

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Overall Project Rating:** Needs Improvement (The lessons learned report is required for all projects. See question 25)

**Project Number :** 00094198

**Project Title :** Ce Programme permettra d'accroître le taux de desserte et d'accès à l'eau potable des populations non encore couvertes dans 54 communes du Bénin couvrant 307 villages.

**Project Date :** 01-Jan-2016

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)**

- 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

## Evidence

Les réunions de coordination du programme et la réunion avec l'Agence en charge de l'Eau du 25 septembre 2017 ont recommandé qu'un point global soit fait sur la mise en œuvre du programme. A cet effet, les rapports de la mise en œuvre du programme sont transmis à la partie nationale (Direction Générale de l'Eau). Il existe des preuves qui montre que le projet a pris des mesures pour la prise en compte des changements dans la théorie du changement. Ces changements sont pleinement intégrés dans la théorie du changement du projet. Le Gouvernement a mis à la disposition du PNUD le financement complémentaire et les activités planifiées sont achevées Source : Rapport final du programme

**2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging [areas](#) and implementation was consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

## Evidence

Le projet contribue à la réalisation des objectifs de développement durable. Il permettra d'accroître le taux de desserte et d'accès à l'eau potable des populations non encore couvertes dans 54 communes du Bénin couvrant 307 villages, afin de contribuer à l'amélioration de leurs conditions de vie et à la réalisation complète de la cible C de l'ODD n°7 et des cibles 6a et 6c de l'ODD6

### 3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.

- Yes
- No

## Evidence

le projet alimentation en eau qui répond à la stratégie nationale de l'Eau s'arrime bien sur l'UNDAF et le CPD 2014-2018: D'ici à fin 2018, les institutions et les populations des communes d'intervention assurent une meilleure gestion de l'environnement, des ressources naturelles et énergétiques, du cadre de vie, des conséquences des changements climatiques, des crises et catastrophes naturelles; voir Prodoc. il est toujours pertinent pour le CPD et l'UNDAF 2019-2023

## Relevant

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

### 4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected.
- Not Applicable

## Evidence

Les commentaires des bénéficiaires et leurs perceptions du programme sont bonnes. Un film documentaire a été réalisé et confirme la satisfaction des bénéficiaires. Ces éléments ont été utilisés pour la mobilisation du financement complémentaire du programme. Le CD du film documentaire est

**5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were regularly discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

**Evidence**

---

Le projet génère des connaissances, en particulier les leçons apprises ont permis d'améliorer la mise en œuvre du programme pour assurer la pertinence du projet par rapport aux objectifs fixés. Source : rapport final

---

**6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based adjustments and changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments made, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence that adjustments and/or changes were made, as appropriate. This option should also be selected if the project had no special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to project results and activities.

**Evidence**

---

Le programme permet de remédier aux inégalités entre les sexes et de donner aux femmes les moyens d'agir et de produire les effets escomptés. Dans les milieux ruraux en général, la corvée de l'eau revient à la femme. La réalisation des forages dans ces lieux réduisent considérablement cette corvée de l'eau et permet aux femmes notamment de concentrer leur temps dans les activités génératrices de revenu. Source : Prodoc et rapport final et CD portant film documentaire réalisé en mai 2017.

---

**7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project reached a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the initiative in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage in a second phase or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: *The project was not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the initiative in the future.*

**Evidence**

Bien que l'envergure du programme soit nationale, il importe de noter que toutes les localités du Bénin ne sont pas prises en compte. En vue de donner un accès universel à l'eau potable d'ici 2021, le Gouvernement mise en place de l'Agence Nationale pour l'Eau potable en Milieu Rural qui prendra en charge le volet accès à l'eau potable. Source : Prodoc et rapport final

**Social & Environmental Standards**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited to no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

**Evidence**

Certaines éléments indiquent que le projet favorise la réalisation des droits de la personne Source : Prodoc et rapport final

**9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

La table des risques du projet est suivie et mise à jour durant tout le cycle

**10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is “Yes”)**

- Yes
- No

#### Evidence

un  
risque est l'insuffisance des ressources planifiées pour la  
mise en œuvre du projet due au fait de la nature de certains  
sols qui a engendré des forages non productifs. le nombre de  
forages prévus dans document de projet a été révisé au prorata  
des ressources  
disponibles.

#### Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data sources were not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were rarely captured and used.

