a billion pounds over the next six years to reverse the rapid decline in Darfur's water supply.<sup>13</sup>

2.13 DFID's WASH programming uses three different delivery channels: UN agencies; UN- and World Bank-administered trust funds; and international NGOs.

#### ***i) WASH sector support via UN projects***

- The Darfur Urban Water Supply Project (DUWSP) is a £6.7 million initiative implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS),<sup>14</sup> launched in November 2010 and due for completion in December 2012. The project's objective is to provide access to clean drinking water to 450,000 people by increasing the water supply to the main urban centres in Darfur. A complementary project to construct a distribution network in three of the towns is being managed by the federal government.
- The Sudan Integrated Environment Programme (SIEP) is a £20 million programme implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), with support from UNOPS, launched in 2009 and due for completion in 2013. Its aim is to improve the management and use of natural resources through investments in more effective environmental governance. The programme is constructing or rehabilitating a series of dams in Darfur to improve the sustainability of the water supply there. Some SIEP dams contributed to urban water facilities developed under DUWSP. As of May 2012, four

---

<sup>7</sup> 'Improved water source' is defined by the UN as any of the following: piped water, public tap, borehole or pump, protected well, protected spring or rainwater. It does not include vendor-provided water, bottled water, tanker trucks or unprotected wells and springs. 'Improved sanitation' means facilities that hygienically separate human excreta from human, animal and insect contact, including sewers, septic tanks, pour-flush latrines and simple pit or ventilated improved pit latrines, where correctly constructed and properly maintained. *Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals: Definitions, Rationale, Concepts and Sources*, United Nations, 2003, pages 64 and 66.

<http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Resources/Attach/Indicators/HandbookEnglish.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> Data provided by DFID.

<sup>9</sup> L. Attree, *China and Conflict-Affected States, between Principles and Pragmatism*, Saferworld, January 2012,

<http://www.saferworld.org.uk/downloads/pubdocs/China%20and%20conflict-affected%20states.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> *Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Portfolio Review*, DFID, March 2012, page 38,

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/DFID%20WASH%20Portfolio%20Review.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> Approximate spending by DFID on WASH in Darfur for fiscal year 2011-12 was £18.5 million, representing 59% of total country programme spending for that year (£31.5 million). These figures have not been verified and exclude a substantial transfer to CHF (£6.5 million) which took place at the start of the next fiscal year.

<sup>12</sup> *Voices of Darfur*, United Nations Mission in Darfur, June 2011,

[http://unamid.unmissions.org/Portals/UNAMID/Voices/vod\\_june\\_en\\_web.pdf](http://unamid.unmissions.org/Portals/UNAMID/Voices/vod_june_en_web.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.darfurwaterforpeace.org/>.

<sup>14</sup> UNOPS is a service agency within the UN system that provides support in procurement, contract management and civil works to other actors in the humanitarian and peacekeeping areas, including other UN agencies, donor and recipient governments, NGOs and the private sector, <http://www.unops.org/english/whoweare/Pages/Mandate.aspx>.

construction projects have been completed, four are undergoing design or procurement and two feasibility assessments are underway.<sup>15</sup>

### ***ii) WASH sector support via multi-donor trust funds***

- Since its commencement in 2005, DFID has contributed nearly £300 million to the Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) – a multi-donor trust fund administered by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The 2011 contribution was £50 million. Other donors include the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Ireland, Denmark and Australia. CHF funds are programmed through a joint process under the leadership of the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator and implemented by UN agencies and NGOs. In 2012, the CHF had 17 WASH projects for a total contribution of £5.1 million (all projects are also co-financed from other sources). Of these, 15 are in Darfur and two in the disputed border areas.
- DFID has also contributed £27 million to a World Bank-administered Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), which funded activities identified through a Joint Assessment Mission carried out jointly by the World Bank, the United Nations and the Sudanese authorities following the 2005 CPA. The MDTF built or rehabilitated 451 water points before being wound up in 2011. It was designed to benefit half a million people, with a particular focus on improving water facilities for school-age children.

### ***iii) WASH sector support via international NGO humanitarian projects***

- A grant of £9.1 million to Medair between 2006 and 2012 for a project supporting the handover of basic health care and WASH services from humanitarian organisations to local authorities in West Darfur (now complete), of which approximately £3.6 million was spent on WASH.
- A grant of £6.7 million to Tearfund between 2007 and 2012 to meet emergency and early recovery needs of conflict-affected communities in Darfur (scheduled for completion in August 2012), of which approximately £3 million has been allocated to WASH.

2.14 Looking forward, DFID is currently developing a business case for a new water programme in eastern Sudan, which is planned for submission in mid-2012. The initial budget is likely to be £10 million, with the aim of providing 500,000 people with access to clean drinking water over a three- to four-year period. The implementing partner will be selected through a competitive process, with bids expected from UN agencies, NGOs and private contractors.

