

## Project Completion Report

This Top Sheet captures the headlines on the project performances performance over the course of its lifetime. Teams should attach summary sheets from each annual review over the life of the project.

<b>Review Date:</b>	June 2015
---------------------	-----------

<b>Title:</b> Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction (UPPR)		
<b>Project Code:</b> 107467	<b>Start Date:</b> March 2008	<b>End Date:</b> August 2015

### Summary of Project Performance

Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 - PCR
Project Score	n/a	62.50	70	A	A	A+	A+
Risk Rating		High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

### Financial Position

<b>Original Project Value:</b>	£60.10m
<b>Extensions/ amendments:</b>	1.Nutrition component added in 2012, £4.87m, 2. Project extension 7 months (September 2014 to March 2015), £3.0m. 3. No cost extension, April 2015 -August 2015
<b>Log-frame revisions:</b>	Multiple revisions were made to the log-frame.
<b>Total project spend:</b>	£67,893,697 (99.88%)

### Follow up actions required following closure

- DFID and UNDP will together need to ensure there is a smooth transition of the nutrition component (which runs until March 2016) from the UPPR management structure to that of UNDP.
- Agreement should be reached between UNDP and Government of Bangladesh regarding the hosting of the UPPR website by the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) at the Ministry of Local Government Rural Development and Cooperatives (MoLGRDC).
- UNDP to retain limited staff until the new programme on urban development- also funded by DFID- comes on stream by Dec 15, 2015.
- UNDP shall ensure proper disposal and transfer of assets as per plan shared with DFID including assets kept for the new National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP).

## A. Introduction and Context

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	N/A
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	<a href="http://eks-web-03/AMP/Project/Documents/107467">http://eks-web-03/AMP/Project/Documents/107467</a>

### Background

1. As with most of South Asia, urbanisation is occurring rapidly in Bangladesh. Inadequate infrastructure and service provision, increasing land prices, weak governance and accountability are among the most significant challenges.<sup>1</sup> Dhaka is growing at an estimated 3% per year and the urban population is projected to double in the next 40 years.<sup>2</sup> This has been driven primarily by economic growth, with cities now accounting for more than 50% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This has coincided with a decline in work in the agricultural sector, leading to the movement of surplus labour from rural to urban areas, further exacerbated by climate-related shocks and stresses.<sup>3</sup>
2. To help tackle some of the challenges associated with rapid urban growth, the UK provided approximately £68m between March 2008 and August 2015 to the Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction Project (UPPR). UNDP provided £2.6m and the Government of Bangladesh £2.9m of in-kind support. UPPR built on the experience of a previous project, the Local Partnerships for Urban Poverty Alleviation Project 2000 - 2007 (LPUPAP). Putting community mobilisation at its core, the purpose of UPPR was to bring improvements in livelihoods and living conditions of 3 million poor people in 23 major cities and towns across Bangladesh. This was done through:
  - Organisation and mobilisation of poor people living in slums in Community Development Committees leading to organising them in a federated structure.
  - Improvement in their livelihoods through savings and credit schemes, small business grants and training.
  - Improvement in living conditions in slums with better paths, drainage, sanitation, water supplies and other small infrastructure.
  - Assist in linking to services and support provided by private sector and other donor implemented programmes on urban development
3. Delivery included two main strands. Firstly, support was provided to communities to organise decision-making groups and funding investments to achieve the results above. Communities were helped to organise into Community Development Committees (CDCs) which then decide how to use the funding available. Community Facilitators (CFs) were recruited from among the community and paid a stipend. They are a key point of contact for the project and play an important role in supporting the CDCs in their interaction with the project. The Settlement Improvement Fund (SIF) paid for clean water supplies, better sanitation, sealed paths and improved drainage. The Socio-Economic Fund (SEF) provided grants to start businesses, for apprenticeships and training, to help children continue at school who are at risk of dropping out, promote health and nutrition, tackle domestic violence and reduce early marriage. The activities were particularly targeted at poor, vulnerable and excluded women and children and they get access to the full range of project support.
4. The second main area of work was around building linkages to other sources of support. The project linked the communities with organisations that provide services and longer-term support; e.g. partnerships with the private sector to train people to get better jobs. The project also aimed

<sup>1</sup> *UNU and Alliance Development Works (2014) World Risk Report: The City as a Risk Area. Helal-uz-Zaman, A K M et al (2010) Urbanisation in Bangladesh: Present Status and Policy Implications. ASA University Review, Vol 4 (2)*

<sup>2</sup> *Streatfield, P and Karar, Z (2008) Population Challenges for Bangladesh in the Coming Decades. Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition 26(3): 261 – 272.*

<sup>3</sup> *Helal-uz-Zaman, A K M et al (2010) Urbanisation in Bangladesh: Present Status and Policy Implications. ASA University Review, Vol 4 (2)*

to influence local and national government policies and programmes so they include and benefit the urban poor.

5. There were three extensions to the project:
  - i A nutrition component was added to the project in 2012 at a cost of £4.87m;
  - ii The project was then extended from September 2014 to March 2015 at a cost of £3.0m; and
  - iii A no-cost extension was granted from April 2015 to August 2015.
6. The nutrition component was added as part of an effort by DFID Bangladesh to enhance nutrition outcome of the programme. 56% of children under the age of five living in slums are stunted, and 28 percent are severely stunted<sup>4</sup>. This compares with equivalent figures of 36% percent and 16 percent in the population at large. Other nutrition indicators were similarly poor.
7. The first extension to the project (August 2014 - March 2015) was intended to scale-up the project's phase-out activities to enhance sustainability i.e. strengthening community-based organisation structures so that they are sustainable and able to advocate with municipalities to integrate their views into local planning and pilot and document new models of security of land tenure.
8. The no-cost extension (April 2015 - August 2015) was designed to help sustain and consolidate these achievements and to further strengthen the community and local Government structures, operationalising the Community Housing Development Funds (CHDF) and scaling up of land tenure models. In addition it was intended to help transition to the future programme.
9. Overall, the project achieved the expected results in all these result areas, and in many cases achieved more than was planned. Detailed results are presented under each output. The highlights are:
  - i 816,000 households organised into Community Development Committees (CDCs);
  - ii 399,000 households active as members of savings and credit groups;
  - iii 247,000 households provided with better water supplies, 187,000 with improved latrines and 495,000 households benefitting from improved drains and footpaths; and
  - iv 240,000 people provided with skills training.
10. There is good evidence that CDCs which are the foundation of the project, are developing into strong organisations that are becoming developmental in their own right, rather than acting only as a conduit for resources. The election as town councillors of members of the CDCs- considered to be one the most significant indicators for empowerment- has provided the poor with an increasingly effective voice within the municipality.