#### Evidence

Le  
projet comporte un plan de S & E chiffré et la plupart des  
lignes de base et des cibles sont précisés. Les données  
d'avancement par rapport aux indicateurs du projet sont  
recueillies régulièrement, bien qu'il puisse y avoir un  
certain retard dans la fréquence indiquée dans le plan.  
Source : Prodoc, PTA 2017 et rapport  
final

**12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)

*The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*

The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

#### Evidence

Le mécanisme de gestion du projet fonctionne comme prévu dans le document du projet. Source : Prodoc rapport des réunions d'orientation et rapport final

### 13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)

*2: The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)*

1: The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.

#### Evidence

La mise à jour des risques se fait chaque trimestre dans ATLAS, comme en témoigne un journal des risques mis à jour. Des mises à jour ont été apportées aux plans de gestion et aux mesures d'atténuation. Source : rapport final et rapport de progrès

Efficient

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

### 14. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

Yes

No

#### Evidence

les ressources budgétisées pour la mise en oeuvre du projet sont révélées insuffisante compte tenu du fait sur certains sites les sols sont cristallins et les forages sont révélés improductifs ce qui a demandé le choix d'un autre site et des dépenses supplémentaires non prévues. l'organe de gouvernance du projet s'est réuni et les résultats en termes de nombre de forages prévus ont été ajustés dans le Prodoc. le nombre de

forages a été réduit de 320 prévus à 250 réalisés.

**15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. This option is also selected if operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

**Evidence**

Les plans de procurement du projet est actualisé et suivi tout le long du cycle du projet

**16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was made.

**Evidence**

Le projet surveille ses propres coûts mais il n'y a pas d'analyse systématique des coûts. Le projet coordonne les activités avec d'autres projets afin de réaliser des gains d'efficience.  
Source : PTA et offre technique et financière des consultants

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

**17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?**

- Yes
- No

## Evidence

Rapport  
final du  
projet

### 18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

- Yes
- No

## Evidence

Rapport  
final et de clôture du  
projet

### 19. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no regular review of the work plan by management took place.

## Evidence

Source:  
PTA et Rapports de progrès et  
final

### 20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Targeted groups were systematically identified using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence to confirm that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries were members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.
- Not Applicable



## Evidence

Le projet cible des groupes et / ou des zones géographiques spécifiques, en se basant sur l'expression de leurs besoins. Certains éléments de preuve sont fournis pour confirmer que les bénéficiaires du projet sont membres des groupes ciblés. Un engagement /motivation des bénéficiaires a été observé et dénote leur niveau de satisfaction. Source : Prodoc, Rapport de progrès et final

**21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?**

- Yes
- No

## Evidence

un staff homme a été mis à disposition sur le projet et tous les cadres impliqués dans les structures de L'État sont des hommes. seulement deux points focaux de communes sont des femmes

## Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

**22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as needed. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

## Evidence

Les parties prenantes et les partenaires nationaux participent pleinement à la prise de décisions, à la mise en œuvre et au suivi du projet. Source : Rapport de progrès et compte rendu de réunion de coordination du programme avec la partie nationale.

**23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources. There is clear evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources. There is limited evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence

---

Il a été observé sur le programme, une amélioration des capacités et des performances des institutions et systèmes nationaux pertinents à l'aide d'indicateurs et de sources de données raisonnablement crédibles, y compris les activités d'assurance HACT. Source : Prodoc et rapport de progrès et final

---

**24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: *The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.*

#### Evidence

---

Il y a des possibilités de répliation dans les zones non encore couvertes mais les réformes du Gouvernement ayant donné lieu à la création d'une agence de l'eau qui exécute directement avec les prestataires les travaux n'a pas facilité une nouvelle phase du projet. des négociations sont en cours avec l'Agence pour un accompagnement du Bureau au delivery

---

**25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.**

## Summary/Final Project Board Comments:

Le projet reste pertinent au vu des besoins des communautés et des cibles ODD priorisées par le Bénin. Des possibilités de répliation des actions du projet dans les zones non encore couvertes existent. mais les réformes de l'Etat ont conduit à la création d'une Agence de l'Eau qui exécute directement avec les prestataires les travaux de réalisation d'AEP. il est recommandé que des négociations soient engagées avec l'Agence et son conseil d'administration en vue d'établir des modalités de collaboration pour un delivery efficace et efficient.