WORKING PAPER 99

Improving Irrigation Project Planning and Implementation Processes in Sub-Saharan Africa: Diagnosis and Recommendations

S. Morardet, D. J. Merrey, J. Seshoka and H. Sally

International Water Management Institute

FUTURE HARVEST
IWMI is a Future Harvest Center supported by the CGIAR

Working Paper 99

Improving Irrigation Project Planning and Implementation Processes in Sub-Saharan Africa: Diagnosis and Recommendations

S. Morardet
D. J. Merrey
J. Seshoka
and
H. Sally

Final Report Submitted by
International Water Management Institute
August 2005

IWMI receives its principal funding from 58 governments, private foundations and international and regional organizations known as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). Support is also given by the Governments of Ghana, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Thailand.

Morardet, S.; Merrey, D.J.; Seshoka, J.; Sally, H. 2005. Improving irrigation project planning and implementation processes in Sub-Saharan Africa: Diagnosis and recommendations. Colombo, Sri lanka: IWMI. 91p. (Working paper 99)

This report was prepared as a contribution to the Collaborative Program on "Investments in Agricultural Water Management in Sub Saharan Africa: Diagnosis of Trends and Opportunities." This Program involves collaboration among the African Development Bank (ADB), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), International Water Management Institute (IWMI), New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), and the World Bank. Other supporting partners included the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture, and InWent. This particular report was funded by the African Development Bank with complementary support from IWMI. Although the report has been reviewed by the members of the Collaborative Partnership Working Group, the authors remain responsible for the contents, which do not necessarily reflect the views of the collaborating partners.

The authors are grateful to the Collaborative Program Steering Committee for guiding the work and providing feedback on earlier reports, particularly to Tony Peacock for his fruitful suggestions. They also wish to thank the consultants who assisted with the case studies: Habtamu Gessesse and Sorssa Natea in Ethiopia, Josué Rajoelison in Madagascar, Manda Sadio Keita in Mali complemented by useful comments from Jean-François Bélières (Cirad), Babatunde Omilola in Nigeria and Josy Siakantu in Zambia. We greatly appreciated the patience and availability of staff from African Development Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, FAO Land and Water Development Division and Investment Centre, and Agence Française de Développement, who agreed to answer our questions. Nicolas Faysse prepared the preliminary literature review and research framework. Colleagues at IWMI provided valuable comments on earlier versions of this and the other reports written for this component of the Collaborative Program.

/ Irrigation programs / planning / financing / financial institutions / irrigation management / operations / maintenance / privatization / Africa South of Sahara /

ISBN 92-9090-613-8

Please direct inquiries and comments to: iwmi@cgiar.org

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Boxes

List of Acronyms

ADB	African Development Bank
ADF	African Development Fund
AFD	Agence Française de Développement
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern & Central Africa
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CI	Cooperating Institution
CORAF	Conférence Ouest et Centre Africaine pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunities Paper
CPM	Country Program Manager
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EDF	European Development Fund
ESRDF	Ethiopian Social Rehabilitation and Development Fund
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAO-IC	Food and Agriculture Organization Investment Center
FERHA	Fonds d'Entretien des Réseaux Hydro-Agricoles
GTZ	Gessllschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Country
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ICID	International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage
ICR	Implementation Completion Report
IDO	International Development Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFIs	International Financing Institutions
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IMT	Irrigation Management Transfer
IPTRID	International Program for Technology & Research in Irrigation and Drainage
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MaraFIP	Mara Region Farmers' Initiative Project (Tanzania)
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OE	Office of Evaluation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OED	Operations Evaluation Department
O&M	Operation and Maintenance

ONAR	Operations North East & South Agricultural & Rural Development Department (ADB)
OPEV	Operations Evaluation
PCR	Project Completion Report
PER	Performance Evaluation Report
PIDP	Participatory Irrigation Development Program (Tanzania)
PIP	Project Inception Paper
PHBM	Projet de développement du Haut Bassin de Mandrare (Madagascar)
P&I	Planning and Implementation
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPAR	Project Performance Assessment Report
PPI	Petit Périmètre Irrigué
PRBM	Projet de Réhabilitation du périmètre rizicole du Bas Mangoky
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
REAP	Rural Enterprise and Agri-Services Promotion Project (Kenya)
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SDARMP	Smallholder Dry Areas Resource Management Project (Zimbabwe)
SSA	sub-Saharan Africa
SSI	Smallholder Systems Innovations
SWAps	Sector Wide Approaches
SWMNET	Soil and Water Management Research Network
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WUA	Water User Association
WSDP	Water Sector Development Program

SUMMARY

Weaknesses in planning and implementation (P&I) have been identified as one of the main reasons for the disappointing results of agricultural water development and management projects. Based on a review and critical analysis of experiences and case studies in sub-Saharan Africa, this study component proposes practical ways of improving performance related to planning and implementation and thereby enhancing the returns to investments in agricultural water.

