

# **Water and Development: Taking Lessons from Evaluation**

## **Summary of Discussions at the Berlin Conference**



May 6, 2011

---



# Contents

1. Opening of the Berlin Conference on Water and Development .....	1
2. Messages from the Berlin Conversation .....	7
Evaluating Governance in the Water Sector .....	7
Water Has become More Conceptually Integrated .....	8
Addressing Persistent and Systemic Problems in the Water Sector .....	9
Economic/Financial Returns and Cost Recovery .....	10
Outcomes and Impacts .....	11
Improving Institutional Learning From Evaluations .....	13
3. Comparing Recent Evaluation Cooperation Group Evaluations with the Findings of Institutions Attending the Conference .....	14
4. Influential Evaluations .....	17
5. Improving Evaluations in the Water Sector .....	21
Are We Doing the Right Kind of Evaluations? .....	22
Influential Evaluations and Evaluation Coordination .....	22
Evaluation Capacity Development .....	22



## Preface

The overarching goal of evaluators is to strengthen the work of their institutions by facilitating accountability and lesson learning. Taken together, these permit evaluation results to enhance local processes of social and economic development in partner countries. Following the release of *Water and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 1997-2007* by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank (IEG), the Evaluation Department of KfW Entwicklungsbank (development bank), together with IEG, organized a conference for practitioners who had recently carried out or were working on evaluations of water-related activities in developing countries with the objective to foster discussions and offer a forum to exchange experiences among evaluators tackling water sector evaluations. The conference took place in Berlin, Germany, on August 31-September 1, 2010.

The conference covered a range of water-related topics, including wastewater and sanitation, rural and urban water supply, Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM), and governance. The scale of the evaluations presented ranged from project-level reviews to sectorwide water evaluations, and they included rigorous and anecdotal approaches as well as synthesis reports. About 60 evaluators attended, representing the evaluation units of 28 institutions.

The conference built on several earlier events that brought development evaluators together to share their evaluative work on specific topics. In November 2006, the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and the World Bank (IEG) sponsored two events at CEB's facilities in Paris: a conference titled "Disaster Risk Management: Taking Lessons from Evaluation," which brought implementers and evaluators together; and an Evaluator's Roundtable. This event was followed two years later by a side event at the Davos International Disaster and Risk Conference (IDRC) in August 2008. One action recommended from the conversation in Davos was to organize a follow-up forum in two to three years to continue the dialogue on evaluation results for other topics. Another important predecessor event was the May 2010 Evaluation Cooperation Group workshop on water evaluation held in Washington, D.C.

Evaluation lessons and findings from Berlin were shared more broadly with the European evaluation community when KfW made a presentation to the 9th European Evaluation Society International Conference in Prague on October 7, 2010.

This paper was prepared within IEG by Ronald Parker (IEG), Gunhild Berg (KfW), Marlis Sieburger (KfW), and Silke Heuser (IEG). William Hurlbut (IEG) edited the paper. Eva Terberger (KfW) provided a technical review of the initial draft report.



# 1. Opening of the Berlin Conference on Water and Development

1.1 Following the release of *Water and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 1997-2007* the Evaluation Department of KfW Entwicklungsbank (development bank), together with the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), organized a conference to bring together practitioners who had recently carried out or were working on evaluations of water-related activities in developing countries. The intention was to foster high-level discussions and offer a forum to exchange experiences.

1.2 Although the institutions that participated in this event each have unique concerns related to their own management and authorizing environment, the conference enabled participants to explore what works and what does not, both in water practice and in techniques that can be used to evaluate it. The conference, subtitled "Taking Lessons from Evaluation," focused largely on the results of completed evaluations, although experience with ongoing evaluations was also discussed. Key topics discussed included:

- What are the experiences in feeding back the results into the organizations in order to shape future projects?
- What are the limits of evaluative work in influencing policies?
- How should evaluators deal with those limits?
- What have we learned about good practice? What are the problems encountered during the implementation of water interventions, and which goals and objectives are regularly realized?

1.3 The event took place over two days, August 31-September 1, 2010, the agenda for which is attached to this paper. The first day featured a dinner speech by Margaret Catley-Carlson of the Crop Diversity Trust and the UN Secretary General's Advisory Group on water and sanitation. The second day centered on keynote addresses by Norbert Kloppenburg and Vinod Thomas. All three speeches are summarized in this section. Subsequent sections capture the major messages from the conference organized by themes (section 2), a comparison of recent findings by the evaluation institutions attending the conference (section 3), a summary of the panel discussion on influential evaluations (section 4), and a conclusion that captures key evaluation issues raised by the conference (section 5).

1.4 This paper summarizes only the highlights of the conference deliberations, particularly regarding evaluation practice in the water sector. While the paper refers to the findings of some of the numerous water sector evaluations discussed during the conference, it does not attempt to summarize all of those findings.

***Excerpts from the speech by Dr. Norbert Kloppenburg, Member of the Managing Board, KfW Bankengruppe***

1.5 Evaluating the outcomes of projects and assessing their development success has a long history at KfW, and objectivity, transparency, and a systematic approach have always

been important for its work. In 1991, in a major step toward more transparency and credibility, KfW published its first evaluation report that focused equally on successful and unsuccessful projects.

1.6 In those early years, the operational departments provided the final assessment, and the evaluation unit used that information to rate the success of each project. Then, in 2000, the evaluation unit gained greater independence and evaluations were no longer done by the operational department responsible for the project being evaluated. Independence of the evaluation unit rather than outsourcing evaluation is KfW's strategy to induce institutional learning.

1.7 Another feature of KfW evaluation is that it uses experts from operational departments other than the department that carried out the project to conduct evaluations. Results therefore have an impact on several departments, while the management and quality assurance of evaluations remain with the independent evaluation unit.

1.8 Since 2007, KfW has evaluated a representative, random sample of projects rather than every single project. This was a consequence of realizing that the added value of ex-post evaluation findings was decreasing as KfW had evaluated every single project and program for years, including many interventions of the same type. This change allowed KfW to use the freed-up resources for more in-depth analyses in selected cases.

1.9 KfW's evaluation database now contains more than 1,800 single project ratings for the period 1988 to 2008. This allows statistical analysis of a very broad range of questions. The meta-analysis of KfW's evaluation data pool clearly indicates that working in least-developed countries is more difficult and shows a lower probability of success. Turned positively, however, it can also show that effective development assistance today is the foundation for higher probabilities of success in the future.

1.10 Not only regional groups, but also sectors show differences in success rates: in recent years the average success rate of KfW projects trended upward, and the water sector performed even above average. Does this mean that the project design has been improved—perhaps by lessons learned from evaluation? Whether improved performance is a short-term, coincidental event or a trend can only be judged in the longer term, based on more in-depth analysis. One hypothesis that could be explored would be that cost coverage indicators strongly influence the success rate in the water sector. As developing countries have experienced a period of positive macroeconomic development before the recent financial crisis, this might have contributed to the improved financial sustainability in the water sector.

