

Mid-term Review of:

Tanzania

Final Report

24 November





## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW MANDATE**

- The Pangani Basin Water Board was the first of nine in Tanzania to be established.
- The new National Water Policy was gazetted in 2002 g







**APPENDICES:**

Appendix 1: Maps, fi





It is difficult to establish a definite single starting date of the project preparations. Already in November 2001 IUCN had a reconnaissance trip in the PB to investigate its suitability as an IUCN-WANI demon



The overall purpose of this Review is twofold:

- I. Learning and Improvement: The outputs of this Mid-term Review will provide useful and relevant information to the ongoing scope of work of the partner institutions; explore why the interventions implemented by thn





Team uses data to populate flow scen





seeing how a reasonable budget could have been set up based on this list. It is suspected that the planning of activities has started with the available funding coming onboard, and, partly based on requirements from the donors, the list of activities have been created. The modality of implementation has therefore from the start been fairly “loose”, with one activity building on the previous one, and the road largely being built as progress materialises. This is probably not entirely appropriate in a project with activities widely spread out thematically and geographically, which is also being reflected in the lack of project progress.

The merged activities are not presented in a joint time schedule format, and this is a shortcoming of the planning so far. Each of the main components has, as part of their agreement/project description, a tentative allocation schedule over time

15 August 2007 and ends at 14 August 2010, i.e. the duration being 36 months. On yearly basis, the Project has budgeted to spend USD 295,374, USD 354,722 and USD 349,544 for Year 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

- c) ***IUCN WANI Funds:*** IUCN WANI had budgeted to spend USD 1,000,000 (largely covering the period July 2004 to June 2007). Additionally IUCN ESARO in June 2008 (26.06.08) has allocated additional funding to





*project staff (CDO, PM) ... ”.*

In addition, under Section 6.3 the PC should “*assist in overseeing and developing*” the relationship between IUCN and the donors, partners and the PBWO.

**The Review Team’s Observations/Comments:**

The RT is confused as to what managerial set-up was *intended* to start with, and what *is said* in the above documents about











- It seems as if the Reference Group will be responsible for the design of the forum (“design the KCF”, “participate in stakeholder consultation processes”). This is however pulling the responsibility away from







an important intervention that op

important basis for the continued IWRM planning in the Basin, and will subsequently be presented in a Scenario Report. The capacity building under this component has been truly hands-on, by working with the Tanzanian Core Team. In order to make s

correspondence between the PMU and SNV (see other section in this report). The PBWO has obviously not







shortcoming that makes the direct comparison between the two difficult. Two comprehensive progress reports have been prepared under the Project: The “Technical Progress Report January 2003 – December 2006”, and “Technical Progress Report January–December 2007”. Both these reports have descriptive narrative text outlining what has been undertaken during the period under each result area, which is  
cw







Catchment Forums (SCFs) are established and operational, the larger Kilometwe  
should be formed in the future.

The establishment of the KCF should be quicker and easier once the experie

outputs. This Core Team should comprise one of the CDOs (Ms. Irene), seconded full time to the Projs



suffering non-deliveries in Soko and Hingilili, and that this could indicate that the NGO would *not* be a suitable partner to heavily involve in the KC. The RT still maintains that PAMOJA should be involved in the KC process, as these activities seem to be mm



complete, being the groundwater



and the bulk of the work would have been done at this time, at least on the sub-catchments level. It should be emphasised that as the RT does not have the full overview of the project budget details and are not experts on community development and participation processes, the final extension of the Project must therefore be decided by the experts in this field and the project management.

Another issue is the extension of funding by the donors, EU and UNDP/GEF, and their acceptance of the change in project focus by dropping the IWRM planning (if needed) and concentrate on stakeholder interventions from the grassroots level. The RT had a meeting with the EU, and the EU representative informed that an extension of the project period is “no big deal”, where only an addendum to the present agreement has to be signed in case the logframe is changed. If the revised work plan is reasonable and sensible, the EU is therefore expected to have a long total funding from EU. It is not clear if the EU will exceed This should be possible to accommodate by clever planning and budgeting, as the processes are more human intensive than capital intensive. Which requirements UNDP/GEF might have on extension of the project period and reallocation of funds within a project, is not known to the RT at this stage. This will be task for the project management to sort out with the UNDP.

As mentioned previously

## Mid-term Review