P&I is analyzed within the overall context of the project life cycle, broken down into the following six phases: (i) Identification; (ii) Preparation; (iii) Appraisal; (iv) Negotiation and Approval; (v) Implementation and Supervision; and (vi) Evaluation. Weaknesses reported at the different stages of this cycle are identified and analyzed. A comprehensive desk review of 18 selected projects funded by the World Bank and African Development Bank, covering 11 countries in West, East and Central Africa, and detailed case studies of 19 projects in 5 countries, are supplemented by the P&I lessons learnt from another 5 case studies of IFAD-supported projects in Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar and Zimbabwe carried out under the Poverty Reduction component of the Collaborative Program. In addition, staff of several development agencies (including ADB, IFAD, AFD, FAO) were interviewed. The sample of projects analyzed is therefore broadly representative of agricultural water development and management experiences in sub-Saharan Africa. This summary presents the major findings and key recommendations emerging from the study.

Major findings

Similarities and differences among different international financing institutions (IFIs): Overall, financing agencies follow similar project cycles with some variation in terms of the emphasis and actors involved at different stages. For example, IFAD's approach tends to be more participatory compared to the World Bank and African Development Bank. With respect to the project cycle, governments take the lead in project identification; few IFIs take an active part at this stage. Insofar as project preparation is concerned, the official position is for the borrower to drive the process with the financing institution providing support as needed. But in practice this phase is led by financing agency staff, assisted by their consultants (although some IFIs provide assistance to the borrower through special loans or grants, or solicit borrower inputs through stakeholder workshops and consultations). IFIs' approaches to project appraisal and negotiations are very similar. All IFIs consider project supervision as a critical task and provide for periodic formal progress reviews during the project life, with a project completion report produced at the end of the implementation period. Finally, ex-post evaluation is carried out systematically for all World Bank projects, but other IFIs do this more selectively; in all cases, this is performed by specialized departments of the financing agencies, separate from those responsible for operations and implementation.

Overview of P&I weaknesses: The contribution of the project to the realization of relevant sectoral strategies, national policy goals and more recently poverty reduction strategies has not always been explicitly spelt out. This often results in a lack of fit between the project planning process and the general policy dialogue between government and IFIs and ultimately, weak buy-in on the part of the latter, and difficulties for governments to satisfy their own commitments. Although the impact

of sound project preparation and appraisal on project performance is recognized, particularly by IFIs, it does not seem to get the attention it deserves in practice. For example, design choices that do not take into account actual on-the-ground operational and management capabilities can seriously compromise outcomes. The arrangements for overall project implementation and supervision are by far the major determinants for project success. Key constraints are: limited technical and managerial capacities within government and executing agencies, lack of incentives to attract and retain skilled staff, inadequate monitoring, inappropriate supervision by IFIs (with over-emphasis on physical achievements and disbursements at the expense of development effectiveness), and difficulties coping with institutional changes such as decentralization, irrigation management transfer, and greater private sector participation. Finally, explicit mechanisms (and resources) to evaluate project impacts such as on poverty reduction are rarely in place with the result that there is no real opportunity to learn from project experiences and feed into a country's knowledge base of P&I of agricultural water projects.

IFIs' responsibilities in P&I failures: Shifts in IFIs' funding priorities sometimes lead to inconsistency with government strategies, particularly in the case of bilateral financial institutions (which are strongly influenced by the political orientation of the financing country). However, multilateral agencies are also blamed by national partners for their complex and lengthy disbursement procedures and strict conditionalities. On the other hand, financing agencies also appear to be operating under a lot of pressure — staff not only have large portfolios of responsibility but are also expected to have sound knowledge of the agency's procedures, be skilled in project management and their own area of disciplinary competence, as well as be able to integrate crosscutting issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, and the environment, among others. This situation has an adverse effect on IFI involvement in critical phases of the project cycle and ultimately on project performance and outcomes. Furthermore, internal communication and sharing of experiences within and among different departments of financing agencies are deemed to be poor, hampering development of institutional memory and capacity. The fragmentation of, for example, water projects among different departments of IFIs mirrors the fragmentation among government departments, and hinders their capacity to take an integrated approach consistent with the principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM). In view of the trend towards decentralization of authority to local government levels, IFIs also need to focus more seriously on supporting capacity building at these levels to support this decentralization trend.

Government responsibilities in P&I failures: Government responsibility ranges from the commitment of financial and human resources to assuming ownership and responsibility for project performance. Falling short in any of these areas – inability to respect counterpart contributions, inadequate staff skills, poor support services to beneficiaries, non-transparent procedures for procurement and recruitment of personnel — seriously compromises outcomes. This predicament is not made easier by the different IFIs procedures and rules, and the trend towards decentralization to local levels, where the shortage of skills and resources is even worse than at national level.

Responsibilities of executing agencies in P&I failures: It is not always easy to assemble and retain the complex mix of technical, social, economic and management skills required for an effective project management team, especially in light of the limited human and financial resource base of many countries in SSA. In the absence of incentives such as a reasonable salary and working conditions, it is a huge challenge to retain the requisite skills and build continuity and national capacity in project management. On the other hand, early establishment of a project management unit

adapted to the local context enhances chances of successful project implementation, although there is debate about the desirable degree of autonomy of a PMU: whether the governmental executing agency should use its own staff for the PMU, or hire staff especially for the task with the risk of their abandoning the project before completion.