1.11 The water sector is now one of the three main focal areas of KfW Entwicklungsbank. Supported by German budget funds, the Entwicklungsbank is currently financing 270 projects in 60 countries, which corresponds to funding worth €4.8 billion for ongoing projects and programs that are currently being implemented. This volume is complemented by €2.3 billion of partner countries' equity capital and cofinancing from other donors. German Development Cooperation, led by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and implemented by KfW and other implementing agencies, is the

third-largest bilateral donor in the water sector. Currently, KfW is estimated to reach 73 million people with its water-related projects. More than a third of the target population is considered very poor.

1.12 Despite these impressive figures, much remains to be done in the water sector. The comprehensive assessment of the World Bank portfolio in the sector clearly points to major challenges that would have to be mastered in the future. Given that around 1.1 billion individuals still lack access to safe drinking water and 2.6 billion lack access to basic sanitation, it is evident how much there is still to do to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

1.13 The focus of current KfW work in the water sector is on urban and semi-urban water supply and sanitation and solid waste management. As three-quarters of all of KfW Entwicklungsbank's activities are in countries under increasing water stress, resource management and environmental protection have gained importance. Its project portfolio ranges from local, national, or even cross-border water supply to erosion control and alternative means of agriculture to building hydropower plants and establishing Integrated Water Resource Management schemes. Many of the projects have multiple layers that are expected to improve the living conditions of the target population in a variety of ways.

1.14 In Tunisia, a country under water stress, KfW Entwicklungsbank is working closely with the World Bank, the EU, and AFD and is currently cofinancing the country's National Water Sector Investment Program. Agriculture alone accounts for more than 80 percent of the water that is used. Thus, efficient water resource management is needed.

1.15 Tunisia is an excellent example of how political will and commitment are driving forces for successful Integrated Water Resource Management. In this context, KfW has financed major wastewater and sanitation projects and solid waste management projects more generally. The projects include irrigation management, rain and wastewater collection and use in agriculture, desalination of groundwater, construction of controlled landfills, and disposal centers for hazardous and industrial waste. The joint efforts have greatly improved the quality of groundwater and water from rivers, and water use has become more efficient. Furthermore, the IWRM framework is taking climate change into account more strongly.

1.16 Over the past few years, KfW Entwicklungsbank's water-related projects have increasingly been diversified in respect to instruments as well as focus of intervention. Sectorwide approaches and sector budget support were extended and the focus has shifted from water supply toward water and sanitation projects and environmental protection.

***Excerpts from the Keynote Speech by Vinod Thomas, PhD, Director-General, World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)***

1.17 Even in the midst of massive floods across the planet, the world is faced with mounting shortages of water, a worsening trend in water pollution, and escalating environmental and financial costs associated with climate change. While the problem differs by region, the Middle

East and Northern Africa region is the most challenged. Each country faces its own unique challenges, as the water is often located where the people aren't and vice versa.

1.18 Water scarcity affects every continent of the globe. About 700 million people in 43 countries are under water stress, led by Ethiopia, Haiti, and Niger with the least amount of water available. The United Nations calculates that even if the Millennium Development Goals for clean water supply are achieved, 800 million people will still lack access to safe drinking water in 2015. And 1.8 billion people will still not have access to basic sanitation. Sustained population growth, urbanization, and the demand for better livelihoods are contributing to a steadily deepening global water crisis.

1.19 There is a widespread and growing appreciation of the relationship between water and economic development and, as a result, evaluators are giving unprecedented attention to a number of topics related to water.

1.20 IEG's recently released report, *Water and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 1997-2007*, finds that not only the World Bank but also the broader donor community must find new ways to support countries in managing their water resources, and the task for evaluators is not to substitute for expert opinion but rather to expeditiously bring to our organizations' attention information on what is working and what is not. The over-arching challenge is to meet today's water needs while putting in place innovative strategies to address water stress—manifested in shortages projected on the order of 40 percent by 2030.

1.21 The private sector also has a role to play, although the results of private involvement are mixed and its potential is limited by governments' attitude to increased involvement. Private businesses are equally part of the problem and part of the solution. Industry, responding to rising consumer demand and expectation, is creating new water-soluble pollutants faster than water authorities and under-resourced public utilities can improve treatment technology. Compounds in the reservoirs and the drinking water of many cities include soaps, deodorants, pharmaceuticals, and pesticides. More effort is needed to keep these substances out of our water, and better technologies need to be found for cleaning up wastewater. But we also need to give nature more of a chance to help — allowing water to flow slowly through wetlands and marshes can remove many pollutants.

1.22 Against the background that wealthier countries find treating water and preserving aquatic environments to be a financial and technological challenge, imagine how much more daunting these tasks are for developing countries facing the same threats but with more limited resources. In many developing countries, even where water is still plentiful, environmental destruction and pollution have made surface and groundwater too expensive to use. In some others that enjoy a good supply of clean water, it is used inappropriately. Priorities can be so skewed that while cities remain desperate for water, farmers are irrigating fruits or cotton in the desert. Even less acceptable, in some places potable water is used to maintain gardens and golf courses for the wealthy while the urban poor are forced to pay dearly to buy drinking water by the bucket.

1.23 By coming together as evaluators to talk frankly and to discuss ways to cause organizational change, we increase our potential influence. When there are areas where findings overlap, evaluators could be more confident and forceful in dealing with colleagues in our organizations. Evaluators can point out that evaluations of development partners are calling for similar changes. On the other hand, when there are findings that are not broadly shared, all of us need to reflect whether we might not have left an important point out of the analyses. Thanks in part to the contribution that evaluators in each of the present organizations have made, the challenges that the water sector faces as donors attempt to foster long-term development are now more accurately known.

1.24 Mundane as it might sound, improved data collection, better monitoring, and public disclosure are what it takes to trigger action. Citizens are less willing to put up with water pollution if they can find out what toxins are making it through treatment plants into their water pipes. Evaluators need to use their influence to raise the priority of the water-environment connection. Most countries need to address gaps in data and information that would allow them to see their water situation clearly.

***Excerpts from the speech by Margaret Catley-Carlson, Looking back on 50 Years of Water Work: Prologue and Portents***

1.25 Water often is not a priority in developing countries. Government budgetary allocations for water are usually low, and poverty reduction strategies and requests to aid programs rarely prioritize water. People themselves often do not assign a high priority to water. When they have some water, regardless of its quality or quantity, they may prefer to spend scarce resources on other services, such as telephones and electricity. Sanitation is even less often a priority.

1.26 A major problem is that water is not properly valued. In rural areas, irrigation systems run at very low efficiency. In urban areas, about a third of the production of municipal systems is classified as unaccounted-for water. In most countries, customers don't pay enough for water to be concerned with reducing demand, and when water is an input to other projects it is not treated as though it is scarce or valuable.

1.27 Despite all the difficulties of doing so, we must work on water. It is too important to ignore. Water tables are declining, important rivers no longer reach the sea, critical aquatic species are in peril, and deltas and wetlands are disappearing. Most importantly for the poor—and for achievement of the Millennium Development Goals—vast numbers of families have no consistent access to freshwater and many more lack sanitation.