## **B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **Overall Outcome Assessment: A**

11. The outcome of the project was: "Livelihoods and living conditions of 3 million poor and extreme poor people living in urban areas, especially women and children, sustainably improved." Achievement was assessed against the following indicators:
  - i A reduction in the numbers of poor households and the depth of their poverty;
  - ii Improvements in water supply and sanitation;
  - iii Women having more money, autonomy, independence and higher status;

---

<sup>4</sup> Multi-dimensional Poverty in Urban Bangladesh 2014 (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

- iv Changes in national urban policy that benefit poor people, including the effective operation of the Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF) and the achievement of targets in the 6<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. Summary of Outcome score

Indicator	Target	Achievement	Score - net of issues flagged
1.1. % of beneficiary households (HH) multi-dimensionally poor by Multi-Dimensional Poverty Index (MPI)	38.1%	23.5%	A
1.2. Average % (intensity) of deprivations among beneficiary households multi-dimensionally poor by MPI	46.8%	40.3%	A
2.1. % poor settlements in Community Development Committees (CDCs) reporting at least 10% improvement in Water and Sanitation and Infrastructure conditions	60%	51.3%	A
3.1. % empowered women by the UPPR participatory women's empowerment scorecard	60%	90%	A++
4.1. Two annual urban targets of Sixth Five Year Plan met	Yes	No	C
4.2. Formation of high level Ministerial Committee for Bangladesh Urban Forum	Yes	Yes	A
4.3. Establishment of permanent Secretariat for Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF)	Yes	Yes	A
4.4. % of Pillar 6 targets of UNDAF achieved	40%	n/a	n/a

12. The table above summarises the outcome indicators and targets. It provides the best estimate of achievement available against these indicators and an indicative mark based on this. As discussed below there are issues with these outcome indicators and with the estimation of achievement that make establishing actual outcomes and then scoring outcome difficult. In the above table we have provided an indicative score based on the best evidence we have, net of severity of the issues with it. Combining these gives an overall outcome score of A, which, considering the outcome statement and what we know more broadly about the programme that is not captured by the indicators seems reasonable, if unsatisfactory. More detail on specific indicators is provided below.
13. The Multi-Dimensional Poverty Index (MDPI) study was conducted in a sample of towns in 2013 and 2014. The MPI uses ten indicators under three dimensions: two for health; two for education; and six for living standards. Each dimension and each indicator within a dimension is equally weighted. The MPI provides a poverty headcount. This is the number of people who are considered multi-dimensionally poor at the chosen cut-off point, given as 30% of the weighted indicators. The MPI also provides an intensity measure of multidimensional poverty. This means the average proportion of indicators across which people experience deprivation. The overall MPI score is determined by multiplying the headcount by the intensity measure.<sup>5</sup>
14. The findings for the full sample of 2014 indicated 23.5% of the surveyed population was experiencing multidimensional poverty (1.1.). This was a sharp drop from the 33.3% identified in 2013. Analysis of households that were considered multi-dimensionally poor in 2013 but not multi-dimensionally poor in 2014 shows that their conditions had changed across several indicators.
15. However, this is a short run change, not one that spans the course of the programme. As importantly, due to the absence of an adequate baseline or control, it is not possible to attribute a share of the improvements in poverty reduction to UPPR or any particular interventions - as distinct from aspects of broader processes of economic growth and development taking place in communities.
16. Having access to an improved water source or latrine is more than simple coverage. Assets must be near, functional and safe to use. This indicator was assessed using a comparison between a

<sup>5</sup> Multi-dimensional Poverty in Urban Bangladesh 2014 (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

sample survey in 2014 of Community Development Committees and the Settlement Land Mapping study of 2010 as a baseline. A composite index - the Settlement Living Conditions Index (SLCI) - was developed that amalgamated (a) the quality of water and sanitation provision - latrines, drainage and water supplies; and (b) the quality of infrastructure - roads, paths, electricity, street lighting and solid waste collection.

17. The change in these indices between 2010 and 2014 was measured. The outcome indicator required at least a 10% improvement in water and sanitation *and* infrastructure conditions. Although this was not reached (2.1.), it is worth noting that 76% of settlements reported improved access to water (sub-index) and 66% access to sanitation and infrastructure (sub index).
18. Further, to people living in slums, the water point installed in the area under UPPR was clearly not merely a physical device for safe water supply. It seems to have had greater significance as an indication of their well-being. The quality of water was appreciated [*We are happy with the water as it does not have any bad smell or colour and remains free of arsenic*] - community members, Jessore and Khulna]. CDC leaders from Jessore also pointed out that young children now spent less time collecting water and so had the potential to spend more time for studying. As a result of various testimony of which this is indicative, the review team is of the view that although strictly speaking the target was not met, it obscures some significant improvements that should be taken into account when assessing the target.
19. Changes in the social status of women emerged as a significant indicator of empowerment (3.1.). Women in their discussions with the review team described how participation in their primary group was a means of transforming their lives from [household based] isolation to active engagement in household decision-making and with wider issues in their community. In particular, the women's status as managers of community funds and decision-makers on what activities should be undertaken, where and for whom, marked them out as influential figures in the community in ways that were not possible previously. Women continuously emphasised the importance of education of girls and considered this as an element of their overall empowerment. It was also clear from the discussions that the women's aspirations went beyond working in the informal economy.
20. UPPR's approach to measuring empowerment was to do so on the women's own terms rather than against standardized indicators. The responses of women were reviewed and resolved into five overlapping aspects of empowerment that were combined into a single index. These five aspects were: personal development; status; economic conditions; group participation; and "agency" (i.e. being able to do things). The index ran from 1 to 100. Thresholds were set for "low" and "limited" empowerment (< 40), "moderate empowerment" (40-59), "good empowerment" (60-79) and "high empowerment" (>80). Anyone who scored 40 or more was considered "empowered." 90% of the surveyed women scored 40 or more.<sup>6</sup>
21. In Bangladesh, the opportunities and challenges of urbanisation - unlike the improvements delivered by programmes like UPPR - are set in the context of any supportive policy. There is a lack of urgency and opportunities are missed. UPPR is among the programmes influencing government policy on urban planning and poverty reduction to complement using the evidence generated. The progress, however, can only be assessed as limited. The national urban development policy - a decade in the making - is yet to be approved. The target for spend in urban development as mentioned in the 6<sup>th</sup> Five Year plan was not fulfilled and the ministerial committee mandated to provide strategic steer on urban development has been largely inactive (4.1.). However, the Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF) - a common platform for organisations working on urban poverty to engage with the government - was established in 2013 (4.2.) and continues to engage with the government in taking forward the urban policy albeit with limited success to date.
22. Away from central government policy the project has had success in developing effective relationships with Mayors in the municipalities and city corporations. Resources have been allocated to poverty projects and new staff positions of Slum Development Officers (SDOs) were