Recommendations

Two overarching recommendations emerge from this study. The first is that project management should not be viewed as an "overhead" to be minimized, but an essential feature of successful projects, with potentially huge pay-offs. It requires the deployment of adequate human and financial resources and is applicable at IFIs as well as government and partner levels.

The second overarching recommendation is that projects must be considered as learning and capacity building opportunities that will contribute to a knowledge base on planning and implementation of agricultural water projects (costs, technical options, standards/norms, policies, institutional arrangements for service provision, inventory of expertise …), strengthening the institutional memory of governments and IFIs, and ultimately creating an environment that encourages and enables better quality investments.

Other recommendations are summarized in the table below:

STAGE IN PROJECT CYCLE	ACTOR TO WHOM THE RECOMMENDATION IS DIRECTED		
	Governments	IFIs	IFIs & Govts.
Identification	• Better articulation of linkages between project objectives, sectoral strategies & overall national development goals • Identify & put in place enabling conditions for beneficial use of investments • Promote participatory assessment of community needs • Agree on clear criteria for selecting project beneficiaries	• Greater involvement of IFIs at this stage with a view to achieving a better understanding of local context and hence perform a better-informed appraisal	• Governments and IFIs should coordinate investments, in a way that takes best advantage of individual IFIs' strengths
Preparation, Appraisal and Negotiation/ Approval	• Carry out careful analysis of local context – bio-physical, socio-economic, environment • Minimize complexity of projects to fit local management and implementation capacities • In making infrastructure design choices, take into account indigenous knowledge and local capacity for operation & maintenance • Early establishment of the project management team to help build relations of confidence and mutual respect with IFI staff, participating local communities & other partners; will also improve monitoring of project progress & timely decisions about possible remedial action • Adopt participatory approaches to allow beneficiaries to articulate their own needs and preferences, and be an integral part of project identification, design and implementation.	• Greater involvement of IFIs at this stage with a view to achieving a better understanding of local context and performing a better-informed appraisal	• Promote use of project management tools such as log frames in a participatory way • Limit number of project components to fit better with local management capacities • Create and make use of knowledge base of lessons and past experiences

STAGE IN PROJECT CYCLE	ACTOR TO WHOM THE RECOMMENDATION IS DIRECTED		
	Governments	IFIs	IFIs & Govts.
Implementation & Supervision	• Be more inclusive in selection of service providers (level playing field); provide training & capacity building to potential local and national bidders where necessary • Make greater use of NGOs and private sector to fill skills and capacity gaps and shortcomings in public sector • Provide adequate incentives to sustain the interest and retain qualified project staff	• Make provision for closer supervision and knowledge sharing • IFIs & governments should mutually agree on the supervision framework • PMU and beneficiaries should be able to give feedback on the ToR of consultants, participate in their selection and assess their performance • Quick feedback and responsiveness will improve implementation of remedial measures • Introduce sufficient flexibility in implementation to allow for adapting designs to local context	• Effective implementation of agreed M&E procedure responding to government and users needs; train local staff in use of project management tools
Evaluation (completion)		• Carry out and disseminate PCR expeditiously	• Joint evaluations of government and IFIs with beneficiary partners
Evaluation (post-completion, after-care)	• Provide for some 'residual' government role, especially in regard to provision of support services (inputs, markets, credit) • Avoid or overcome O&M problems through design choices (physical, institutional) that are compatible with locally available skills and capacity, and support the emergence of professional quality service-oriented services providers specifically in charge of O&M.	• Long term support to, and monitoring and evaluation of new institutional and financial arrangements for irrigation services provision (public-private partnerships, federation of WUAs)	• Devise better ways of assessing poverty reduction impacts of projects

STAGE IN PROJECT CYCLE	ACTOR TO WHOM THE RECOMMENDATION IS DIRECTED		
	Governments	IFIs	IFIs & Govts.
Along and around the project cycle	• Improving the understanding of rural poverty and how agricultural water management contributes to its reduction by all stakeholders (financing institutions, national and local governments, academic institutions, NGOs) • Adopting participatory approaches to designing and implementing projects will strengthen local water and irrigation management institutions and improve the sustainability of such projects. On the other hand, implementation of such an approach will entail (a) building the capacity of relevant project personnel in participatory approaches, and (b) setting up incentives that encourage them to interact with local stakeholders • Strengthen collaboration between IFI staff and project management staff at all stages of the project cycle • Provide for training, capacity building and skills development at all levels as part and parcel of project • Simplify IFIs' procedures for procurement, disbursement, monitoring, reporting. IFIs should adopt uniform procedures to make the job of government and executing agencies easier • Development and adoption of Result-Based Management tools for policy dialogue, sector work and projects • Include more systematically in evaluation reports standardized indicators regarding P&I: i.e., information on project management arrangements, how effective they were, lessons learned • Revisit internal organization of financing/development agencies vis-à-vis assigning roles and responsibilities; sharing of information and experience regarding P&I successes and failures and best practice; alleviating time pressures on task managers; decentralizing financing agency responsibilities to country/regional offices wherever possible; adequate technical support on issues outside project task manager's area of expertise • Assist governments to take the lead with respect to agricultural water development and management seeking for integration with PRSP processes.		