1.28 Water's impact on poverty is profound. The poor spend a much larger portion of their income on water than wealthier households do. Moreover, the poor are the most affected by the lack of systems, due to water-borne illnesses, for example, they lose working days and jeopardize production. Women are particularly disadvantaged by the lack of attention to water.

1.29 Water projects are surrounded by tough management issues. For example, the politics of water pricing usually lead to a situation where politicians are unwilling to allow water tariffs to reach financially sustainable levels. Ethnic and social status issues also play a part in water management, not to mention the irremediable conflict between pastoralists and farmers. For urban projects, people living in poor neighborhoods are unlikely to get national support. Corruption is also a problem, and project design or execution judgments may be being skewed by its impacts. Yet corruption is not adequately covered in most evaluation reports.

1.30 Water projects may find it difficult to try and change local systems of politics or social stratification, but they may not work if they do not try. New water projects that create local organizations to run them often offer communities their first introduction to participation. Development projects are destined to fail when satisfactory performance is judged according to unrealistic assumptions about the possibilities and merits of participation. It is not that we should never do water projects, but there are very real obstacles to success.

1.31 Integrated resource management greatly complicates water management. When we expand the water focus, we also expand the problems. When we use IWRM we expect cross-sectoral management among sectors that probably are not adequately managed now. The problem is further exacerbated when we lift those same expectations to water basin management. At the international level, the problem is still more complex: nations need some measure of internal coordination to be able to coordinate issues across borders.

1.32 Can we expect water system managers to be willing and able to tackle the really tough issues? Conflicts and management issues that arise over water projects may simply demand too much from community management and may be overburdening communities with matters they can't deal with. When something goes wrong with water service delivery, for whatever reason, people stop paying. None of the service problems may be insurmountable, but who will fix the broken links and persuade the community to resume payments? Who can control the whole process well enough to catch the problems in a timely fashion and correct them? Community participation appears to be a necessary but not a sufficient condition. It is essentially a group decision-making process which we hope will bind individual decision-makers. But do rural people really differ that much from urban dwellers that we can expect them to assume a role that we don't expect of urban dwellers?

1.33 The role of the donors is to help communities with what they most need and are most willing to work for. Providing adequate and well-targeted technical assistance before an agreement is reached on a major investment program is essential where institutional capacity is weak. Evaluators need to ascertain whether the project structure recognized this, and whether project timelines allowed this kind of preparatory work. Donors need to be prepared to provide project assistance until local village groups can independently handle preconstruction activity (developing rules, for example), construction monitoring and supervision, management, and operation and maintenance. Arrangements must be made to support the local group until it can perform all its functions without assistance.

1.34 As evaluators we need to recognize that removing the ostensible causes of failure does not equal success. We need to be harder on ourselves, evaluating why lessons learned are not applied. We should look at relevance more carefully, evaluating the extent to which the existing project model may or may not suit water delivery projects—and especially whether the balance between engineering/technology and community and institutional growth was appropriate. And lastly, we really need to force ourselves to evaluate whether the project was really a priority for the community served.

## **2. Messages from the Berlin Conversation**

2.1 The messages from the conference “Water and Development: Taking Lessons from Evaluations” relate to both evaluation (applicable to other sectors) and to good practice in the water sector (which may also have implications for evaluators). Since these two types of messages are so intertwined, they are presented together and are organized by major themes. This section reviews key points made by speakers, discussants, and conference participants during the various sessions that identified challenges associated with implementing water interventions and evaluating them effectively.

### **EVALUATING GOVERNANCE IN THE WATER SECTOR**

2.2 Institutional weaknesses are a major constraint on progress in the water sector, yet hard evidence on institutional issues is often lacking in evaluations. Evaluators have had a hard time confronting governance and related institutional issues for a number of reasons. For example, legal help may be needed to find a way to evaluate more dynamically the impact of legal reform. Among the questions to explore in such an evaluation would be: does having an independent judiciary and equitable law enforcement have an impact on the effectiveness of water law reform, cross-sectoral reform, and what we are getting from projects? Some examples of evaluable governance interventions mentioned were efforts to combat corruption, promote democracy, ensure fair elections, increase civic participation, and improve public services.

2.3 Rigorous impact evaluation of interventions that look at governance topics prove challenging because interventions tend to be complex, combining several activities. Also there is often homogeneous and widespread coverage (think laws or institutional reforms) of interventions where there is a shortage of reliable baseline and longitudinal data. Furthermore, and probably the biggest impediment to rigorous impact evaluation, an appropriate control group is missing. Adding to the evaluation challenges, such projects also are almost always politically sensitive and thus difficult to execute.

2.4 Some presenters noted that looking at governance is a necessary part of focusing on the sustainability and replicability of development assistance, for example, the cultural/institutional changes that are integral to good governance. A key challenge facing evaluators may be to do more evaluations focusing on governance issues, and these efforts should include policy changes (and their operationalization) at national level. Even if it is

often unrealistic to aim at applying methods of rigorous impact evaluation in this setting, this does not imply that evaluation results of a softer nature are less valuable. On the contrary, applying a wide range of methods and being innovative in evaluation is advisable to collect every clue on what works and what doesn't in the institutional sphere, which is recognized as one of the main drivers of development success, not only in the water sector.

## **WATER HAS BECOME MORE CONCEPTUALLY INTEGRATED**

2.5 Although the multi-faceted nature of water projects and their impact has become increasingly recognized, it is not always reflected adequately in evaluation. How evaluators go about defining the scope of their evaluation and how they deal with the integrated nature of almost any water-related intervention is central to what they find: The results of an evaluation that simply focuses on whether the project aim of sustainable access to water was achieved in the project area can be very different from a basin-wide evaluation, taking into account effects on other sectors like agriculture or electricity, problems of water scarcity and climate change, or disputes over water rights.

2.6 To make evaluation results more valid, it seems necessary not only to look at the wider scope but also to document whether, where, and how boundaries were transcended. There are at least two issues here. First, how do evaluators measure progress on integration across sectors, because water is water, energy, food, climate change, and so on. Second, water scarcity, providing access to water and access to sanitation, and water pollution are interrelated, but they are also divorced one from another, and at certain times and places they are antithetical. Measuring integration and how geographical and disciplinary boundaries are transcended may require the development of new evaluative tools.

2.7 Climate change, water stress, degradation of water resources, and rising demand all make the evaluation of sustainability more difficult. Monitoring is still not sufficiently based on empirical data. Raising the priority of the water-environment connection will require governments in many countries to address those gaps in data and information that are preventing them from seeing their water situation clearly, especially regarding the available supply and the risks to which it is subject. Evaluations and case studies show that public disclosure based on credible work has triggered effective action. Citizens are far less willing to put up with water pollution once they find out what toxins are making it through treatment plants into their water pipes.

2.8 A comprehensive approach to water resource management views water as a single resource with competing uses and interlinkages with the ecological, social, and economic systems. While each agency has its own acronym for this sort of comprehensive water integration (AWM, AWE, IWRM, etc.) project appraisal, implementation, and execution now routinely deal with the social, environmental, and economic aspects, and with the hydrological context, including downstream and upstream impacts. For evaluators not to approach water sector evaluations in an equally complex manner is a source of failure. When evaluating projects that address resource management, not only the logic of change should be considered but also the sequencing: were the right things done? *And*, were they done at the right time?