---

<sup>6</sup> Further details can be found in the final report on Women's Empowerment "Now I Can" available on the UPPR website. <http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>.

created in towns and cities. The creation of town level Federations of CDC clusters and election of members as town councillors, provide further opportunities to embed the project approach in town-level institutions.

23. Considering this and other evidence, the size and scope of the programme, the range of implementing environments and partners and the magnitude of the challenges in addressing the needs urban poor - transience, lack of tenure rights, lack of access to basic services - the overall outcome has probably been positive. While not all of the targets were met, the scale of the improvements were considerable whilst some of the targets with the benefit of hindsight unrealistically ambitious.
24. The programme introduced new approaches to ensure that communities were involved in the identification and prioritisation of needs and the delivery of interventions in addressing them. The increase in the capacity of the local government institutions to identify needs of the urban poor has since been complemented by government's increased allocation to urban development.

### Overall Output Score and Description

25. The weightings for the outputs changed in 2014 as indicated below to help sharpen the focus on management and partnership building to enhance sustainability in the close-out period. This review, has taken the original weightings as the basis for the assessment as they were in force for the majority of the project period and are overall a more realistic guide to the importance of output delivery to the success of the programme.

Output	Output Weighting by Year					Output Performance
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Overall	
1. Urban poor communities mobilized to form representative and inclusive groups and prepare community action plans	20%	20%	20%	10%	20%	A++
2. Poor urban communities have healthy and secure living environments	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	A++
3. Urban poor and extremely poor people acquire the resources, knowledge and skills to increase their income and assets	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	A+
4. Pro-poor urban policies and partnerships supported at the national and local levels	15%	15%	15%	20%	15%	A
5 Effective project management systems established and operational	5%	5%	5%	10%	5%	B

26. The overall output score for UPPR is **A+**. Output 1 outlines progress in community mobilisation in terms of their ability to prepare action plans and represent the views of the poor in relevant forums. The formation of clusters, town-level federations, the election of CDC members as town councillors and the willingness of CDCs to take on the funding the community facilitators and contributing to financing of local infrastructure are all evidence of sustainable and transformational social and political change is taking place in slums. The output is therefore scored A++.
27. Output 2 relates to the contribution of the programme in making slums healthy and secure for urban communities. Substantial financial support was provided through UPPR for improving local infrastructure-footpaths, drainage, latrines and water points - financed through Settlement Improvement Funds (SIF). Output targets were mostly significantly exceeded and the score for this output is therefore A++.
28. Output 3, on the other hand, captures changes in income and assets of poor and extremely poor people living slums. Women and girls are leaders in UPPR and their needs and interests are incorporated throughout the programme. The output contributed in tackling under-nutrition,



violence and early marriage all of which have high impact on girls and women living in the slums. Overall, an output score of A+ is based on available evidence across a wide range of indicators.

29. Output 4 assesses the contribution made by the programme to urban policies and partnerships both at national and local levels. While UPPR clearly managed to build effective alliances at local levels, working with municipalities and city corporations, around which the majority of output indicators cluster, at national level progress was very limited. So, although the formal indicators might suggest a higher score, the spirit and letter of the output suggest a score of A is justified.
30. Output 5 concerns project management. Although the majority of targets were met by the end of the project (aside from female staff at town and HQ level) and progress clearly picked up in the last two years, for the majority of the programme management has been a major challenge. As a result an overall score of B is a fair reflection.

## Lessons

31. Some of the key lessons from UPPR include:
  - ***Building the capacity of communities is worth doing in its own right, and not just as a means to an end.*** CDCs, clusters and town level federations developed significant capacity to do things on their own. This has encouraged municipalities to draw on the capacity and interest of communities to help develop their approach to tackling urban poverty.
  - ***Influencing national policy is difficult, but it is possible to build good working relationships at town level.*** There is political resistance to decentralisation in Bangladesh. Financing and management decisions are highly centralised - with politicians using patronage in influencing the allocation and use of resources. Institutional co-ordination at national level is also limited - with power mainly held in one central ministry in particular with minimal incentives to work together with other agencies.
  - ***Secure tenure and access to housing loans are high priorities for the urban poor.*** This can be provided without large amounts of external financing. The housing finance through Community Housing Development Fund (CHDF) is financially sustainable and an effective tool to create ownership of the community in maintaining infrastructure.
  - ***Local infrastructure improves people's lives and should continue to be an element in helping the urban poor in future programmes.*** The Settlement Improvement Funds (SIF) have helped improve people's living conditions. Future programmes should include incentives for local governments to shoulder more of the infrastructure cost.
  - ***Partnerships and linkages (P&L) provide an effective way to sustain the project impact.*** The partnerships and linkages element of the programme has been assessed as being at the "cutting edge" of development thinking and practice. The CDC, cluster and federations system makes it much easier for other organisations to access the urban poor.

## Recommendations

32. Recommendations for further programming in this area include:
  - a. ***Advocacy:*** Assess the political and institutional challenges in urban issues in advocating with the government for supportive urban policies.
  - b. ***Capacity:*** Build capacity of municipalities and city corporations in urban planning and management. Future programmes should include incentives for local governments to shoulder more of cost of infrastructure.
  - c. ***Climate Change:*** Mainstream climate change and resilience issues in future urban development programmes. There are efficiency gains to be had from partnership and discussion with communities and town planners and engineers.
  - d. ***Infrastructure:*** Link community level infrastructure to city level planning. This will have significant implications for we plan and implement our work in slums. Future programmes should also include incentives for local governments to contribute a greater share of the costs of infrastructure and to extend city services to poor neighbourhoods ensuring a more equitable spread of investments across poor communities.