RÉSUMÉ

Les résultats décevants des projets d'aménagement et de gestion hydro-agricoles ont été attribués principalement aux faiblesses de la planification et de la mise en oeuvre des projets. Basée sur une revue et une analyse critique d'expériences et de cas d'étude en Afrique sub-saharienne, ce rapport propose des voies pratiques pour améliorer les performances liées à la planification et à la mise en œuvre des projets afin d'accroître la rentabilité des investissements hydro-agricoles.

La planification et la mise en oeuvre sont analysées dans le contexte général du cycle de projet, décomposé en six phases : (i) Identification; (ii) Préparation; (iii) Evaluation préalable; (iv) Négociation et Approbation; (v) Mise en œuvre et Supervision; et (vi) Evaluation a posteriori. Les faiblesses relatives aux différentes étapes de ce cycle sont identifiées et analysées. Une revue détaillée d'une sélection de 18 projets financés par la Banque Mondiale et la Banque Africaine de Développement, couvrant 11 pays en Afrique de l'Ouest, de l'Est et Centrale et des études de cas détaillées de 19 projets dans 5 pays sont complétées par les leçons tirées de 5 autres cas d'étude de projets financés par le FIDA au Kenya, en Tanzanie, à Madagascar et au Zimbabwe, et conduits dans le cadre de la composante sur la Réduction de la Pauvreté du Programme de Collaboration. De plus, des personnels de plusieurs agences de développement (BAD, FIDA, AFD, FAO) ont été interviewés. L'échantillon de projets analysés est donc d'une manière générale représentatif des expériences d'aménagement et de gestion hydro-agricoles en Afrique sub-Saharienne. Ce résumé présente les principaux enseignements et les recommandations clés qui se dégagent de cette étude.

Principaux enseignements

Similarités et différences entre les différents bailleurs de fonds : Dans l'ensemble, les bailleurs de fonds suivent des cycles de projets similaires, avec quelques variantes concernant l'importance relative de chaque étape et les acteurs qui y sont impliqués. L'approche du FIDA, par exemple, tend à être plus participative, comparée à celles de la Banque Mondiale et de la Banque Africaine de Développement. En ce qui concerne le cycle du projet, les gouvernements ont l'initiative dans la phase d'identification, alors que peu de bailleurs de fonds s'impliquent à ce stade. Pendant la phase de préparation, la position officielle est que l'emprunteur conduit le processus avec si nécessaire l'aide du bailleur de fond. Mais en pratique cette phase est conduite par le personnel des institutions financières internationales ou leurs consultants (bien que certains bailleurs de fonds fournissent une aide aux emprunteurs sous forme de prêts ou de subventions, ou sollicitent la participation des emprunteurs au travers d'ateliers ou de consultations des parties prenantes). Les approches des bailleurs au cours des phases d'évaluation et de négociation du projet sont très similaires. Toutes les institutions financières internationales considèrent la supervision du projet comme une tâche cruciale et prévoient des rapports d'avancement tout au long du projet, avec un rapport final à la fin de la période de mise en œuvre. Pour finir, une évaluation ex-post est conduite systématiquement pour tous les projets de la Banque Mondiale, mais d'autres bailleurs de fonds n'y ont recours que ponctuellement. Dans tous les cas, ces évaluations sont conduites par des services spécialisés des agences financières, différents de ceux qui sont en charge de la mise en œuvre et de la gestion des projets.

Vue d'ensemble des faiblesses de la planification et de la mise en œuvre : La contribution des projets à la réalisation des objectifs des politiques nationales, des stratégies sectorielles pertinentes, et plus récemment des stratégies de réduction de la pauvreté, n'est pas toujours démontrée de façon explicite. Il en résulte souvent une inadéquation entre le processus de planification des projets et le dialogue général sur les politiques entre le gouvernement et les bailleurs de fonds, avec pour conséquence un manque d'engagement de la part des bailleurs et des difficultés pour les gouvernements à assumer leurs propres responsabilités. Bien que l'intérêt d'une solide préparation du projet et de l'évaluation de ses performances soit reconnu, en particulier par les institutions financières internationales, cette phase ne semble pas recueillir dans la pratique toute l'attention qu'elle mérite. Par exemple, une conception qui ne tient pas compte des capacités réelles d'exploitation et de gestion sur le terrain peut compromettre fortement les résultats du projet. Les arrangements concernant la mise en œuvre et la supervision sont de loin les déterminants majeurs de la réussite du projet. Les principales contraintes à ce stade comprennent des compétences techniques et d'encadrement limitées au sein du gouvernement et des agences d'exécution, le manque de mesures incitatives pour attirer et fidéliser un personnel qualifié, un suivi sur le terrain et une supervision inadaptés de la part des institutions financières internationales (avec trop d'importance accordée aux réalisations physiques et aux décaissements au détriment de l'efficacité du développement), et des difficultés à faire face à des changements institutionnels tels que la décentralisation, le transfert de gestion de l'irrigation et la participation accrue du secteur privé. Enfin, les mécanismes explicites (et les ressources) permettant d'évaluer les impacts des projets, par exemple sur la réduction de la pauvreté, sont rarement en place, ceci limitant les possibilités réelles d'apprentissage à partir des expériences de projets et de constitution de bases de connaissances sur la planification et la mise en œuvre des projets hydro-agricoles.