2.9 Higher awareness on the part of intervention designers and evaluators about the integrated nature of water does not imply, however, that the above-mentioned problem of defining and measuring progress in an integrated way, across sectors, across regions, and even across time, is solved. Innovation is called for, even if it is only to contribute to the more modest evaluation aim of judging whether the water sector is developing in the right direction.

### **ADDRESSING PERSISTENT AND SYSTEMIC PROBLEMS IN THE WATER SECTOR**

2.10 While many water sector evaluations have shown that donors are successful at building water infrastructure, the often complex problems in the sector are rarely addressed or overcome. Too often water supply is still provided without sewage disposal and irrigation without drainage because the impact of no drainage takes time to show up. Other examples of challenges that persist despite donors' best efforts include water scarcity, water demand management, conflicts of interest between different water users, such as agriculture, industries, and domestic usage, or the effects of climate change on the water situation in the country or region. Some of the factors responsible for this persistence are easy to detect, but difficult to tackle:

- Institutional changes require the involvement of all stakeholders and some amount of consensus-building. The challenging nature of both these tasks makes projects that take a broader perspective more prone to failure.
- Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), a concept that shifts projects to a more multisectoral approach, is complex, and its acceptance by the more powerful decision-makers and government agencies takes a great deal longer than desirable (sometimes decades), something that is not conducive to the project cycle of various donors.

2.11 As the water situation in many countries and regions deteriorates, and the challenges in the water sector become increasingly fraught and complex, finding solutions has become ever more urgent. Hence, the simple linear causality chains that are applied today need to be adapted and replaced by impact chains that take the complex nature of the sector and the local context more into account. This requires that sector guidelines be reviewed and harmonized with guidelines from other sectors, such as agriculture, health, environmental protection, or energy.

2.12 The challenges of the sector also require that the most pressing of them need to be addressed first, even if the tasks involved are difficult. For evaluation, taking this broader perspective implies that fewer project-specific evaluations are needed. Not even sectorwide analyses and synthetic reviews can grasp all water-related issues. Multisectoral evaluations of water-related interventions might offer additional insights. Suggestions for improvement include:

- More complex and realistic causality chains that take the local context into account need to be developed.
- Intervention designs should leave room for longer-term approaches.

- Water sector evaluations need to be broadened to respond to the multisectoral challenges of the water sector.

## **ECONOMIC/FINANCIAL RETURNS AND COST RECOVERY**

2.13 Although the financial sustainability of water sector projects is a longstanding problem, there is still too little information on the issue.

2.14 Evaluations in the water sector have shown for years that achieving full-cost coverage is not only challenging but often nearly impossible. Leaving aside the original cost of the infrastructure, even the recovery of operating costs is very difficult to attain in many countries. Of course, a number of potential reasons for this ongoing problem can be found. For instance:

- The incentives offered to water service providers are often insufficient relative to the ease with which public subsidies can be mobilized.
- Political support for cost recovery is often lacking.
- Often there is no higher-level interest in the water sector.
- Service areas for water service providers in some countries have been defined politically and not according to economic considerations (if the average income of the served population is too low, water consumption levels will be low, as will the users' ability to pay). Also when cross-subsidization of low-income users is intended, there must be enough better-off users with higher consumption levels to generate the subsidy.
- Users often are unwilling to pay the fees charged by the providers, especially when service interruptions are more the norm than the exception. As Margaret Catley-Carlson told the conference "Donors love water, beneficiaries not quite as much."

2.15 The effects of an intervention on the financial sustainability may be different at the project and sectoral levels. When evaluating a project, it may be important to measure the impact of the project on the water sector of the country and not only the impact of a project on the population that is directly affected by it. Donor financing for even a very good project can slow down sector progress in the country if it does not also address what is happening with water sector financing at the national level.

2.16 Positive experiences with commercialization of water utilities in the urban sector were presented as well; sometimes these were accompanied by a benchmarking system. Notwithstanding, conference participants noted that some improvements in the coverage of costs are a function of improvements of the country's macroeconomic situation.

2.17 For the rural sector, equally positive evidence was presented concerning community participation in WSS system design even if that implies that donors cannot focus their efforts simply on easy-to-implement infrastructure in relatively uncomplicated contexts.

2.18 One modality presented channels funds through a local private financing institution directly to communities, which are themselves responsible for constructing the wells and conducting the tendering process for the materials. According to an ex-post analysis

conducted in 2010, the approach has clearly led to higher cost efficiency, a faster pace of construction, and more sustainable results. While the strategy may be a tool for reducing corruption and building capacity, lukewarm government support constrains broader implementation.

2.19 Interventions that responded to the actual demand of the stakeholders (that is, they took the time to ascertain carefully what needs and affordability might be) generally had more positive results. Some evaluations showed that water user groups feel more responsible for systems that have been designed as they specifically requested them. Having them file applications that specify their requirements ensures coherence with community norms, and a well-managed community involvement process during design can be a success factor with respect to sustainability.

2.20 Hence, from the evaluators' perspective, providing incentives for participation in systems design so the projects can take the preferences of the beneficiaries more into account is good practice and should be applied more widely. However, care needs to be taken that preferences are clearly tied to tariffs in the users' minds, to prevent installation of the most expensive and elaborated technologies where smaller-scale interventions are more likely to succeed. Piped water and household connections, for instance, may not be a suitable option for all contexts. And evaluations suggest that longer-term involvements are necessary to change attitudes and behavior enough to improve cost coverage.

2.21 Despite some positive experience driven by commercialization in urban settings, well-designed incentives, and active stakeholder participation in system design, the cost coverage challenge is likely to persist, and donors should also think about reducing expectations with regard to cost recovery targets in the light of experience, which shows clearly that achieving full cost coverage rarely happens

## **OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS**

2.22 When projects are evaluated their results are usually assessed physically. That is, how many connections were built? How many cubic meters of water could be mobilized? But just measuring things that are that easy to count and measure is not enough because it allows evaluators to lose sight of the issue that *people* need water—and just increasing the amount of water going into a piped system does not mean that the people at the far reaches of the system actually receive more and safer water. Workshop participants stressed that what is important to measure is the use of water by the beneficiaries, not just the physical improvement of infrastructure.

2.23 An important area where progress has been made in measuring impact on beneficiaries' livelihoods is health benefits of improved water supply and sanitation. Experience with impact evaluation in the recent years has shown that the usually presumed and expected health benefits of simple interventions in the water sector, especially in the context of water supply, are often lower than expected or even missing altogether. While existing impact evaluation results have called this type of benefit into question, too often

there is simply no data to check for health benefits, even when projects' relevance is regularly justified by positive expected impacts in this area.