- e. **WASH:** Programmes should include gender sensitive indicators for WASH access that cover the need for privacy for women.
- f. **Accountability and Oversight:** The role of Mutual Accountability Unit need to be extended to include financial and risk control measures.
- g. **Partnerships:** Build on UPPR's experience to train staff on brokering and supporting partnerships.
- h. **M & E:** M&E should ensure appropriate structures that will facilitate efficient and effective DFID oversight of the project as well as create space for closer engagement with government to disseminate findings and influence key officials.
- i. **Tenure:** Future programming should maintain a focus on tenure security and affordable housing finance. Future programming should pilot tenure models and financing solutions suitable for these populations living on government land in major cities.



## C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING

<b>Output Title:</b>	<b>Urban poor communities mobilized to form representative and inclusive groups and prepare community action plans</b>		
<b>Output number per LF:</b>	1	<b>Output Score:</b>	<b>A++</b>
<b>Risk:</b>	Medium	<b>Impact weighting (%):</b>	20%
<b>Risk revised since last AR?</b>	N	<b>Impact weighting % revised since last AR?</b>	N

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestone (2015)</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Mark</b>
1.1. HH in: CDCs # in Primary Groups % of HH in Primary Groups	700,000 518,000 75%	813,000 624,491 76.3%	A++
1.2 % of decision making positions held by women from: - extremely poor and poor households - vulnerable and socially excluded households	85% 10%	91% 12%	A
1.3 CDCs with a Community Action Plan	5%	97%	A++
1.4 Clusters in the ward-level planning pilot registered with local authority	10	19	A++
1.5 Towns in the ward-level planning pilot with climate change resilience strategies	4	4	A
1.6 % of community facilitators retained by CDCs	80%	100%	A++

### Key Points

33. This output has significantly exceeded expectations. The targets for all six indicators were met or exceeded. The target for the participation of vulnerable households, which at 10% might appear low, is representative of the share of vulnerable households in the urban poor population.
34. The changes targeted in this output form the foundation of the project and its sustainability. It involves the creation of a hierarchy of community-based organisations that link poor households to both the project and to the municipality. Households were recruited into Primary Groups (PGs) of 30, with up to 10 PGs then forming a Community Development Committee (CDC). Thus each CDC represents about 300 households.
35. The CDCs were the fundamentally the 'engine' of the project. They had a significant planning and oversight role in activities supported by UPPR through developing, prioritising, implementing, and monitoring for community contracts linked Slum Infrastructure Fund (SIF) and activities supported by Socio Economic Fund (SEF) - i.e. education grants, skills training etc. CDC membership provides access to savings and credit group activities ensuring livelihoods.
36. CDCs were made up of Primary Group Leaders and Secretaries. CDCs normally represented a whole settlement, of about 200 to 300 families. These were then combined to form clusters, which are roughly equivalent to a political ward. The clusters have then latterly combined to form Federations at town level.
37. The social mobilisation of poor women through CDCs has led to significant developments not well captured by the indicators. For example, 25 leaders from 19 CDCs in 7 Municipalities ran for office as councillors out of which 8 were elected, all women. The empowerment outcome presented women's view on what decisions and actions signify empowerment. Having skills (personal development) increased their ability to earn money and save (economic conditions) improving their position both within the family and wider community (social status). Similarly investing in girls education (personal development) increased her chances to delay marriage (health).

38. The Community Action Plan (CAP) process is the foundation of the relationship between the programme and the community. The CAP sets out the objectives of the community, a plan to achieve the objectives, and mutual expectations of the programme and community. Quite a large number of communities continued to revisit their CAP which is an evidence of the continuing strength of CDCs and emphasis the project team has placed on strengthening the CDCs.
39. 500 Community Facilitators (CF) posts that were originally funded under the project have been retained and are now being fully funded by the community. The CFs report to the town-level federation. Their main role is to support the CDCs run the savings and credit programme by training and supporting the office holders.
40. 14 Community Housing Development Funds (CHDFs) were formed, each with an Executive Committee elected from the community. Of the 113 committee members, 34% are from extreme poor households, 58% from poor households and only 8% from non-poor households.
41. Four towns (Chittagong, Comilla, Rajshahi and Sirajganj) were supported in adopting specific actions to mitigate the consequences of climate change by devising their own Climate Change Resilience Strategies. These actions were supported by BDT 5.4 million (£43k) of UPPR funding and included the construction of 332m of slope protection, 163m of drain slabs and 1,277m of footpaths. In urban centres such as Khulna along the southern coastal belt where people are particularly at risk from salt water intrusion, communities are already factoring climate change issues into planning and construction. UPPR was not designed with climate and resilience as priorities, although the project started to address this at the latter stages. An example is the emphasis on the use of environment-friendly and more resilient building materials under the SIF.

<b>Output Title:</b>	<b>Poor urban communities have healthy and secure living environments</b>		
<b>Output number per LF:</b>	2	<b>Output Score:</b>	<b>A++</b>
<b>Risk:</b>	Medium	<b>Impact weighting (%):</b>	30%
<b>Risk revised since last AR?:</b>	N	<b>Impact weighting % revised since last AR?:</b>	N

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Mark</b>
2.1 # of beneficiary households benefiting from water facilities, latrines and drainage and footpaths.	<u>Water facilities</u> 195,433 <u>Latrines</u> 173,119 <u>Drains and Footpaths</u> 400,225	<u>Water facilities</u> 246,891 <u>Latrines</u> 187,101 <u>Drains and Footpaths</u> 495,581	A++
2.2. % HH members in CDCs with access to improved water source	70%	84%	A++
2.3. % HH members in CDCs with access to improved latrines	70%	87%	A++
2.4. % community contracts completed in less than 12 months	75%	91%	A++

### Key Points

42. Water quality testing found that 99% of tube-wells in slums were free from arsenic contamination. The study on water and sanitation assessed whether households had access to “improved” water supplies and sanitation. The definition of “improved” incorporated not just whether or not the facility had been built, but whether it was being used, when it was being used, how convenient it was to use, whether or not it flooded during the rainy season, and, critically, whether women enjoyed sufficient privacy and felt secure using the facility. So the definition for “access to improved sanitation/water supply” is set high. Nonetheless, the results were satisfactory. By

December 2014 87% of households surveyed reporting access to “improved” sanitation, which entails “continuous and safe access to an improved latrine.” Access to improved water supplies is similarly encouraging, with 84% of surveyed households meeting all the criteria for access to an improved water supply (2.2.).