Les responsabilités des institutions financières internationales dans les échecs de la planification et de la mise en œuvre : Des changements dans les priorités de financement des bailleurs de fonds amènent parfois à des incohérences avec les stratégies des gouvernements, particulièrement dans le cas des institutions financières bilatérales (qui sont fortement influencées par l'orientation politique du pays bailleur). Toutefois, les agences multilatérales sont aussi montrées du doigt par les partenaires nationaux en raison de la complexité et de la lenteur de leurs procédures de décaissement et de la rigueur de leurs conditions d'octroi des financements. D'un autre côté, les agences financières opèrent sous une forte pression – leurs employés ont non seulement un large éventail de responsabilités mais sont également supposés avoir une connaissance approfondie des procédures de l'agence, être qualifiés dans leur propre discipline et dans la gestion de projets, et être capables d'intégrer des questions transversales telles que le genre, le VIH/SIDA et l'environnement, entre autres. Cette situation a un effet négatif sur l'implication des bailleurs de fonds dans les phases critiques du cycle du projet et finalement sur les performances et les résultats des projets. De plus, la communication interne et le partage d'expériences au sein de et entre les différents services des agences financières sont connus pour leur faiblesse, ce qui gène le développement des capacités et la constitution d'une mémoire institutionnelle. La fragmentation des projets hydrauliques par exemple entre différents départements des institutions financières internationales reflète la fragmentation entre les départements ministériels au niveau des pays, et limite leur capacité à adopter une approche intégrée cohérente avec les principes de la Gestion Intégrée des Ressources en Eau (GIRE). Etant donnée la tendance à la décentralisation de l'autorité vers les niveaux locaux de gouvernement, les institutions financières internationales doivent aussi renforcer sérieusement leur soutien au développement des capacités à ces niveaux pour appuyer ce mouvement de décentralisation.

Les responsabilités des gouvernements dans les échecs de la planification et de la mise en œuvre : La responsabilité des gouvernements va de l'engagement des ressources financières et humaines à l'appropriation et à l'endossement de la responsabilité des performances du projet. Un manquement dans quelque domaine que se soit – incapacité à respecter sa contribution financière, personnel insuffisamment qualifié, insuffisance des services d'aide aux bénéficiaires, manque de transparence dans les procédures d'approvisionnement et de recrutement du personnel – peut compromettre sérieusement les résultats des projets. Cette situation est rendue plus difficile encore par la diversité des règles et des procédures des différents bailleurs de fonds et par la tendance à la décentralisation vers les niveaux locaux, où le manque de ressources et de qualification est encore pire qu'au niveau national.

Les responsabilités des agences d'exécution dans les échecs de la planification et de la mise en œuvre : Il n'est pas toujours facile de rassembler et de maintenir la combinaison complexe de compétences techniques, sociales, économiques et d'encadrement requise pour former une équipe de gestion de projet efficace. Ceci est d'autant plus vrai si l'on considère les ressources humaines et financières limitées de beaucoup de pays d'Afrique sub-saharienne. En l'absence d'incitations telles qu'un salaire raisonnable et de bonnes conditions de travail, c'est un énorme challenge que de conserver les compétences et de maintenir la continuité et la capacité nationale de gestion des projets dans le pays. A l'opposé, la mise en place, très tôt, d'une équipe de gestion de projet adaptée au contexte local accroît les chances de réussite du projet. Il y a cependant débat à propos de l'autonomie de cette équipe de gestion de projet : l'agence gouvernementale d'exécution doit-elle employer son propre personnel pour la constituer ou recruter des personnes spécialement pour cette tâche, au risque de les voir partir avant l'achèvement du projet ?

Recommandations

Deux recommandations générales émergent de cette étude. La première est que la gestion de projet ne doit pas être considérée comme une charge, que l'on doit chercher à réduire, mais comme une caractéristique essentielle à la réussite des projets, génératrice de bénéfices potentiellement très importants. Elle nécessite de ce fait la mobilisation de ressources humaines et financières adaptées et concerne à la fois les institutions financières internationales, les gouvernements et leurs partenaires.

La seconde recommandation générale est que les projets doivent être considérés comme des opportunités de création de savoirs et de renforcement des compétences qui contribueront à une base de connaissances sur la planification et la mise en œuvre des projets hydro-agricoles (coûts, options techniques, standards et normes, politiques, arrangements institutionnels pour la fourniture de services, inventaire des capacités d'expertise,…) , renforçant la mémoire institutionnelle des gouvernements et des bailleurs de fonds, et créant finalement un environnement qui encourage et facilite l'accroissement d'investissements de meilleure qualité.