## **3. Purpose of this review**

3.1 To assess the effectiveness and value for money of DFID support for water, sanitation and hygiene programmes in Sudan.

## **4. Relationship to other evaluations/studies**

4.1 In March 2010, DFID's Evaluation Department published a Country Programme Evaluation for Sudan covering the period 2005-08.<sup>16</sup> The evaluation examined the operations of the CHF and the MDTF. It found that the CHF was slow and unpredictable and therefore was not used as initially envisaged for critical needs but rather for top-up funding of projects with access to more reliable support. Despite a complex allocation process, quality control of projects was found to be weak and monitoring and evaluation poor. The MDTF was found to have been slow to become operational and a lack of sufficient in-country management staff resulted in slow disbursement; it had, nonetheless,

---

<sup>15</sup> Information provided by DFID Sudan.

<sup>16</sup> *Country Programme Evaluation: Sudan 2005-2008*, DFID, March 2010, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/evaluation/evaluation-summary-sudan708.pdf>.

delivered some good results on community development, health and the conduct of the national census. Overall, the DFID Sudan programme was found to involve a proliferation of relatively small and inefficient aid instruments. The evaluation recommended rationalising and consolidating the delivery channels and instruments.

4.2 There have been no prior external evaluations of DFID Sudan's WASH programmes but a number of other studies and reviews are relevant:

- the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) was commissioned to carry out a study<sup>17</sup> of DUWSP investments in water supply to the town of Nyala, Darfur, which examined the impact of an expanded urban water network on the livelihoods of poor households and internally displaced persons (IDPs), particularly informal water sellers;
- the ODI also carried out research on urbanisation and vulnerability in Sudan in 2010-11, looking at the effects of rapid urbanisation on infrastructure, basic services and livelihoods.<sup>18</sup> The study found that the aid community is predominantly focussed on supporting rural populations and has not yet risen to the humanitarian and development challenges of the urban centres;
- UNEP carried out a post-conflict environmental assessment<sup>19</sup> in 2007, examining environmental risks, looking both at the impact of conflict on the environment (through population displacement, poor governance, conflict-related resource exploitation and under-investment in sustainable development) and at the impact of environmental issues on conflict dynamics (including competition over oil and gas reserves, Nile waters, timber and agricultural land); and
- a DFID Internal Audit visit to Sudan in February 2012 included a management audit of DUWSP.

4.3 DFID is currently planning an external evaluation of SIEP, to be completed by the end of 2012. We will take this into account in planning our work.

## 5. Methodology

### *Analytical approach*

5.1 This evaluation will review a selection of DFID WASH programming in Sudan over the past five years. While covering the full ICAI evaluation framework, the evaluation will have two main components.

5.2 First, we will evaluate how well the WASH projects have been designed and implemented to deliver sustainable impact for communities. This will include an assessment of whether:

- the projects are based on sound analysis of conflict dynamics and seek to anticipate and monitor risks of unintended consequences;
- adequate measures have been taken to ensure longer-term sustainability of water supply, both in terms of quantity (taking into account social and environmental projections and considering different water uses, e.g. agricultural irrigation) and quality (including managing pollution);

---

<sup>17</sup> *Pipelines and Donkey Carts: A Social Risk Analysis of Water Availability, Access and Use in Nyala, South Darfur*, ODI, 2012, [www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/7634.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/7634.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> *City Limits: Urbanisation and Vulnerability in Sudan*, ODI, January 2011, <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/6511.pdf>.

<sup>19</sup> *Sudan Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment*, UNEP, June 2007, [http://postconflict.unep.ch/publications/UNEP\\_Sudan\\_synthesis\\_E.pdf](http://postconflict.unep.ch/publications/UNEP_Sudan_synthesis_E.pdf).

- intended beneficiaries and their representatives are adequately included in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the projects;
- the investments in WASH are owned by the local authorities, with the necessary technical and management capacity developed for future operations and maintenance; and
- there is good co-ordination between the different agencies running WASH projects in Darfur, including private sector firms.

5.3 As far as possible, we will also try to assess the level of impact of the WASH programmes on the recovery and livelihood opportunities of conflict-affected communities. According to DFID Sudan, however, the pool of primary data on social and economic conditions in Darfur is limited and we will have limited scope to supplement it through our own fieldwork due to security constraints. We will, nonetheless, compile and analyse the results data that is available and assess the strategies used by DFID to measure impact.