43. Out of those households that did not meet all the criteria, the reasons included the latrine flooding, inaccessibility at certain times of the day, lack of privacy, particularly for women, and damage to the latrine. The project established norms for distribution of latrines and tube wells. One latrine is to service three families and one tube well or equivalent for 15 to 20 families. In order to ensure that services are both demand-led and sustainability is ensured through community ownership, 10 per cent of the cost of construction of each latrine and water point was taken as a contribution from the beneficiaries.
44. Ensuring privacy of women and girls in highly dense settlements where facilities are typically shared is a challenge. Women reported that facilities could be locked, used at any time of day and night, and located nearby fostered a sense of security in using these facilities<sup>7</sup>.
45. A particular feature of this output was the use of community contracting to promote greater participation, accountability and to reduce fiduciary risk (2.4.). Community contracting entails community members and households in CDCs identifying their needs, procuring materials and providing or hiring labour to do the settlement improvements works. They also monitor the works done and check for quality assurance, the latter with inputs from UPPR town teams. Community contracts were found to be up to 19.5% cheaper than the prevailing market rates as they did not incur taxes nor have to allow room for contractor profit.
46. Community contracting is an important tool to manage fiduciary risk in implementation of small scale infrastructure. CDCs prepared the contracts and plans for the infrastructure with support from the technical assistance team. Findings from different progress reports, indicate that community contracting has helped in timely construction of latrines. Community contracting as a legitimate means of channelling government funds to poor communities and local government’s recognition of CDCs as a formal and credible partner. Spot checking of contracts was carried out by the Mutual Accountability Unit established under the project. Communities also managed to access funds for infrastructure through partnerships between them and external organisations, most significantly in Sirajgonj (Concern Universal) and Dhaka (UNICEF).
47. Payments for community contract are paid in several small instalments, so the overall fiduciary risk is kept low. Progress is checked continually by staff and bids and costs proved to be lower. A procurement committee is formed by CDC when physical works are agreed and CDC office bearers are not permitted to be part of procurement process. This separation of powers ensures transparency and reduces the scope for fraud. Finally, the 5% management fee that is paid to the CDC is only paid when work has been completed and signed off by the Executive Engineer of Municipality.
48. The infrastructure component of the programme used the highest share of the budget. While on its own improved infrastructure does not improve livelihoods or reduce poverty, it proved a good incentive for the urban poor to organise themselves and take control of their own development. But to be sustainable in the future, the component needs to leverage in more funding from government. There are also gains to be had from ensuring the infrastructure links the urban poor into the wider city infrastructure.
49. **Summary of response to issues raised in previous 2014 Annual Review** - the 2014 AR suggested that UPPR should seek to make more visible the contribution of UKAid on project outputs. Community infrastructure has UKAid branding prominently placed on them.

<b>Output Title:</b>	<b>Urban poor and extremely poor people acquire the resources, knowledge and skills to increase their income and assets</b>
----------------------	---

<sup>7</sup> The Right to be Safe and Healthy: Study of Short Term Outcomes for Households Using Improved Water and Sanitation Sources (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<b>Output number per LF:</b>	3	<b>Output Score:</b>	<b>A+</b>
<b>Risk:</b>	Medium	<b>Impact weighting (%):</b>	30%
<b>Risk revised since last AR?:</b>	Y/N	<b>Impact weighting % revised since last AR?:</b>	Y/N

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target Dec 2014</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Mark</b>
3.1 # of beneficiaries receiving: i) skills development training ii) small enterprise block grant	239,529 321,121	240,609 388,260	A A+
3.2 % of beneficiaries employed six months after: i) skills development training ii) small enterprise block grant"	60% 60%	73% 85%	A+ A+
3.3 # of school years supported of children studying for their Primary School Certificate (PSC) and Secondary School Certificate (SSC)	308,738	363,564	A+
3.4 Beneficiaries receiving: Iron and folic acid (IFA) Deworming tablet (DT)  Deworming Suspension (DS)	196,959 159,135  29,377	235,192 186,624  29,105	A+ A+  A
3.5 # and % of primary group households saving and having access to credit through savings and credit groups	50%	64%	A+
3.6 % of SEF contracts completed within 12 months	80%	61%	C
3.7 MOUs between community, municipality with private sector to provide training and employment	8	15	A++

## Key Points

50. Although most of the targets have been met or exceeded it was not possible to attribute with precision the impact on incomes and livelihoods due to the absence of a baseline and a counterfactual. However, the uptake of training, education grants and the level of interest in savings and credit programmes suggests that the programme had a significant impact on people's income and well-being.
51. More than 50% of those receiving skills training and 95% of recipients of block grant for establishing small enterprise were women. The block grant was not the only source of support as most of the recipients supplemented it with funds from other agencies - an indicator of their enterprise. Recipients expressed preference for employment rather than self-employment - another sign of their entrepreneurship. It is therefore reasonable to assume that incomes have improved. The employment rate stood at 73% in 2015 - clearly highlighting relevance and usefulness of the trainings provided<sup>8</sup>.
52. Education grants proved popular. The size of the grant ranged from BDT 2,000 to BDT 2,880 for primary education and BDT 5,400 to BDT 9,040 for secondary education depending on location, level of schooling and vulnerability of the child or household. The Education Grant Outcome study concluded that enrolment and completion rates had greatly increased in the slums- enrolment was 94% in primary and 69% in secondary schools while completion rate reached 90% in primary and 71% in secondary. By keeping children in schools grants helped in reducing child labour and early marriage of girls. The Outcome Study on Childhood Early and Forced Marriage (CEFM)<sup>9</sup> in urban slums suggests that the prevalence is driven by complex interplay of socio-cultural, religious, economic and political factors. The drivers included cultural norms, social

<sup>8</sup> Building confidence, creating livelihoods: Study of short term outcomes for apprenticeship and block grants recipients (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<sup>9</sup> Research on Early and Forced Marriage in Poor Urban Areas of Bangladesh (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

pressure, poverty, social insecurity and sexual harassment of girls. Lack of awareness, weak enforcement of law are other important drivers.