D'autres recommandations plus spécifiques aux projets d'aménagements hydro-agricoles sont résumées dans le tableau ci-dessous :

PHASE DU CYCLE DU PROJET	ACTEURS AUXQUELS SONT DESTINEES LES RECOMMANDATIONS		
	Gouvernements	Institutions financières internationales	Institutions financières internationales & Gouvernements
Identification	• Mieux articuler les relations entre les objectifs du projet, les stratégies sectorielles et les objectifs de développement nationaux. • Identifier et mettre en place les conditions d'une utilisation rentable des investissements. • Promouvoir l'évaluation participative des besoins des communautés. • S'accorder sur des critères clairs pour la sélection des bénéficiaires du projet.	• Une plus grande implication à ce stade, dans le but de mieux comprendre le contexte local et de réaliser ainsi une évaluation préalable mieux renseignée.	• Les gouvernements et les institutions financières internationales doivent coordonner leurs investissements, afin de tirer le meilleur avantage des points forts de chaque bailleur.
Préparation, Evaluation préalable et Négociation/ approbation	• Mener une analyse précise du contexte local – bio-physique, socio-économique, environnemental. • Minimiser la complexité des projets pour s'adapter aux compétences locales de gestion et de mise en œuvre. • Prendre en compte les savoirs indigènes et les capacités locales d'exploitation et de maintenance dans les choix de conception des infrastructures. • Mettre en place très tôt une équipe de gestion de projet pour aider à l'établissement de relations de confiance et de respect mutuel entre le personnel des institutions financières, les communautés locales et les autres partenaires. Ceci améliorera aussi le suivi des avancées du projet et l'adoption en temps voulu d'actions correctives. • Adopter une approche participative pour permettre aux bénéficiaires d'exprimer leurs propres besoins et préférences, et de prendre part à l'identification du projet, à sa conception et à sa mise en œuvre.	• Plus grande implication à ce stade, dans le but de mieux comprendre le contexte local et de réaliser ainsi une évaluation mieux renseignée.	• Promouvoir l'usage des outils de gestion de projet tels que les cadres logiques dans un contexte participatif. • Limiter le nombre de composantes du projet pour s'adapter aux compétences locales de gestion. • Créer et utiliser une base de connaissances des leçons et expériences passées

PHASE DU CYCLE DU PROJET	ACTEURS AUXQUELS SONT DESTINEES LES RECOMMANDATIONS		
	Gouvernements	Institutions financières internationales	Institutions financières internationales & Gouvernements
Mise en œuvre et Supervision	• Ouvrir plus largement la sélection des prestataires de services ; si nécessaire, offrir des formations aux soumissionnaires locaux et nationaux. • Recourir plus largement aux ONG et au secteur privé pour combler les lacunes du secteur public en terme de compétences. • Fournir des incitations adaptées pour maintenir l'intérêt et conserver le personnel qualifié.	• Prendre des dispositions pour une supervision plus rapprochée et un partage du savoir. • Les bailleurs de fonds et les gouvernements doivent s'entendre sur le cadre de supervision. • Les équipes de gestion de projet et les bénéficiaires doivent avoir la possibilité de se prononcer sur les termes de référence des consultants, de participer à leur sélection et d'évaluer leurs performances. • Une capacité de réaction rapide améliorera la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives. • Introduire suffisamment de flexibilité dans la mise en œuvre pour permettre l'adaptation de la conception au contexte local.	• Mise en œuvre effective de procédures agréées de suivi et d'évaluation répondant aux besoins des gouvernements et des usagers ; formation du personnel local à l'utilisation des outils de gestion de projets.
Evaluation (achèvement)		• Rédiger et distribuer rapidement les rapports d'achèvement de projet.	• Evaluations conjointes par les gouvernements, les bailleur de fonds et les partenaires bénéficiaires
Evaluation (post-achèvement, assistance)	• Assurer un rôle « résiduel » du gouvernement, en particulier quant à la fourniture de services aux agriculteurs (intrants, marchés, crédit) • Eviter ou surmonter les problèmes d'O&M par des choix de conception (physique, institutionnelle) compatible avec les compétences et capacités disponibles localement et favoriser l'émergence de prestataires de services professionnels, orientés vers la qualité du service, spécifiquement en charge des fonctions d'Ó&M.	Soutien à long terme, et suivi et évaluation des nouveaux arrangements institutionnels et financiers pour la fourniture des services d'irrigation (partenariats public-privé, fédération d'associations d'usagers de l'eau)	• Améliorer les modes d'évaluation des impacts des projets en matière de réduction de la pauvreté