5.4 Second, the evaluation will examine the efficiency and value for money of the delivery channels used by DFID. It will examine the adequacy of financial management, procurement, fiduciary risk mitigation, project management and monitoring and evaluation undertaken by the implementing partners and their contractors. This will include assessing the efficiency with which UK aid funds reach the intended beneficiaries in Darfur.

5.5 By comparing the different delivery channels and partners used in the WASH portfolio and the strategies and methods they employ for managing the difficult operating environment, it will seek to draw lessons on effective programme delivery in conflict-affected environments. An outline of the methodology for conducting this assessment is included from paragraph 5.11 below. This will be further elaborated prior to the country visit.

#### *Selection of project sample*

5.6 We have selected three of the six programmes with WASH components for inclusion in this evaluation: the Darfur Urban Water Supply Project; the Common Humanitarian Fund; and the Tearfund Integrated Relief and Recovery Project.

5.7 Our selection has been guided by four criteria:

- we have chosen one example from each of the three delivery modalities (UN implementing partners; multi-donor trust funds; NGO accountable grants) used to reach intended beneficiaries in the Darfur region;
- the sample enables us to examine the entire delivery chain from Khartoum to project sites in Darfur, which means that the projects need to be ongoing;
- we are able to examine both urban and rural dynamics of WASH delivery; and
- site visits are feasible in prevailing security conditions.

5.8 Figure 1 sets out the projects that have been included and excluded from the sample. We will, however, also seek to obtain project completion reports and independent reviews in respect of the three excluded projects, for comparison purposes.

5.9 Three projects with WASH components have been excluded from the sample: SIEP; an accountable grant to Medair; and the UK contribution to the World Bank-administered MDTF (National) for Sudan. We will, however, obtain project completion reports and any external evaluations for these projects and include the outcomes in our assessment of overall impact. The sample for detailed review covers £40.1 million or 80% of DFID's total WASH expenditure since 2007 of £50.5 million.

**Figure 1: Sample of projects for review<sup>20</sup>**

Name and purpose of project	Implementing partner	Project period	Total DFID contribution since 2007	Share of DFID contribution spent on WASH
<b>Darfur Urban Water Supply Project (DUWSP)</b> To provide access to clean drinking water to 450,000 people by increasing the water supply to the main urban centres in Darfur	UNOPS	2010 – 2012	£6.7 million	£6.7 million
<b>Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)</b> Multi-donor fund for provision of humanitarian support, including maintaining and extending access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene promotion services to underserved, vulnerable or conflict-affected populations and to build the capacity of communities and local authorities to manage these services	OCHA and UNDP	2005 – 2013	£218 million <sup>21</sup>	£30.5 million (approximately) <sup>22</sup>
<b>Tearfund Integrated Relief and Recovery Project in Darfur</b> To meet emergency and recovery needs of conflict-affected communities in Darfur	Tearfund	2007 – 2012	£6.8 million	£2.9 million
<b>Excluded from the sample</b>				
<b>Sudan Integrated Environment Program (SIEP)</b> To improve the management and use of natural resources, including through the construction and rehabilitation of dams in Darfur	UNEP, with support from UNOPS	2009 – 2012	£20 million	£2.8 million
<b>Medair humanitarian response in West Darfur and South Kordofan</b> To work alongside communities and line ministries to exit from and handover the support of access to basic health care services and water and sanitation for conflict-prone and conflict-affected communities in West Darfur	Medair	2006 – 2010 (completed)	£9 million	£3.6 million
<b>Multi-Donor Trust Fund (National) for Sudan</b> Multi-donor trust fund for supporting activities identified through the 2005 Joint Assessment Mission, including the construction of water points with a focus on school facilities	World Bank	2005 – 2011	£27 million	£4 million (approximately)

<sup>20</sup> Except where otherwise indicated, data in this table was either provided to ICAI by DFID or comes from the DFID Project Database. Share spent on WASH is based on projections at design, rather than actual expenditure.

<sup>21</sup> *Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund: Annual Report 2011*, OCHA, 2012, page 21, [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Full%20Report\\_762.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Full%20Report_762.pdf).

<sup>22</sup> Calculated on the basis of 14% of the total contribution. In 2011, 14% of CHF funding was allocated to the WASH sector: *Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund: Annual Report 2011*, OCHA, 2012, page 20, [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Full%20Report\\_762.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Full%20Report_762.pdf).



Evaluation framework

5.10 The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. This has as its basis the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which are focussed on four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning. We have selected 12 of the 22 standard ICAI evaluation questions, namely those from the Terms of Reference (TORs), for detailed examination. These are marked in bold type. We have also included an additional question on conflict sensitivity – that is, whether the programmes are designed to avoid causing unintended harm.