53. The Education Grant Outcome study<sup>10</sup> was not able to draw any firm conclusions about the impact of the scheme on the enrolment and retention of girls. This was disappointing, given that the educational stipend scheme was designed to overcome the obstacles to girls continuing and completing their education. In 2014 Municipalities and City Corporations undertook to continue funding the education grant scheme. In addition to the above, the SEF enabled CDC clusters to establish 35 preschools, 17 day care centres and three basic education centres.
54. The nutrition programme (3.4.) began in 2013. Progress has been satisfactory and targets for the distribution of commodities have been met. The UPPR nutrition component distributes surplus IFA tablets and MNP sachets among the beneficiaries. This included daily one IFA tablet for pregnant women (during 4 - 9 month pregnancy) and lactating mothers (up to the first six months); two IFA tablets per week for all adolescent girls and women of child bearing age (15 - 49 years); and 60 MNP sachets for 60 days for children age between 7-24 months. Activities under this will continue until March 2016 through a special arrangement with UNDP.
55. Community Savings and Credit Groups<sup>11</sup> were mainly devised as a driver of mobilization within UPPR. The idea behind their creation was to help build solidarity and empowerment among members - mostly women - through the promotion of savings habits and to build financial management skills. The groups set up 14 Community Housing Development Funds (CHDF). An amount of £1.5m was disbursed for housing purposes. The collective total savings by the end of 2014 was £6m and the loans disbursed stood at £18.1m. The community banking approach was undertaken while disbursing loans resulting in lower lending rates and management fees. Flexible terms and conditions and affordability led to high level of satisfaction among members.
56. The SEF contracting target was not met (3.6). In the early years, there were delays completing projects. However, there was good progress in the last final two years. In 2014, out of total 1478 contracts including 887 contracts were completed within the previous 12 months.
57. Partnerships with private organisations<sup>12</sup> to provide training was an innovation designed to contribute to the sustainability of the training programme (3.7.). This indicator has exceeded its target and over 2,500 people have been trained under the 15 MOUs that have been signed. The Partnership Outcome Study presents strong evidence that partnership with private sector has benefitted communities in various ways e.g. high quality health services (Marie stopes), skills training (Bijoy Switches, Dhaka City North Skills and Productivity Centre Ltd) and access to water (Sobar Jonno Pai).

#### **Summary of response to issues raised in previous 2014 Annual Review**

58. Various issues were raised in the 2014 AR:
  - UPPR should survey recipients of training to find out how long they stay in the jobs they find after training. This has been done and 73% of the recipients stayed in jobs after 6 months of completion of training.<sup>13</sup>
  - As shown above, the indicator description of number of 'children' supported by the education grant has been revised to the number of school 'years' to align with the project's reporting.
  - Finally, it was recommended that the 2014 milestone for the nutrition indicator should be revised given the delays in starting this component of the programme - this figure was recalculated and scaled downward.

---

<sup>10</sup> Education Grant Impact Study (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<sup>11</sup> End of Project Evaluation of the Savings & Credit Group Initiative (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<sup>12</sup> Assessment of UPPR's Partnerships and Linkages Strategy (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<sup>13</sup> Employment Generating and Skills Development Outcome Study (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)

<b>Output Title:</b>	<b>Pro-poor urban policies and partnerships supported at the national and local levels</b>		
<b>Output number per LF:</b>	4	<b>Output Score:</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Risk:</b>	Medium	<b>Impact weighting (%):</b>	15%
<b>Risk revised since last AR?</b>	N	<b>Impact weighting % revised since last AR?</b>	N

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Mark</b>
4.1 # of project towns where low-income settlements are officially recognised by Municipal and Pourashava Mayors through signing the Settlement Land Map	22	22	A
4.2 # of press and television reports covering urban poverty issues in UPPR low-income settlements	240	356	A++
4.3: # of partnerships and linkages established.	805	935	A+
4.4: New models of security of tenure are piloted and documented	3	5	A+
4.5: Number of towns where the capacity of Local Government (LG) to support pro-poor policy development is deemed at least satisfactory on a capacity assessment scorecard	6	Not assessed	-
4.6 Database of UPPR supported activities/tools/assets established in the LGIs	80%	100%	A+

## Key Points

59. The targets - all of which refer to local level developments - have all been met or exceeded, except for Indicator 4.5. for which data is not available. Performance against the set indicators might suggest a higher score than the A that is recommended here, which is also based on the spirit and letter of the output statement. Under this output there should have been some progress at national level to report.
60. The community registration process provided the basis for negotiation with Local government, private service providers and other partners. By December 2014, 22 of the 23 project towns had low-income settlements officially recognised - i.e. signed endorsement of town Settlement Land Map (SLM) by Mayors. This is expected to lead to greater inclusion of poor communities in municipal masterplans and local governments investing in infrastructure and supporting the tenure rights of the poor.
61. 350 Ward Councillors, and over 100 municipality staff and community leaders attended training in land tenure regulations, climate resilient urban planning and implementation. In 2014, alone Municipalities contributed £750k for construction of drains, latrines, footpaths and small access roads. The number of staff assigned to work in slums, however is still very low, which is making it challenging for the municipalities to follow up on the quality of the work undertaken. In Narayanganj Municipality there is only one Slum Development Officer covering 84 settlements.
62. The number of press and television reports covering urban poverty issues, has substantially exceeded expectations with 356 reports recorded by the UPPR database. This has been achieved through increased advocacy with national and local media houses.
63. Partnerships and linkages established by communities has enabled the poor to get access to various services. Examples include children in slums accessing education (through partnership with Sheba Foundation), adult literacy (Grameen Prodip), skill development (Bangladesh Garment Manufactures & Exporters Association–BGMEA & International Labour Organisation–ILO); health services (Marie Stopes), adolescents reproductive and sexual health (BRAC). The study found that over 750,000 people have benefitted from services worth £25.6m provided by 450 organisations.