2.24 The reasons for missing health benefits that were mentioned are diverse.

- First, knowledge about adequate hygiene behavior in the household may not be sufficient for achieving health benefits through providing clean water. For instance, if water is not stored safely, it is more or less irrelevant whether the water is clean at the source. Similar examples would be whether household members regularly wash their hands or safely dispose of their garbage.
- Second, even if good water infrastructure is provided in rural areas, there may be too many users per clean water source, which can also limit potentially positive effects; for example, due to long queues and users switching back to or mixing with unsafe sources.
- Third, users may still prefer to use traditional water sources such as rivers or lakes—and especially rainwater in the rainy seasons—if their willingness-to-pay for clean water is lower than the price charged. The willingness-to-pay can of course also be negatively influenced by long waiting time, bad water quality, or limited knowledge about the potentially positive effects of clean water.
- Fourth, in water-scarce areas water supply may be too unreliable for health effects to materialize. This is even true for urban piped systems because unreliable water supply implies the need for storage or supply from mixed sources, accompanied by well-known hygiene problems.
- And fifth, one reason may be that only water supply is improved while sanitation remains inadequate, which then undermines the positive effects of safe water.

2.25 Even though evaluation has made progress in measuring impact on beneficiaries and many reasons for the missing health benefits were uncovered, evaluation gaps concerning the outcomes and impacts remain even for simple and often-used impact chains in water supply and sanitation. For instance:

- Knowledge about the economic benefits of access to improved water sources is still limited. Reports of time savings are more common, at least in rural areas. But even if evaluations find time-savings effects, it is not clear what households do with this additional time, that is, whether they use it for productive work, for education, or for leisure.
- Knowledge on the outcomes of latrine use is still a fairly blank spot in the evaluation landscape as well. More evidence is needed on the actual usage of latrines before potential impacts can be examined.

2.26 Despite these caveats and for the reasons mentioned above, integrated program designs are called for. This means that water supply measures should be combined with sanitation improvements and, if the knowledge about hygiene behavior is still wanting, with hygiene education. However, donor support for (small-scale) sanitation has been low in the past and big investments, such as building large treatment plants, seem to be preferred. From

the perspective of the evaluators this should be reconsidered, and integrated designs should be pushed more intensely in the future.

2.27 More integrated program designs, even if it is only in the narrow sense of combining water supply, sanitation, and hygiene interventions, go along with greater difficulties to measure the contribution of single components and, perhaps even more importantly, the contribution of single donors. This problem obviously increases exponentially if a cross-sectoral or cross-regional perspective is applied. For accountability reasons, however, most donor agencies would prefer their evaluators to measure the impact of the projects that their institution is financing. It appears necessary to raise awareness that in a world where access to water and access to sanitation as well as water scarcity, ecological problems, and climate change are the subject of very high-level global discussions, policies, and targets, it might make less sense—or even be impossible—for evaluation departments to report on the segregated impact of their institutions' projects in this area.

2.28 All ambitions to measure outcomes and impacts, be it in a segregated or integrated way, fail if the data are not available. In selected cases, an adequate database can be created ex post, but this is usually rather costly. The quality of evaluations could benefit greatly if functioning monitoring systems were in place. Unfortunately, monitoring systems at the project level and the national level are weak in many partner countries, even leading to difficulties in assessing the actual number of functioning water supply and sanitation systems. Speakers called for more support for the development of comprehensive monitoring systems that provide adequate information about sector progress and efficiency.

## **IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING FROM EVALUATIONS**

2.29 Evaluation results are not as widely applied and incorporated into the designs of new projects to the degree evaluators desire. The reasons for this, and what might be done about it, were discussed during the conference, and there was convergence on the need for more homogeneity. The high number of evaluations in the water sector that all use their own concepts, indicators, methods, impact chains, and formats is not conducive for developing overarching lessons that could be incorporated into project designs.

2.30 Several presenters noted that water objectives too often are not quantified or are poorly defined and hard to measure. They were supported by the IEG presentation and the ECG paper that noted that water strategies tend not to quantify aims and benchmarks. Evaluators need to be more critical when they are asked to review corporate intentions in the water sector and need to push for goals tied to measurable results. Evaluators need to build on each others' successes in this regard.

2.31 To improve practice it is imperative that common indicators and harmonized impact chains be developed as this would facilitate the development of overarching lessons learned and synthetic reviews. The same holds for impact evaluations, which also rely on specific causality chains. For those too, methods need to be further standardized. Furthermore, it is important to put more effort into learning about the results of others and building on them. A regular exchange of evaluation results can help.

2.32 Recommendations that tell the users of evaluation what to do or not to do might put potential users off and carry the danger of supporting the unpleasant picture of an evaluator as “know-it-all.” Evaluations that have developed lessons jointly with the recipients of the evaluation have found that approach helps to improve the uptake of the lessons. The process facilitated the identification of stakeholders with the evaluation, and its results and led to a better incorporation of the results into sector concepts and project designs.

2.33 Evaluations should focus their efforts more on what worked instead of what went wrong. Even though it is an important aspect of evaluation to highlight what went wrong within specific projects, the staff that design and implement projects are generally more interested in learning about successful approaches, which can then be applied in other settings as well.

2.34 Additionally, more effort needs to be put on how evaluation results are communicated. It is imperative that the communication of results is targeted to the appropriate audience. Within communication it is clear that evaluation departments have to think about how they can better target their messages to the different audiences they want to address.

### **3. Comparing Recent Evaluation Cooperation Group Evaluations with the Findings of Institutions Attending the Conference**

3.1 At the close of the conference, and following a presentation on the findings of recent multilateral evaluations, a summary of the results of those evaluations (as identified by a paper discussed at the May 24, 2010, meeting of the Evaluation Cooperation Group [ECG]) were distributed to the conferees. They were asked to fill in a questionnaire indicating whether their recent water evaluations led them to support the conclusions identified. Six bilateral organizations sent in their results. A few individuals also filled out the questionnaire based on their personal experience. For the purpose of the institutional comparison presented in this section, these individual responses were not included.

3.2 The table below illustrates the level of agreement between ECG members’ findings and participants in the Berlin conference, in descending order to show where there is most agreement. It should not be concluded that lower levels of agreement represent a strong difference in opinions; however, as in some cases it may only reflect that some donors did not study this particular topic area.

3.3 In general, evaluators from both types of organization were found to have a fairly large overlap in their assessments and opinions. Interestingly, they unanimously found great value in getting together to discuss evaluation results and methods. A call for more evaluator cooperation, such as was provided for in Berlin, received a high level of support from both groups.