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
<b>Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?</b>			
Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)	<b>Do the programmes adequately address the needs of and involve the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.2.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality needs assessment, including livelihoods analysis and social impact assessments</li> <li>• Level of involvement of intended beneficiary communities and their representatives in programme design</li> <li>• Arrangements to assess and monitor impact of programmes on livelihoods and community dynamics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID analytical work (conflict assessments; governance assessments)</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)	Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of evidence base underlying programme design and choice of delivery channel</li> <li>• Convincing theories of change</li> <li>• Technical adequacy of programme designs, including related drainage and sewage works. Rigorous selection of delivery options, based on evidence of past experience in Sudan and similar contexts</li> <li>• Strategies for building local ownership to fit local institutional context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	<b>Do the programmes complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? Do they take into account the importance of water to wider national development objectives? (ToR 6.2.4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation of Government of Sudan and state authorities in needs assessment and strategy setting</li> <li>• Appropriate joint working or division of labour with other organisations or the private sector</li> <li>• Effective structures and processes for policy dialogue and co-ordination to ensure a joined-up, consistent approach to WASH programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Third party reporting</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
<p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<p><b>Do the programmes have clear, relevant and realistic objectives given the political, economic, social and environmental context? (ToR 6.2.1)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of needs assessments</li> <li>• Quality of political and conflict analyses</li> <li>• Quality of environmental analysis including a rapid review of the disposal and treatment of used water</li> <li>• Clear, relevant and realistic objectives given identified needs and ongoing conflict dynamics</li> <li>• Clear and appropriate criteria for the choice of geographical focus</li> <li>• An appropriate balance between emergency relief, early recovery and longer-term development goals</li> <li>• A credible strategy for building local ownership of facilities and developing sustainable governance structures</li> <li>• A credible strategy for developing local institutional capacity to operate, maintain and manage the facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
	<p><b>Are the programmes designed to maximise positive and minimise negative impact on conflict? (ToR 6.2.3)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of conflict analysis</li> <li>• Integration of conflict sensitivity criteria into project design, implementation and monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID analytical work (conflict assessments; governance assessments)</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
<p><b>Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?</b></p>			
<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)</p>	<p><b>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (ToR 6.3.1)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery and funding options appraised</li> <li>• Quality of business cases/project design documents and supporting evidence</li> <li>• Capacity assessments of partners</li> <li>• Fiduciary risk assessments</li> <li>• Appropriate measures to mitigate fiduciary risk and leakage of funds</li> <li>• Use of explicit value-for-money criteria in partner selection and procurement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	<i>Covered in question 1.1 under objectives and question 2.3 below.</i>		
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	<b>Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (ToR 6.3.3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable involvement of intended beneficiaries in programme governance and delivery arrangements</li> <li>• Programmes informed by and support wider governance objectives</li> <li>• Programme design based on sound financial and capacity assessments of responsible authorities</li> <li>• Adequate capacity-building measures for local authorities and communities</li> <li>• Adequacy of fiduciary controls and anti-corruption measures, including adequacy of management and other reports and DFID's use of those reports</li> <li>• Adequacy of response to any corruption allegations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Project management rules and procedures of implementing partners</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)	Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of UK funding in total programme budgets</li> <li>• Record of the programmes with fundraising</li> <li>• Extent of Government of Sudan contribution to programmes and/or sector</li> <li>• Progress in securing operations and maintenance budgets for facilities</li> <li>• Success in creating a viable long-term economic model for WASH services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme budgets and financial reporting</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner project planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Project reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)	<b>Do managers ensure the efficiency and value for money of the delivery chain? (ToR 6.3.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of DFID supervision of implementing partners in the field and participation in governance and oversight arrangements for multi-donor pooled funding arrangements</li> <li>• Adequacy of project cycle management processes and capacities of implementing partners, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– managerial and staffing capacity;</li> <li>– needs identification and project design and appraisal processes;</li> <li>– procurement of goods and services and methods for ensuring value for money;</li> <li>– oversight and management of local partners;</li> <li>– financial reporting and audit;</li> <li>– anti-fraud procedures; and</li> <li>– monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Efficiency of delivery chain, including the level of overhead charged by different implementing partners and whether these are clearly defined and justified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff and implementing partners</li> <li>• Detailed examination of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– project management rules and procedures;</li> <li>– accounting systems and records;</li> <li>– financial and activity reports;</li> <li>– management minutes; and</li> <li>– reviews and evaluations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of analysis of unit costs and overheads during partner selection</li> <li>• Appropriateness of measures taken to minimise overheads through the delivery chain</li> <li>• Appropriateness and consistency of definition of costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement records and bidding documents</li> <li>• Financial reporting</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff and implementing partners</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of risk appraisals</li> <li>• Quality of risk monitoring and mitigation</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate actions in response to crystallised risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk appraisals</li> <li>• Risk registers and monitoring arrangements</li> <li>• Programme reports</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff and implementing partners</li> </ul>
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	<b>Are the programme outputs being delivered effectively? (ToR 6.3.4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of delivery of programme inputs and outputs</li> <li>• Progress against delivery timetables</li> <li>• Measures for managing security constraints and operational challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visits, including interviews with intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Programme reports</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> </ul>
Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation reviews of objectives and delivery arrangements</li> <li>• Adequacy of management responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Management minutes</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff and implementing partners</li> </ul>



Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
<b>Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?</b>			
Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)	<b>Are the programmes delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of improvement in targeted facilities</li> <li>• Level of increase in access to WASH facilities and services</li> <li>• Equity in service delivery, including measures to target marginalised and hard-to-reach groups</li> <li>• Increases in capacity of local water authorities and communities to manage WASH facilities and services</li> <li>• Impact on livelihoods of target communities</li> <li>• Impact (positive and negative) on conflict dynamics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner reporting</li> <li>• Evaluation and monitoring reports</li> <li>• Consultation with intended beneficiaries, NGOs and informed observers</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors and Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of information sharing and co-ordination between donor and Government of Sudan WASH programming</li> <li>• Evidence of a clear division of labour in the WASH sector</li> <li>• Combined impact of programmes and efforts by DFID and other organisations (Government of Sudan and development partners) contributes to sustainable, consistent delivery of WASH services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Government of Sudan and other donor reporting</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	<b>Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programmes? (ToR 6.4.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical suitability of works, given environmental and social context and organisational and financial constraints</li> <li>• Adequacy of organisational arrangements for operations and maintenance of works</li> <li>• Budget arrangements in place to cover operations and maintenance</li> <li>• Adequacy of community involvement in governance, oversight and maintenance</li> <li>• Adequacy of arrangements for managing conflict-related risks</li> <li>• Environmental sustainability, including consideration of likely future trends, e.g. population, effects of climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• DFID and implementing partner reporting</li> <li>• Evaluation and monitoring reports</li> <li>• Consultation with intended beneficiaries, NGOs and informed observers</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Third-party reporting</li> </ul>
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ownership of programme approaches and WASH services by intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Extent of emergence of sustainable capacity</li> <li>• Extent of leadership by local authorities</li> <li>• Exit strategies incorporated into programme designs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Evaluations and reviews</li> <li>• Third-party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme information (including objectives, expenditure and results) adequately publicised</li> <li>• Increased capacity of national stakeholders to make use of results information to hold authorities to account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme reporting</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> <li>• Third-party reporting, including to the Sudanese Parliament (if access can be achieved)</li> </ul>
<b>Learning: what works and what needs improvement?</b>			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	<b>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (ToR 6.5.1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes designed to facilitate impact assessment</li> <li>• Quality of monitoring and evaluation systems</li> <li>• Involvement of intended beneficiaries in monitoring</li> <li>• Adequacy of measures to secure performance data from isolated and insecure locations</li> <li>• Improvements in national information systems and data collection</li> <li>• Usage of monitoring and evaluation reports to strengthen programme design and execution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	<b>Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (ToR 6.5.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme designs based on evidence and best practice</li> <li>• Appropriate adjustments to project design and implementation arrangements in response to changing conditions on the ground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme design documents</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take-up of international evidence and best practice</li> <li>• Take-up of recommendations from programme evaluations</li> <li>• Gaps in delivery arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature review on good practice in WASH, especially in conflict-affected situations</li> <li>• Needs assessments for Darfur</li> <li>• Programme evaluations</li> <li>• Programme design documents</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff, implementing agents, other donors, Government of Sudan officials at federal, state and district levels, intended beneficiaries, NGOs and independent observers</li> </ul>

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Evaluation questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	<b>Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (ToR 6.5.3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons identified</li> <li>• Lessons disseminated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Documentation</li> </ul>

## Methodology

5.11 While the programmes to be examined in this evaluation are managed from Khartoum, the majority of their activities are located in the Darfur region. An assessment as to what level of access to Darfur is possible will be made based on security conditions at the time of the visit. The evaluation methodology must, therefore, be flexible enough to allow the balance between field work in Darfur and headquarters-level consultations in Khartoum to be adjusted as necessary.

5.12 The methodology will have two main components. The first part will assess the quality of delivery of the WASH projects and, as far as possible, their impact, with a particular focus on the interaction with intended beneficiary communities and local authorities. This will include assessment of the drainage and sewage activities aimed at avoiding deterioration of the facilities built and any possible negative environmental impact as a consequence of poor construction quality or lack of technical consideration in the designs. The assessment will be delivered through a mixture of Khartoum-based investigations and field research in Darfur, to the extent possible given security conditions at the time. The sample of activities selected for site visits will be large enough to allow the programme to be adjusted as necessary. In addition, back-up, Khartoum-based options for accessing data on delivery and impact have been identified in case travel to Darfur proves infeasible.