64. The review team also noted some possible missed opportunities for partnerships. More systematic partnership agreements at national level could have helped address this. The partnerships and leveraging in resources allowed the CDCs would have helped to draw in donor support for their own action plans. The linkages seem weaker between UPPR and some prominent service providers.. For example, there has not been a partnership between UPPR and BRAC in Sirajganj despite both receiving UK aid.
65. Indicators 4.4. was added during the extension phase of the project. 5 new models of land tenure were piloted<sup>14</sup>. Community Housing Development Funds in Gopalganj, Sirajganj, Rajshahi, and Chittagong supported tenure security and housing improvement reaching 300 households. As much as £9m was invested in piloting various models- a) resettlement on government land with long term lease; b) resettlement on private land with lease arrangement; c) in situ upgrading of land owned by beneficiaries and d) in situ upgrading of land owned by municipalities and e) construction of shelter for extreme poor.
66. Indicator 4.5. on the capacity of local government to support pro-poor policy development against a capacity assessment scorecard was not assessed as the study would have gone over the same ground as a report prepared in 2014 - "Policy and institutions for inclusive urban governance".
67. **Summary of response to issues raised in previous 2014 Annual Review** - the 2014 AR recommended that UNDP and UPPR should work more closely with Local Government Division (LGD) and Local Government Engineering Division (LGED) to get the Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF) fully functioning by the end of the project. The BUF was established and recruited by UNDP to support its work.

<b>Output Title:</b>	<b>Effective project management systems established and operational</b>		
<b>Output number per LF:</b>	5	<b>Output Score:</b>	<b>B</b>
<b>Risk:</b>	Medium	<b>Impact weighting (%):</b>	5%
<b>Risk revised since last AR?:</b>	N	<b>Impact weighting % revised since last AR?:</b>	N

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Mark</b>
5.1 Proportion of SIF budget delivered	£5.5m	£5.8m	A
5.2 Proportion of SEF budget delivered	£3.9m	£4.3m	A
5.3 % of posts staffed HQ Town	90%	100%	A
5.4 % of female staff HQ Town	25% 25%	: 8% : 11%	C
5.5 Outcome studies and research studies commissioned and completed.	10	10	A

### Key Points

68. The Annual Review of 2011 noted several areas of weak project management and recommended a Strategic Management Review. One of the outcomes of the review was the development of an Organisational Development Plan which helped address weaknesses in management (e.g. lack of strategic management, centralised decision-making, absence of systematic monitoring, shortage of technical leadership capacity and too few community mobilisers). The International Project Manager was delegated authority to conduct local recruitment, which helped fill vacancies quickly. Staff were redeployed when posts became vacant, rather than automatically filling them with new recruits. As the programme neared completion and staff attrition increased, technical

<sup>14</sup> Documentation of Pilot Project Experience on Secure Tenure under Urban Partnership for Poverty Reduction (UPPR) project, Bangladesh (<http://www.upprbd.org/projectrpts.aspx>)



skills across programme were reassessed and the decision made to spread capacity across different areas of work.

69. The 2013 annual review noted continuing weaknesses in project management, in particular persistent vacancies in essential management and advisory positions at HQ. In 2012 only 67% of posts were filled. By the end of the project, however, the spending and overall staffing targets were being achieved. As a result, renewed efforts we made to strengthen the management of the project and in 2014 the management output was the most improved output in the project.
70. The recruitment of female staff remained a challenge until the end (5.4.). The project did not manage to recruit sufficient women and staffing levels by women fell towards the end of the project. It was difficult to recruitment qualified senior female staff who were willing and able to work outside Dhaka. However, it did prove possible to recruit locally for junior posts. This is less to do with UPPR's human resource policy, rather that it is generally very difficult to recruit female staff outside major cities- safety and security being the major impediments.
71. Future programmes should consider a gender analysis of staffing and management practices to assess whether the requirements of the posts (in particular those requiring a degree of mobility) discriminate against women and whether adaptations need to be made to increase the number of women in these posts. Filling positions in remote locations is particularly difficult. Finally, where women are well educated and competent they may not be willing to work in community development roles that UPPR offers relative to other better paid jobs.
72. A fifth target (5.5.), introduced for the project extension, covers the new commissioning and production of research and outcome studies. By September 2015 a total 20 outcome studies had been completed, since the beginning of the project.
73. Although management improved significantly over the life of the programme and especially in the last two years, there were major weaknesses through much of the programme that held back progress. As a result an overall score of B is reasonable though it should not obscure impressive progress in the later years.

#### Summary of response to issues raised in previous 2014 Annual Review

74. In 2014 the AR recommended that the International Project Manager, the Head of the Research and Evaluation Learning Unit (RELU) and at least one experienced staff member from MAU be retained until the end of the project, as their inputs would be critical during the last year. A new IPM and Head of Monitoring and Evaluation was recruited in June 2015. The programme has also retained staff from MAU.
75. The review also recommended that UPPR commission some research for lesson learning. As many as 20 outcome studies were commissioned, looking at different aspects of the programme.

## **D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

### **Key cost drivers and performance**

76. The main cost drivers for the programme are Settlement Improvement Fund (SIF) for infrastructure improvement and the Socio-Economic Fund (SEF) for livelihood and educational opportunities for poor communities. These two comprised nearly 67% of the project cost. The other major costs are administrative and management costs at 26% of the project. This is inclusive of all staff costs. If we consider only management staff costs (rest of staff costs are related to project staff) and general management fees the percentage becomes a competitive 15.4%.

### **VFM performance compared to the original VFM proposition in the business case**

77. VFM could not be assessed since the project memorandum did not include any VFM measures. In 2006, when the project was designed VFM analysis was not mandatory. However, an attempt has been made to conduct ex-post analysis of VFM measures wherever possible.

## **Assessment of whether the project represented value for money**

78. The conclusion of the review team is that the project was good value for money. In January 2015, a VFM study has been conducted which looked into economy, efficiency and effectiveness of some of the interventions. An overall cost benefit analysis could not be conducted due to lack of data and difficulty in monetising some of the benefits. The 2015 study has been looked at economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity aspects of some of the interventions. but it was difficult to find comparable costs for comparable levels of service. The conclusions of the review team drawing on the VFM study and interviews with project staff are set out below.

### **Economy**

79. The administrative cost of the project (staff cost and management cost) is around 26% of the total project cost. This is quite similar to other projects in Bangladesh ie the Char Livelihoods Project (25%).
80. The SIF comprised nearly 42% of the total expenditure. Using community-led and managed construction project led to an average cost savings of around 13% compared to contractor led construction projects. Apart from cost savings, this has also resulted in empowerment of women and – it is suggested – better quality of construction for a lower price as the local community have a strong incentive to ensure the work is done to a high standard.