	<i>ECG Members</i>	<i>Berlin Conference Participants</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Further Evaluator Cooperation</b>			
Organizations feel the need for <b>further cooperation among participants in this event.</b>	7	6	13
<b>WSS Institutional Capacity</b>			
<b>Weaknesses in institutional capacity</b> constrain the effectiveness of the WSS sector.	6	6	12
<b>Water Supply</b>			
<b>A reduction in time spent</b> per household in water collection in rural areas freed up labor, but did not always translate into more income generation.	4	5	9
Projects providing water supply services tend to be about <b>as successful as infrastructure</b> projects generally, with some evidence for recent improvement.	5	4	9
The amount of <b>financing available</b> for supplying clean water is insufficient to meet the demand.	3	4	7
<b>Private Sector Participation</b>			
Supporting <b>private sector</b> water providers has not yielded the benefits anticipated, and private sector performance has been <b>mixed</b>	6	4	10
While small-scale private providers of water-related services are found in many rural areas, <b>private providers</b> are <b>unlikely</b> to make major contributions to overcoming service deficits <b>in rural areas.</b>	3	5	8
The <b>scale of private sector involvement is small</b> ; it is declining in some countries, and large international providers have been replaced by smaller local operators.	4	3	7
<b>Cost Recovery</b>			
<b>Full cost recovery</b> is generally not taking place as anticipated. Cost recovery sufficient to cover just operation and maintenance (O&M) is also not happening.	6	4	10
Getting <b>tariff adjustments</b> right requires a wide range of interventions on many levels, which need to be sequenced and coordinated.	6	4	10
Our organization needs to take a <b>clear stand on cost recovery.</b>	2	4	6
<b>Sanitation</b>			
The last decade saw large gains in the <b>number of families served by safe water supply</b> (mostly in Asia), although little progress was made in sanitation.	4	6	10

	<i>ECG Members</i>	<i>Berlin Conference Participants</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Monitoring</b>			
Projects tend not to collect <b>data on the results of water and wastewater projects</b> (such as improved health of beneficiaries or water quality).	5	5	10
There is a <b>need to support better monitoring processes</b> that deliver relevant information to public and private stakeholders.	5	5	10
<b>Sustainability of the Water Supply</b>			
<b>Climate change</b> poses a risk to water availability.	4	5	9
Protecting the quality and availability of <b>groundwater resources</b> needs to be more highly prioritized in donor-funded projects	3	5	8
<b>Cost-Benefit Analysis</b>			
Organizations appear to have reduced the emphasis given to the <b>economic analysis of water projects</b> (including ex-post profitability calculations).	2	6	8
<b>Community Participation</b>			
Our evaluations found <b>weak community/ beneficiary participation in project design and implementation.</b>	3	3	6
<b>Delay</b>			
<b>Delays in project start up</b> and implementation negatively affected project results.	4	4	8
<b>Sewerage and Wastewater Treatment</b>			
Household connections to sewerage systems fell short of expectations, sometimes leaving wastewater treatment plants functioning below design capacity.	3	4	7

3.4 In most areas the findings are complementary. Where the multilaterals expressed a high level of convergence, the institutions attending the conference did also, and conversely, the points that were supported by only a few multilaterals also received lower levels of support in Berlin. The amount of overlap maps out an emerging international consensus. There is broad agreement that donors need to do more to overcome institutional weaknesses and that the water sectors should place greater stress on the economic importance of what is being done.

3.5 Among the more common findings, with 11 responses, is that, for water-stressed countries and regions where supplies are constrained, the donor community needs to focus more on demand management. Ten organizations found the following:

- Results of involving the private sector with service delivery have been mixed.

- Greater attention to cost recovery is needed, as well as more differentiated thinking regarding its operationalization (coverage of operation and maintenance versus full cost coverage, urban versus rural settings, etc.).
- Getting tariffs right has proven to be more complex than anticipated.
- Monitoring and data collection often do not gather the right information nor do they provide adequate information to sector decision makers with any regularity.

3.6 There were too many helpful comments given by the respondents to include them all here. Some edited excerpts are as follows:

- The affordability of higher-tech sewage treatment facilities does not receive enough consideration, resulting in plants that over-treat a very small percentage of wastewater at such a high cost that the bulk of sewage flows into watercourses untreated.
- Tariffs need to be based on the use of affordable technology that addresses priority needs and takes into account equity issues.
- In rural areas, private providers working with community-based initiatives have helped to increase access to new facilities.
- While many studies show a high willingness to pay for water on the part of the poor, this rarely reaches levels needed to cover operation and maintenance costs, so that finding the funds for the renewal of infrastructure is the most serious problem.
- What does taking a clear stand on cost recovery mean? If it means enforcement of a strategy that does not take local issues and obstacles into account, a clear stand may negatively affect development and sustainability. If it means recognizing the lessons of experience and giving up insistence on cost recovery levels that almost never happen, then this is a desirable outcome.
- There is no clear link between subsidization and service deterioration. Subsidy policy should pay more attention to the possibilities for self-financing at the different levels.
- For water projects a longer implementation period may have a very positive effect on the achievement of results in terms of capacity development.
- It is important to bear in mind that the problems associated with sanitation only appear a few years following the provision of potable water.

3.7 The paper “Evaluation Findings on Urban and Rural Water Supply and Sanitation,” presented at the May 24, 2010, meeting of the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) and distributed at the Berlin conference, contains a more detailed catalog of the various evaluation findings by institution.<sup>1</sup>

## 4. Influential Evaluations

4.1 While some of the water evaluation findings reported at the conference were “new news,” too many were “old friends.” That is, evaluations going back years (and even decades) had come to similar conclusions, yet practice had not improved much. A roundtable

---

<sup>1</sup> The paper is available from IEG on request.

discussion at the end of the conference addressed the topic: What do we need to learn about how to overcome organizational defensive behavior and how can we increase the influence of our water evaluations?

4.2 Before opening the subject to the plenary, a distinguished panel consisting of Christine Wallich (Independent Evaluation Group), Nick York (Department for International Development), Jan Willem van der Kaaij (European Investment Bank), Henri Jorritsma (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands), and Colin Kirk (African Development Bank) shared their thoughts, moderated by Michaela Zintl (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ).

4.3 **Henri Jorritsma** offered the view that the extent to which evaluators can influence the use of evaluation findings is rather limited. For the evaluator it is important that he formulates his findings and recommendations in such a way that the recipient is able to respond, that the recommendations enter into his span of control. There are, however, complicating factors. Firstly, roughly speaking one can distinguish at least three levels on the recipient side; the operational level, the senior management level and the political level. In general the needs on these three levels differ. Experience in the Netherlands shows that most of the learning takes place on the operational level. It was quite surprising to see that one way evaluation findings were used was to bring staff up to date when they moved into a new unit. While on the other levels the primary concern was often on the accountability function and more in particular the potential (political) damage. And secondly, moving from project-level evaluations to sector evaluations was critical in the way they could be. It was easier to adapt policy implementation on the project level as a result of an evaluation, than to adapt the broader orientation of a sector, thematic or country policy.

4.4 Nevertheless lesson learning also takes place on the senior management level. According to a study of the use of evaluation findings by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it was not possible to link policy changes to individual evaluations. However over time one could see that on an aggregate level the outcomes of evaluations were reflected in policy without explicitly referring to the earlier evaluations. Often it takes time for evaluations to be influential. One evaluation was initially disregarded, but six years later changing conditions made it impossible for the issues not to be taken up.

4.5 In her book “Linking Evaluation to Policy Research” Carol H. Weiss speaks about the use of evaluation and highlights that outsiders decide about the right moment and the kind of use of an evaluation. This depends often on the political opportunity and it is in general impossible to predict when that will be.

4.6 Christine Wallich highlighted several factors that are key to the success of an evaluation.

4.7 **First** is the **quality** of the document itself: Analytic rigor and a strong evidence base are both essential. Accuracy and fairness in reporting results, clearly distinguishing areas of strength and weakness, are likewise musts. And, the evaluation must be transparent about the methodology used, and how the conclusions were reached.