PHASE DU CYCLE DU PROJET	ACTEURS AUXQUELS SONT DESTINEES LES RECOMMANDATIONS		
	Gouvernements	Institutions financières internationales	Institutions financières internationales & Gouvernements
Au long et autour du cycle de projet	•Améliorer la compréhension de la pauvreté rurale et de la contribution potentielle des aménagements hydrauliques agricoles à sa réduction, de la part de tous les acteurs (institutions financières, gouvernements nationaux et locaux, institutions d'enseignement et de recherche, ONG). • L'adoption d'approches participatives pour concevoir et mettre en oeuvre les projets renforcera les institutions locales de gestion de l'eau et de l'irrigation et améliorera la durabilité des projets. Par ailleurs, la mise en oeuvre d'une telle approche comportera (a) le renforcement des capacités en termes d'approche participative du personnel du projet, et (b) la mise en place d'incitations à interagir avec les parties prenantes locales. • Renforcer la collaboration entre les personnels des bailleurs de fonds et les gestionnaires des projets à toutes les étapes du cycle du projet. • Proposer des formations, un renforcement et un développement des compétences à tous les niveaux comme partie intégrante du projet. • Simplifier les procédures des bailleurs de fonds pour l'approvisionnement, le décaissement, le suivi et le reporting. Institutions financières internationales doivent adopter des procédures uniformes afin de faciliter le travail du gouvernement et des agences d'exécution. Développement et adoption d'outils de gestion basés sur les résultats pour la discussion des politiques, les programmes sectoriels et les projets. • Inclure plus systématiquement dans les rapports d'évaluation des indicateurs standardisés sur la planification et la mise en œuvre des projets, telles que la description des arrangements institutionnels pour la gestion du projet, leur efficacité, et les leçons que l'on peut en tirer. • Revoir l'organisation interne des bailleurs de fonds et agences de développement concernant l'attribution des rôles et responsabilités ; le partage de l'information et des l'expériences en termes de succès, échecs et bonnes pratiques de planification et lmise en œuvre ; réduire la pression sur le personnel opérationnel ; décentraliser autant que possible les responsabilités au niveau des bureaux régionaux ou nationaux des agences financières ; fournir un appui technique adapté sur les questions en dehors du champ d'expertise des personnels opérationnels. • Aider les gouvernements à prendre l'initiative en matière de gestion et d'aménagement hydro-agricoles, en recherchant l'intégration avec les processus de définition des Stratégies de Lutte contre la Pauvreté.		

1 INTRODUCTION

1 Disappointing results of agricultural water development efforts in the past have often been associated with poor planning, appraisal and implementation of investment opportunities in Asia as well as Africa (Nijman, 1991; 1992). Failures in design and implementation of projects have often caused low or even negative returns on investment, emergence of environmental and health problems, lack of sustainability, subsequent collapse of infrastructure, and emergence of a rehabilitation – lack of maintenance – rehabilitation cycle. Even where project design has been satisfactory, weak implementation capacity has often led to unsatisfactory results.

2 Many projects in the past (not only agricultural projects) were designed and implemented in a top-down fashion, with little or no real participation of the supposed 'beneficiaries' in designing and implementing projects. Investments have often been driven by International Financing Institutions (IFIs) and governments, and not by the demands and wishes of potential beneficiaries. Even projects specifically intended to enhance farmers' capacity for scheme management have often not succeeded, in part because of serious project design and implementation weaknesses (Shah et al. 2002).

3 The main challenge in the sector is to create the environment for increased and sustainable agricultural production through efficient management of the existing irrigated lands and expansion into new areas, to improve food security and livelihoods. This requires development planning and mobilization of investment resources for implementation and operation of many projects over the coming decades. Weaknesses in the planning and implementation process had been identified at the Harare workshop initiating the Collaborative Program and in other forums as one of the key issues that should be addressed to facilitate increased development in the sector. This is the justification for this component study.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

4 The specific objective of the Planning and Implementation component is to identify ways to increase the performance and sustainability of investments in agricultural water, by pinpointing practical measures to improve project preparation and implementation. This includes planning, appraisal, implementation arrangements, supervision (or 'implementation support'), and systems for monitoring and evaluation. Special attention has been paid to the institutional framework for project planning, appraisal and implementation, in terms of the incentives the different parties may have with respect to achieving the project goals. Ways to make projects more demand-driven, such that the water users are motivated and enabled to use the infrastructure productively and sustainably have been emphasized. This component focuses on agricultural water use projects funded by multilateral IFIs (World Bank, African Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, European Union). A few projects funded by bilateral agencies (Agence Française de Développement), governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Care, World Vision) and private sector were incorporated in the analysis. The study covers both large-scale and small-scale schemes.

5 The study comprised two phases: a desk review, and a field study based on a limited set of country cases. The purpose of the desk study was to review and classify the different causes of success and failure of agricultural water development projects that had already been identified and the solutions proposed to remedy these problems. The case studies were intended to fill gaps in information and provide the basis for deeper insights. They focused on recently implemented, not necessarily completed, projects, to assess to what extent the new trends in IFIs' policies and procedures are implemented on the ground, to identify the constraints faced and innovative ways of overcoming them. This report integrates and synthesizes the findings of the two phases[1].