5.13 The second component will be a detailed examination of the management arrangements over the UK funds across the three delivery channels. It will cover cost control and value for money, fiduciary risk management, procurement, project management processes and monitoring and evaluation. It will also involve assessing the efficiency with which UK funds reach the intended beneficiaries. A detailed assessment framework will be developed for assessing the quality of management of UK funds by third parties. This element will be carried out in Khartoum and is, therefore, unlikely to be constrained by security considerations.

5.14 The evaluation will be divided into two phases: a **planning and preparation phase** (18 June-7 September 2012) and a **field research phase** in Sudan (10-21 September 2012).

5.15 The **planning and preparation phase** will involve the following activities:

- a) A literature review on the causes and consequences of conflict in Darfur, including (i) its impact on the social and natural environment, livelihoods, infrastructure and service delivery; (ii) the extent to which inequity in infrastructure and service distribution and environmental issues are continuing drivers of conflict in Sudan; and (iii) how patterns of international assistance in Darfur have affected conflict dynamics.
- b) Data collection on the availability of safe water in Sudan and the effects of conflict on levels of access to safe water and adequate sanitation facilities.
- c) Detailed consultations with DFID Sudan and its implementing partners on how we will carry out the review of implementing partner project and financial management capacity, including reaching agreements on access to data and sharing of review findings (some of the partners have expressed an interest in participating in the evaluation, so we will explore options for collaboration, short of a joint review process).
- d) Collection and review of project documentation, including detailed information on activity sites.
- e) Selection of a sample of projects for review, based on (i) a material sample of activities at different stages of implementation and covering different kinds of investments and delivery partners; (ii) the logistical challenges of accessing sites in the time available, including the willingness and availability of implementing partners to support the visit; and (iii) the creation of a series of options to enable flexibility in the face of any constraints on access. While the difficult operating environment may mean that a fully representative sample of activities cannot be accessed, the final sample will be assessed for any potential bias and other aspects of the review adjusted accordingly. We will seek to ensure that potentially poor performers do not select themselves out of scope and, if necessary, we will bring any issues to the attention of the ICAI Secretariat for intervention at a higher level.
- f) Development of an assessment framework for use in site visits, to include (i) technical assessment of on-going and completed works; (ii) institutional assessment of ownership and management

capacity by local authorities and communities; and (iii) consultations with intended beneficiary communities on emerging and likely impact.

g) Development of a detailed framework for assessing management of UK funds by multilateral partners. We will conduct a brief literature review on good practices in project cycle management, including identifying whether there are existing assessment frameworks that can be used or adapted. We will collect observations and recommendations on management from existing ICAI reports. We will then develop an assessment framework to be used in the review of DUWSP and SIEP. It will cover:

- managerial arrangements and staffing capacity;
- funding allocation, including needs identification and project design and appraisal processes;
- procurement of goods and services and methods for ensuring value for money, including the use of unit cost analysis;
- oversight and management of local partners and field-based activities;
- analysis of overheads and cost control through the delivery chain;
- financial reporting and audit;
- anti-fraud procedures; and
- monitoring and evaluation.

This assessment framework could be used for future ICAI assessments of multilateral partners.

h) Consultations with DFID sectoral experts in the UK.

i) Consultations with other UK stakeholders, including experts in WASH programming in conflict situations and environmental sustainability experts. We will also consult with WaterAid, which has expressed an interest in the review.

5.16 The **field research phase** will involve a number of elements in Khartoum, including:

a) A review of DUWSP and SIEP management arrangements. It is anticipated that the financial adviser to the team will spend the majority of the country visit working with UNEP and UNOPS to carry out this aspect of the review. It will be based on a combination of:

- interviews with DFID Sudan, UNEP, UNOPS, other funders, implementing partners and counterpart Government of Sudan institutions;
- review of UNEP and UNOPS project management rules and procedures, accounting records, financial and activity reports, management minutes and other relevant documents;
- examination of a sample of procurement processes (the sample to mirror the sample for site visits as far as possible); and
- review of audit reports and any external evaluations and reviews.

b) A Khartoum-based review of the quality of delivery of the WASH projects, through:

- interviews with DFID, implementing partners and their contractors, other donors, federal and state government officials and national and international NGOs; and
- a review of programme and project documentation and reporting, monitoring results and any external reviews and evaluations.

c) Visits to activity sites in Darfur, as far as security conditions permit, including:

- rapid technical appraisal of ongoing and completed works by the water engineer, focussing on the quality of technical designs and the inclusion of and interaction with other related projects such as drainage and sewage systems and their sufficiency to support the



desired level of service delivery, the quality of materials and equipment used and visual inspection of works;<sup>23</sup>

- review of the management of ongoing works and supervision of sub-contractors;
- review of the results of tests carried out by the implementing agency or sub-contractors during implementation, such as tests on concrete, soil compaction and water quality;
- review of capacity-building activities and an institutional assessment of the level of ownership and capacity of local authorities and communities to manage, operate and maintain the services and facilities, including the level of revenue generated from water systems;
- review of available data on the incidence of water-borne diseases before and after the project; and
- consultations with intended beneficiaries and their representatives on emerging and expected impact, including impact on livelihoods and on the integration of internally displaced persons. We will need advice from the implementing agencies as to what processes are appropriate for conducting community consultations, given security conditions at particular locations.

5.17 In the event that travel to Darfur is not possible at all, alternative methods will be used to collect data on delivery and impact. These may include:

- a) technical appraisal of works through review of design documents, activity reports, photographs and other physical evidence generated by implementing agencies;
- b) engaging a Darfur-based local organisation to carry out site visits and intended beneficiary consultations on behalf of the review team;
- c) inviting local officials and representatives of intended beneficiary communities to meet with the evaluation team at a third location or interviewing them by telephone; and
- d) interviewing Khartoum-based individuals with personal knowledge of the projects and communities in question.

## 6. Roles and responsibilities

6.1 KPMG will oversee this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director.

6.2 It is proposed that this evaluation is undertaken by a core team of three individuals (indicated with a \* in the table below), together with additional London-based support. While lead responsibility for answering sections of the framework is shown, all will contribute to the analysis supporting the findings for each section.

Team member	Organisation	Role
Team leader*	Agulhas	Team Leader
Team member 1	Agulhas	Support to Team Leader
Team member 2*	Independent	Water Engineer
Team member 3*	KPMG Kenya	Financial Expert

### Team Leader

He is a monitoring and evaluation specialist with nearly 20 years' experience as a development practitioner. He has extensive experience with both delivering and evaluating aid projects in fragile states and difficult operating environments, including Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nepal, Sierra Leone and South

<sup>23</sup> Visual inspections by the water engineer will include: for dams and *hafirs* (a type of reservoir dug out of the land) – embankments, spillways, inlet wells, silt retention basins, intake, flow diversion, pumps, fences; for water systems – sources (rivers, wells, infiltration galleries, etc.), pumping systems and houses, sedimentation, coagulation/flocculation tanks and facilities, filtration equipment and material, workshops, intake, drainages; and for boreholes and hand wells – material quality, pumps, drainages and generators.

Sudan. He is a governance expert with extensive knowledge of techniques for community engagement and participation. He has evaluated WASH projects in a number of African countries, including recently a review of DFID infrastructure projects in South Sudan.

He will lead the team. He will have overall responsibility for delivery of the methodology and for drafting the evaluation report.

#### **Team member 1**

He is a Director of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. With over 15 years in policy analysis, he has worked for a variety of clients on a range of high-level policy issues including implementation of the Paris Declaration, aid effectiveness and fragile states. He specialises in aid effectiveness and governance processes at all levels, including policy development, programme design and evaluation. He has led past ICAI evaluation teams on budget support, the Conflict Pool and the Pakistan bilateral programme and participated in evaluation teams for the value for money and effectiveness review, anti-corruption review, East Africa education and UNDP electoral assistance.

He will provide mentoring and support to the team leader, including ensuring he is aware of ICAI requirements and processes. Although he will not participate in the country visit, he will support the analytical process and the drafting of the evaluation report.

#### **Team member 2**

He is a civil engineer specialising in water supply, sanitation and irrigation. He is experienced in the design, project management and monitoring of a wide range of civil works, including urban and rural water systems, dams, irrigation systems, sewerage systems and treatment plants. He is familiar with the processes for procuring civil works, including technical and financial bid preparation, tender processes and contracting. He has extensive experience with WASH programming in humanitarian emergencies, including reconstruction of water and sanitation facilities, planning WASH services for refugee camps and sectoral co-ordination processes. He has also conducted a range of evaluations, reviews and needs assessments. He has recent experience in South Sudan.

#### **Team member 3**

He is a Director within the International Development Advisory Services department of KPMG and the lead for the Grant and Fund Management pillar in KPMG East Africa. He has over 11 years' experience in accounting, auditing and financial management. He has been involved in assignments for various donors and international agencies, amongst them Global Fund, National Civic Education Programme (NCEP) Uraia, DFID, DANIDA, European Development Fund (EDF), USAID, JICA. He has worked on assignments in Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Rwanda, Uganda, Sudan, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia and UK.