4.8 **Second is relevance:** the audience and purpose of the evaluation should be clear. A successful evaluation speaks to the interests and needs of the clients, whether internal management in an organization, or country development officials. In other words, evaluations that focus on practices that are central to an institution’s mission. An example is IEG's water evaluation that was designed to feed into the preparation of the World Bank’s water sector strategy.

4.9 **Third is timeliness:** bringing findings to light at the right time can significantly contribute to an evaluation’s value. An example is IEG’s synthesis of evaluation findings on post-earthquake reconstruction practices, timed to respond to the earthquake in Haiti.

4.10 **Fourth, is communicating** findings effectively. For evaluations to influence people and effect change, their findings need to be effectively communicated. Unfortunately, evaluators are not always good communicators. IEG is putting substantial effort into developing communication products, including web-based outreach, “Fast Track Briefs” for the president, senior management and the Board. However, more needs to be done to better communicate IEG’s evaluation findings.

4.11 Lastly is the quality of the **recommendations**. Drafting recommendations is not at all easy. These need to follow clearly from evaluation findings, they need to be clear about what actions are called for and how those actions will lead to the intended results. Good recommendations will also reflect the institution’s capacity and not aim for perfection. Having systems that track and report on the implementation of recommendations also helps to reinforce the impact of evaluations. In the Bank, the “Management Action Tracking Record” has been the main tool for this. Currently however, far too many recommendations — accumulated over the years — are being tracked; work is ongoing to focus it more on those that are “mission critical” but this is still a work in progress

4.12 **Jan Willem van der Kaaij** stressed, while emphasizing the importance of independency, that the independence of an evaluation department does not mean that it needs to be detached from the organization.

4.13 Evaluators should present recommendations and conclusions in a short synthesis report. While it is important to also present additional evidence and trend analysis to back up findings in a larger report, communication **is important**, and there is a limit to what busy people are willing to read.

4.14 One apparent difference between multilateral and bilateral organizations is the willingness to systematically track progress toward adoption of evaluation recommendations. EIB has a system in place to track recommendations **at least** twice a year and report on uptake to the Board.

4.15 **Colin Kirk** opened his remarks with the observation that the generation of lessons is a supply-side story. What are operations departments doing, what are countries doing in response to lessons? Using evaluation to generate organizational changes requires that evaluators focus more on the demand-side for lessons. “Targeting messages for targeted

audiences” is important in ensuring the uptake of lessons and moving the agenda forward – after all, we don’t want to repeat ourselves and meet the “old friends” again.

- 4.16 What do the users of evaluations want to see? African governments are mostly interested in evaluation findings at the policy level. They would like to know which policy works and which one does not.
- 4.17 In the **plenary discussion** that followed, several interesting points were raised:
- Many evaluators tend to be challenged when they need to come up with usable lessons. Perhaps in the future this group could spend some time on “How do we construct lessons?”
  - The implementation process is not complete until it has been evaluated. Evaluations can provide a highly cost-effective way to improve the performance and impact of development policies, programs, and projects. But methodologically sound evaluations may produce no useful results because they fail to communicate effectively.
  - One thing that actually promotes institutional learning is story-telling. We need to come up with stories for lesson learning and for promoting the uptake of recommendations. Several kinds of stories may be necessary: a negative story that makes really clear the opportunity cost inherent in not taking on better practice, as well as some positive examples of good results associated with the identified lesson.
  - The uptake of lessons is often a nonlinear process. The Joint African Institute promoted capacity building. AfDB undertook an evaluation with negative results. The Board rejected the negative results of the evaluation. Later, however, lessons were taken up and the institute was closed.
  - Independence may be overrated or, stated differently, the current understanding of what constitutes independence is flawed. Neither the evaluator nor the evaluatee benefit from the creation of antagonistic relationships. The use of inflammatory language sometimes constrains the adoption of evaluation-identified good practice.
- 4.18 Michaela Zintl summed up the key points from the session. Among them were: the client/the partner country engaged with implementation after evaluation reports are gathering dust. If the lessons and recommendations are to spread in developing countries, it is the partners who will have to be the change agents. This argues strongly for carefully targeted papers so that clear messages relevant to a specific recipient group are sent and received. So separate messages for separate audiences are required. As is story-telling. And we need to keep involving operations in the design and implementation of our evaluations. We also need to avoid language that is confrontational, condescending, or otherwise repellent when we have findings to share. Actionable recommendations are also critical. Lastly, the use of an evaluation is not only defined by the quality of the evaluation. Policy makers rely on many other sources of information, and outside events may have a lot of influence. Timeliness, though sometimes hard to predict, is key. A message that is not acceptable today may prove perfectly acceptable in a few years time when conditions are different.

## 5. Improving Evaluations in the Water Sector

5.1 The Berlin conference demonstrated the value in bringing together water sector evaluators from across the international community to share experiences. If another such workshop were to be held on this topic, some of the themes that would need to be covered emerged from the discussions. This section catalogues these themes.

5.2 This paper reports on evaluation challenges and technical challenges facing water sector projects generally. If evaluators are going to become more effective in their work in the water sector, they would benefit from hearing about successful evaluation research on topics that had previously been considered difficult or even impossible to evaluate. Similarly, successes and failures in technical areas considered of critical importance to the water sector would also be of interest.

### EVALUATION GAPS

5.3 Among the evaluation gaps identified was insufficient work in sanitation and in water quality (especially with regard to wastewater). This gap is a function of monitoring oversights and deficiencies.

5.4 Constraints imposed on the sector by institutional weaknesses and governance failures also need more study. Particular needs include:

- Evaluations of the impacts of legal reform and policy changes in the water sector,
- Rigorous impact work on fighting corruption and improving public service,
- Attempts to establish reliable baselines on the above.

5.5 Evaluation practice needs to move away from reporting on things that are easy to count, such as cubic meters of water mobilized, and toward reporting on water use by the target population. Evaluations that exemplify good practice in this regard would be welcomed.

5.6 The conference highlighted the shortfall of resources dedicated to water relative to other urgent needs and noted that the leveraging of aid was an important and under-documented topic.

5.7 Despite the progress on assessing the impact of safe water on health, more evaluation work is required on this area. In particular, more work is needed on whether the timing of hygiene interventions relative to the onset of service provision was an explanatory factor. Another timing question is whether the amount of time spent waiting for or walking to a clean source was the determinant of family decisions to rely (partially or wholly) on traditional sources. Similarly, the relative reliability of service provision needs more study, as does the health impact of latrine provision. The economic benefits of access to clean water unrelated to health (including the economic use of the time savings stemming from better access) also needs further exploration.