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Conceptual framework

6 Planning and implementation problems are often cited to explain the differences between objectives and achievements in agricultural water use projects in Sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover it is assumed that most of the technical failures have an institutional origin. Criteria used to judge these projects refer to their relevance and their efficacy. The ***efficacy*** of projects relates to how the results compare to the objectives, i.e., were the things done in the right way. The ***relevance*** of projects refers to how a set of objectives is defined, i.e., were the right things done[2]. These objectives are then compared to the national development plans and strategies. The idea is therefore to explain how planning and implementation processes may have an impact on the relevance and efficacy of the projects.

7 Planning and implementation problems have already been well documented in many studies, with several contributions dating from the early 1990s (see for example Diemer and Vincent 1992). Nevertheless, the ranking of importance among the possible causes of these problems varies from one expert to another. Further, it is currently difficult to assess to what extent the problems diagnosed in the early 1990s still apply today.

8 In a broad way, many of the problematic issues exposed in the early 1990s have been integrated in new policy frameworks: participation of beneficiaries in the design, attention to gender and the poorer segments of the population, design of user associations to take over the operation and maintenance after project completion, relationships between the project management unit (PMU) and governmental agencies, etc. While these elements are now part of the official discourse and thus more or less compulsorily present in project appraisal documents, more recent projects still show disappointing results vis-à-vis these issues.

[1]For more details, refer to Morardet et al. (2004 a and b).

[2]For a precise definition of the terms "relevance", "efficacy", "efficiency", see for instance World Bank, 1996.

9 Therefore, it may be useful to assess to what extent the planning and implementation processes have really evolved by comparing projects implemented at different periods within the last twenty years. An assessment of some on-going projects may demonstrate what progress has been made, and may also identify a new set of issues.

10 The various failures reported in the literature may occur at different stages of the planning and implementation process. Therefore, the proposed conceptual framework is based on a description of the project life cycle, and on the identification of the different types of failures associated with each stage.

11 The effectiveness of each stage is closely linked to the stakeholders involved in implementation and to the way the responsibilities are shared among them. Therefore it is important to clearly identify for each stage its requirements, the institution in charge, the expected outputs, and the potential means of monitoring its execution.

12 The institutional failures can be divided into three types:

- A lack of capacity of one or more of the actors regarding one or more of the actions (planning, supervision, implementation, etc);
- A lack of incentives to complete successfully the expected actions; and
- A problem within the project lifecycle.

13 There are also often perceived trade-offs between the benefits of an improvement of the institutional process and their costs, but there is evidence to the contrary.

14 For a specific project, the failures or successes at each stage of the project life cycle can be identified by answering the following questions:

- What are the incentives of the various actors involved in the project (e.g., the investor, government officials, politicians, contractors, the presumed 'beneficiaries')? Are project objectives and the incentive structures aligned and consistent? Who are the losers and who are the winners? How do these affect the project outcomes?
- What is the quality of data used in planning, implementation, and monitoring? How effectively are these data used? Do all parties to the project have access to the data they need? How do these issues affect project outcomes?
- How effective are the mechanisms for project management? Do all the key actors have a voice? Is there an effective, transparent planning and monitoring process? Does the project have the support from the government, investors, and beneficiaries it requires for effective implementation? Are the decision-making, tendering, financial disbursement, etc. mechanisms effective, transparent, and consistent with best practice? How do these factors affect project outcomes?

- How is the project design and implementation affected by government policies and capacities? Is the project consistent with government policies? Is the capacity of the implementing agency adequate for project implementation as agreed? If not, what is being done to ensure capacity is built? Is the project designed in a way to capture lessons that may be relevant for improving government policies? How do these factors affect project outcomes?

15 Other issues to be at least partially addressed include the following:

- Application of IWRM principles and treatment of agricultural water within the framework of holistic, integrated river basin management and integrated rural development approach or lack of it[3];

- Suitability of physical design and choice of technology to the local situation; suitability of scale and complexity of project to local capacities and conditions; and

- Strategy for capacity building, awareness and widening the knowledge base including public education; professional services and construction; research and technology adaptation.

16 This component of the Collaborative Program has compiled experiences of countries and the collaborating partners from past and recent project preparation and implementation, and analyzed lessons learned to identify key constraints and innovative approaches to enable increased investment in the sector. The methodology is, broadly, an "institutional analysis," drawing from sociology and institutional economics but focusing on identifying practical implementable suggestions for improvement without indulging in a broad theoretical critique of project design.

17 The study has analyzed the institutional and technical settings wherein projects are conceptualized, developed and implemented and eventually operated. The idea is to understand how these setting have contributed to a project's success or failure.

3.2 Material and method

18 The desk review analyzed past experiences and approaches of financing institutions and countries to identify possible reasons for successes or failures, based on a review of academic and gray literature (a comprehensive list of the references used is provided in Morardet et al., 2004a). Documents from three financing institutions, World Bank (WB), African Development Bank (ADB) and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have been analyzed: policies and guidelines, reviews of project performance, and crosscutting evaluations.

[3]Uncritical implementation of inappropriate policies in the name of "IWRM" is also an issue; see Van Koppen and Safilios-Rothschild 2005.