### **7. Management and reporting**

7.1 The team will present their interim findings to the Commissioners on 9 October 2012 and prepare a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by 16 November 2012, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and final sign-off in the week commencing 11 February 2013.

## 8. Expected outputs and time frame

8.1 The following timetable is based on ICAI's work plan.

Phase	Timetable
<b>Phase 1: Planning and UK-based field work</b>	18 June - 7 September 2012
<b>Phase 2: Sudan field work</b>	10 – 21 September 2012
<b>Phase 3: Analysis and write-up</b> Roundtable with Commissioners Further analysis and first draft Report quality assurance and review by Secretariat and Commissioners Report to DFID for fact-checking Report finalisation	9 October 2012 By w/c 12 November 2012 w/c 19 November 2012 – w/c 21 January 2012 w/c 21 January 2013 w/c 11 February 2013

## 9. Risks and mitigation

9.1 The following table sets out the key risks and mitigating actions for this evaluation:

Risk	Level of risk	Specific issues	Mitigation
Inability to access activity sites and intended beneficiaries	High	Unable to access intended beneficiaries in insecure areas due to security considerations	The methodology is designed to mitigate this risk by: (i) including a substantial component of Khartoum-based activities that are unlikely to be affected by security concerns; (ii) developing a sample of activities for review in consultation with DFID Sudan and implementing partners, drawing on their knowledge of conditions on the ground; (iii) including a series of options within the sample in case access to Darfur is partially constrained; (iv) including a series of back-up options for accessing delivery and impact data in the event that travel to Darfur proves impossible (see paragraph 5.17). The latter includes inviting community representatives to meet the evaluation team outside Darfur and engaging a local market research firm to carry out surveys or focus groups on our behalf

Risk	Level of risk	Specific issues	Mitigation
Safety and security	Medium	Risks to the review team in insecure areas	DFID to provide duty of care to review team, including arranging transport and security. DFID and UN authorities to be consulted on security considerations in advance of any field visit. The team will not travel to areas deemed insecure
Lack of impact data makes impact assessment difficult or impossible	Medium	Impact data absent, incomplete or unreliable	A range of methods will be used to access available impact data, including review of project reporting and evaluations, review of surveys carried out by UN agencies and other international partners and interviews with intended beneficiary communities. The methodology provides that the evaluation will focus on delivery and intended beneficiary engagement, reviewing impact only insofar as the data is available
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Medium	<p>Access to intended beneficiaries proves difficult due to security constraints</p> <p>Access to intended beneficiaries is restricted or managed by implementing partners or local authorities, making it impossible to obtain a representative view</p> <p>Language or cultural barriers make it difficult to understand intended beneficiary perspectives</p>	<p>Gathering intended beneficiaries into focus groups may prove inappropriate in difficult security conditions, due to the need to disseminate a time and place for meeting in advance. We will consult with DFID Sudan and implementing partners on whether this is an issue. Ethical considerations mean that we will not proceed with any activity deemed to pose unnecessary risk to intended beneficiaries. An alternative is to organise impromptu focus groups during unannounced visits to local communities</p> <p>Ensure sufficient time in field and ensure a sufficient range of intended beneficiary consultations to enable concerns to emerge</p> <p>We will engage local interpreters as required</p>

## **10. How will this review make a difference?**

10.1 This evaluation will provide ICAI, DFID and other stakeholders with a view of DFID performance in a number of important areas.

10.2 First, it will be the first detailed ICAI examination of DFID programming in the WASH sector. Achieving global progress on WASH is a key international commitment for the UK aid programme and contributes to the achievement of the MDGs.

10.3 Second, the evaluation will generate additional information on DFID's ability to deliver assistance effectively in fragile and conflict-affected countries. This has been identified as a key theme for ICAI's programme of reviews. The evaluation will assess how well DFID operates in a restrictive security environment and which delivery channels and partners have proved most effective. It will also have a strong focus on conflict sensitivity – that is, whether DFID programmes are based on sound conflict analysis and designed to maximise positive and minimise negative impacts on conflict dynamics. It will consider how DFID assesses impact in an environment where physical access is limited. It will also assess how sustainable arrangements for the delivery of WASH services can be put in place in an environment of continuing conflict.

10.4 Third, the evaluation will assess how well two UN agencies (UNEP and UNOPS) are performing in the management of UK aid funds. A formal assessment methodology will be developed which may be useful for making similar assessments of multilateral partners in future ICAI reviews. The two UN agencies have indicated their willingness to support this aspect of the review, which they see as helping them to strengthen their procedures and demonstrate sound financial and programme management capacity to other funders.