## **ARE WE DOING THE RIGHT KIND OF EVALUATIONS?**

- 5.8 While our organizations have become increasingly multisectoral in the water sector, evaluators have continued to focus inquiries rather narrowly on sector performance or on just one subsector. As a group we really wanted to hear about an evaluation that combined the social, environmental, economic, and hydrological aspects. Not only does the logic of interventions need to be questioned, the sequence of actions has also been increasingly thrown in doubt.
- 5.9 Attempts to measure various types of integration would also be useful. In particular: moving from the project to the basin; balancing the agendas of food and energy producers with household needs for water; vulnerability reducing interventions focusing on climate or scarcity; and the development of evaluation methods that measure how boundaries are transcended (national as well as multidisciplinary). A related interest of the group was to hear about the impact of interventions on the water sector as a whole—recall that it was noted that without looking at this aspect, the net impact of projects could appear much better than it really is.
- 5.10 Participants noted that the success of integrated approaches was critical, but too little work had been done on the achievements stemming from the use of such concepts, not to mention likely future results based on past performance.
- 5.11 Given the importance of financial sustainability and the way economic and financial returns are increasingly overlooked during project preparation, additional attention to this topic is of interest. Based on the evidence presented in Berlin, there seems to be a need to discuss whether the general expectation of full cost coverage is too ambitious, at least for some settings.

## **INFLUENTIAL EVALUATIONS AND EVALUATION COORDINATION**

- 5.12 The conference identified several factors that made evaluations influential. Although progress has been made in this area, lack of evaluator harmonization is a major constraint on influence. Further discussions are needed on the ways in which water sector evaluations can be harmonized, including:
- Key concepts and indicators,
  - Standardization of research methods,
  - Theoretical intervention models/impact chains,
  - Collective identification of overarching lessons.

## **EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

- 5.13 Positive messages can sometimes be more powerful than negative ones, and several participants called for a future workshop session on crafting messages. This topic might be expanded to include “how messages are communicated” and even the targeting of

messages for different audiences. If messaging is really about the framing of conclusions and recommendations, lesson learning could also be a useful session topic.

**Conference**  
**WATER AND DEVELOPMENT**  
**Taking Lessons from Evaluation**

**KfW Bankengruppe, Charlottenstrasse 33/33a, 10117 Berlin, Germany**

**PROGRAM**

**Tuesday, August 31**

**02:00 p.m. Registration**

**02:45 p.m. Welcome, overview and expectations**

**Eva Terberger, Head, Independent Evaluation Unit, KfW Entwicklungsbank (Development Bank)**

**Ronald Parker, Task Team Leader, Water Evaluation, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank**

**03:00 p.m. Collecting and applying lessons from project-based water evaluations**

**Chair: Karin Kohlweg, Head, Evaluation Unit, Austrian Development Agency**

**Werner Schmidt, European Investment Bank (EIB):** EIB's in-depth evaluation in the water and sanitation sector.

**Sylvia Schweitzer and Dörte Ziegler, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit:** Lessons learned from the synthesis report on water-related projects – how does it shape future projects?

**Heidi Pihlatie, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, and Manfred Matz, Independent Consultant:** The implementation modalities at community level water projects and related ownership and capacity development – what have we learned and what do the results mean for our organization?

**Margrethe Holm Andersen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark:** Evaluation of Danish Support to Water and Sanitation (1999-2005).

**Discussion. Further inputs from participants welcome.**

**04:30 p.m. Coffee break**

**04:45 p.m. Findings from water supply evaluations**

**Chair: Rachel Meghir, Director, Ex Post Evaluation Department, Council of Europe Development Bank**

**Rita Tesselaar, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands:** Water supply, sanitation and hygiene policy evaluation using (rigorous) impact evaluations.

**Jon Teigland, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation:** Rural water supply in Tanzania - long term effects of drilling for water.

**Eva Terberger, KfW Entwicklungsbank:** Urban drinking water supply in Yemen – problems caused by water scarcity.

**Discussion. Further inputs from participants welcome.**

**06:30 p.m. Buffet Dinner.**

**Dinner Speech: Margaret Catley-Carlson, Crop Diversity Trust & Sec Gen Group**

**Wednesday, September 1**

**09:00 a.m. Keynote address**

**Norbert Kloppenburg, Member of the Board of Managing Directors, KfW Bankengruppe**

Water, evaluation and Financial Cooperation at the KfW.

**Vinod Thomas, Director General, Evaluation, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank Group**

Addressing the challenges of water scarcity to tackle issues in development.

**09:30 a.m. Water and development – findings from sector-wide evaluations**

**Chair: Jean-Louis Chomel, Head, Joint Evaluation Unit, European Commission**

**Ronald Parker, Independent Evaluation Group:** Assessment of the World Bank support for water.

**Tomoo Ueda, Asian Development Bank:** IED's work in the water sector.

**Dennis Long, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD):** EBRD's water and infrastructure sector review.

**Discussion. Further inputs from participants welcome.**

**11:00 a.m. Coffee break**

**11:15 a.m. Evaluation results on sanitation and waste water – achievements and challenges**

**Chair: Colin Kirk, Director, Operations Evaluation Department, African Development Bank**

**Isabel Günther, ETH Zürich:** Evaluation results and evaluation gaps in sanitation - setting the scene.

**Todor Dimitrov, Black Sea Trade and Development Bank:** Waste water treatment in Bulgaria.

**Ahmad Hamidov, Humboldt University Berlin, and Marlis Sieburger, KfW Entwicklungsbank (joint presentation):** Wastewater treatment – an analysis and cross-cutting issues.

**Discussion. Further inputs from participants welcome.**

**12:45 p.m. Networking lunch**

**Wednesday, September 1**

**02:00 p.m. Concurrent Break-Out Sessions**

**Session 1:  
Methods**

**Silke Heuser, Independent Evaluation Group:** Computer assisted evaluation - where and when?

**Stefan Leiderer, German Development Institute:** Rigorous impact evaluations - where and when?

**Discussion**

**Session 2:  
Governance in the water sector**

**Gunhild Berg, KfW Entwicklungsbank, former Independent Evaluation Group:** Private sector participation.

**Gunhild Berg, KfW Entwicklungsbank, former Independent Evaluation Group:** Decentralization

**Discussion**

**Session 3:  
Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM)**

**Dennis Long, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:** The Danube River Basin study.

**Yves Ficatier, l'Agence Française de Développement, and Larbi Khrouf, Consultant:** IWRM in water scarce regions: Tunisia, decentralized evaluation.

**Ignacio Tourino Soto, African Development Bank (AfDB):** Water for agriculture: an assessment of AfDB assistance in Ghana and Mali 1990-2008.

**Discussion**

**Further inputs from participants welcome.**

**03:30 p.m. Coffee break**

**04:00 p.m. Round Table Discussion: Barriers to change – confronting water policies and politics with evaluation**

**Moderator: Michaela Zintl, Head, Evaluation Department, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development**

**Participants:**

**Christine Wallich, Independent Evaluation Group**

**Nick York, Department for International Development**

**Jan Willem van der Kaaij, European Investment Bank**

**Henri Jorritsma, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands**

**Colin Kirk, African Development Bank**

**Opening Input:**

**Evaluation Cooperation Group:** Focus of water evaluations and findings overlap.

**5:30 p.m. Wrap Up Session: Main messages from the conference and outlook – going to Prague and beyond**

**Chair: Marlis Sieburger, Division Chief, Independent Evaluation Unit, KfW Development Bank**

**06:00 p.m. Farewell**

