

ROM Monitoring Questions

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Type of ROM review | Projects and Programmes |
| Project title | Enhancing Governance and Capacity of Service Providers and Civil Society in Water Supply and Sanitation Sectors |
| Project reference | C-306698 |
| Delegation in charge | Bangladesh |
| Print date | 12/01/2016 |

| Key information | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|--|----------|
| Domain (instrument) | | | |
| DAC sector | | | |
| Zone benefitting from the action | | | |
| Type of Project/Programme | | | |
| Geographic Implementation | | | |
| Contracting party | | | |
| EU contribution | | | |
| Project Implementation Dates | Start date | | End Date |
| Reason for ROM review | | | |
| Countries visited | | | |
| ROM expert(s) name(s) | | | |
| Field phase | Start date | | End Date |

| Summary of grades | |
|-------------------|--|
| Relevance | |
| Efficiency | |
| Effectiveness | |
| Sustainability | |

| Keys documents | Number |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Essential Project/Programme documents | |
| Other documents available | |

| Persons interviewed | Number |
|----------------------|--------|
| EC services | |
| Partner country | |
| Implementing partner | |
| Final Beneficiaries | |
| Other | |

1. Relevance

Select: Good / Very good Problems Serious deficiencies

1.1. Does the project presently respond to the needs of the **target groups**?

1.2. Is the action (including CD if relevant) adequate vis-à-vis the present **capacity of the local partner**?

1.3. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (**ownership**)?

1.4. Is there an effective government led system of sector coordination (including CD) involving the relevant local stakeholders and donors?

| | |
|--|--|
| 1.5. Are there any complementarity issues with other ongoing/planned projects or programmes (including CD) managed by donors that need to be addressed? | |
| | |
| 1.6. Have changed circumstances (including critical constraints in the context) been taken into account by updating the intervention logic ? | |
| | |

1.7. Indicators

a) Are the indicators well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the objectives?

b) Are all related data available?

| | |
|---|--|
| c) Are all indicators sex-disaggregated, if relevant? | |
| | |
| d) Are baselines set and updated for each indicator? | |

e) Are targets values set and are they realistic or do they need to be updated?

Conclusion

2. Efficiency

Select:

Good /
Very good

Problems

Serious
deficiencies

2.1. Are the chosen **implementation mechanisms** (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) conducive for achieving the expected results?

2.2. Do local partners effectively **lead in the planning** of the action (including CD if relevant) beyond formal endorsement?

2.3. Inputs

a) Do the resources correspond to the needs of the action?

b) Do local partners provide the inputs (human or physical) that would be required to enable the action (including CD if relevant) to be effective?

c) To what degree are resources (inputs) available on time from other stakeholders?

2.4. Delays

a) If there are delays, how important are they?

b) Have the reasons been identified?

c) Are the revisions of planning been properly implemented? Effective?

| | |
|--|--|
| 2.5. Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner? | |
| | |
| 2.6. Is the action adequately monitored and/or assessed by the local partners? | |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Conclusion | |
| | |

3. Effectiveness

Select:

Good /
Very good

Problems

Serious
deficiencies

3.1. Has the **expected progress** in term of **outputs** being properly achieved?

3.2. Is the **quality of outputs** (including those of CD support) satisfactory?

3.3. Are the outputs (including CD) still likely to lead to the **expected outcomes**?

3.4. Are there evidences that the action supports the implementation or the development (or its changes) of the **partners' policy/actions**?

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Conclusion | |
| | |

4. Sustainability

Select:

Good /
Very good

Problems

Serious
deficiencies

4.1. Is an adequate level of **human and institutional capacity** (avoiding unnecessary parallel mechanisms) put in place in order to continue delivering the action's benefits?

4.2. Is the role of the EUD/HQ in the management and the monitoring of the operation sufficiently respectful of the **leading role of the partners** in order to enhance their capacities?

4.3. If there is a **financial contribution** needed for continued access to the benefits of the action, can **target groups** afford such a payment?

4.4. Are the **relevant authorities** taken the **financial measure** to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action?

4.5. Has the **private sector** been involved to ensure the sustainability of the action?

4.6. Have the necessary measures been taken to address the **environmental sustainability**?

| | |
|--|--|
| 4.7. Have the necessary measures been taken into account to enhance the role of women ? | |
| | |
| Conclusion | |
| | |

5. Horizontal issues

5.1. To what extent have recommendations raised in QSG/previous ROM/ or previous evaluations been taken into account?

5.2. Have the **communication and visibility** actions been implemented in an appropriate manner?

5.3. Are there **good practises** inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?