### **Efficiency**

81. The programme efficiency has increased over the years. In the last two years, there was a significant improvement in efficiency measured in terms of time needed for project completion, leveraging of resources from municipalities by communities and communities building linkages with other government agencies and NGOs.
82. There has also been an increase in budget utilisation over the years. Total budget utilization stood at 96% ( 2014) compared to 86% in 2013. Efficiency measured in terms of completion of (SIF) contracts within 12 months went up from 27% (2013) to over 60% (2014). Similarly for SEF, the project completion efficiency increased from 27% (2013) to 61% (2014). In 2014, 19 municipalities contributed £0.75m spent for pro-poor infrastructure. The community contribution increased from 10% ( 2013) to 15% ( 2014) as matching fund for infrastructure work.

### **Effectiveness**

83. Due to lack of data on increased income, drop-out rates of children or health benefits it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of SIF, SEF or education grants. The Partnership and Linkages outcome study, however, reported that the value of services leveraged by the programme was around £0.8m, benefitting over 100,000 people. This translated to approximately £8.12 per person in the form of averted out of pocket expenditure. The cost of health services leveraged has been calculated through monitoring and recording the value of services provided such as registering for disability benefits, referral eye care services etc.
84. Another important indicator that reflects the effectiveness is the savings by SCG which was £5.6m and disbursement of loans which stood at £18.1m.

### **Quality of financial management during project**

85. The project did not have a comprehensive audit and review mechanism for funds. Different agencies (UNDP, GoB, UNHabitat) conducted audits under their control. In the first few years of the project no audit had taken place except Government of Bangladesh's own audit. It was observed that financial practices e.g. bank reconciliation, spot checks, regular tracking, reporting, monitoring of funds disbursed and utilised, maintaining complete and accurate contract information were not carried out initially. The audit by OAI in 2013 reported that financial practices were 'partially satisfactory' with gaps in project management, internal controls and asset management. UN-Habitat's internal audit report of 2012 also made similar observation for the SIF funds.
86. The UNDP audit report of 2014 had similar observations on weak financial practices. These observations could also hold equally true for infrastructure works exposing SIF funds to similar risks.

87. The Mutual Accountability Unit (MAU) established in 2013 began to provide additional scrutiny and the quality of monitoring and reporting improved. During the review, UNDP confirmed that they had implemented all the recommendations made by the audits, January 2015.
88. For the first few years, regular financial reporting to DFID lacked consistency and accuracy. However, with strong steer and support from DFID the quality of narrative and financial reporting greatly increased by 2013.

Date of last narrative financial report	Narrative Report: 30.09.2015 Financial Report: 12.08.2015
Date of last audited annual statement	30.06.2015

## E: RISK

### Quality of risk management over the life of the project

89. UNDP's overall risk management was not strong, particularly around financial and staffing risks. Key staff posts remained unfilled over a long period of time. The performance, however, improved towards the end of the project - the management was judged to have improved significantly in the 2014 Annual Review.

### Fiduciary Risk

90. Financial management for the project had been weak at times. The financial audits in 2012 and 2013 assessed financial management of the project as 'partially satisfactory'. Areas where fiduciary risk was assessed as high are- Operation and Maintenance (O&M) funds and the Community Housing Development Funds (CHDF). The Mutual Accountability Unit's role in ensuring compliance strengthened UPPR's ability to mitigate these risks, although the risk log confirms that the oversight weakened as the project neared completion. The MAU compliance log showed a positive action on asset management. UPPR confirmed that they had taken action on all audit recommendations.

### Delivery Risk

91. The main risk area identified in 2014 Annual Review was sustainability of project interventions and benefits that have extended from them. There has been a focus on mitigating these risks in the final year, with some success:
- the project mitigated the risk of frequent changes in town officials and government counterparts by engaging early with new staff to secure their support for the project;
  - the risk that the communities would not pay for Community Facilitators from their savings and credit group funds was not realised. Community organisations have decided to keep Facilitators even after the project closure. Over 500 Community Facilitators have already been hired;
  - security of tenure is a continuing risk: the project has piloted new models of secure land tenure;
  - the risk of staff attrition surfaced in the final year of the project. UPPR management redeployed staff and recruited for higher priority posts, but the loss of frontline staff affected the quality of project management;
  - risk of a disconnect with municipality governance was in part mitigated by aligning Ward boundaries with Federation area of work.
  - The UPPR risk log also mentions that that alternative approaches were adopted at the time of political unrest earlier in 2015, to mitigate the impact on the project.

### Climate and Environment Risks

92. UPPR was not designed with climate and resilience as priorities. Climate change was not addressed at a systematic level in the design of and across the whole project. Under the cost extension arrangement with DFID, UPPR focused more on assessing climate change risks and

working on resilience strategies in selected towns. The review team saw some investment in improved drainage within the settlements and felt that there is an awareness of the need to 'build better', although unclear how this is being applied. The original design of UPPR has therefore exposed some of the projects achievements to environmental risk in the future. Addressing climate change and resilience issues are expected to be a major work stream for future urban development programmes.

## **F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Delivery against planned timeframe**

93. There were delays in implementation of SIF and SEF components in the initial years of the project. With improved scrutiny and guidance from DFID, the project gathered momentum from 2013. By end 2014, all project outputs were delivering on time, and in many cases early.

### **Performance of partnership(s)**

94. The project comprised a range of partnerships. The most significant one was between DFID, UNDP and GOB which worked largely well. GoB met its commitments, providing office space and seconding staff to the project. UNDP provided its own funding, and also supported the policy component, in particular the creation, provision of technical assistance, management of local costs. Secondly, there were partnerships- between the community and the project in the building- for maintaining local infrastructure. Other partnerships were developed between communities and local providers through linkages and partnerships component. More details provided under output 4
95. The relationship between DFID and UNDP as contractor was at times not easy. It was judged unsatisfactory by the 2012 and 2013 annual reviews. The 2013 review also noted that the project has suffered from protracted staffing gaps and improvements were needed including recruitment of female staff both at the HQ and towns. The M & E function of the programme was also judged to be weak. UNDP took steps to address these concerns and at the 2014 annual review management was assessed as satisfactory.
96. The partnership between DFID and UNDP was complicated due to the multiple roles that UNDP fulfils. The advantages UNDP has as a multilateral organisation – legitimacy and access to government, particularly in policy dialogue – counts against it when operating as a contracted provider of services. It is probably not easy for it to be as nimble, responsive and as effective in recruiting staff and managing projects as a private contractor would be. Its rules and procedures, can prove cumbersome and difficult to accelerate. However, there is room for improvement, as the difference between the management of the project in 2012/3 and 2014 shows.
97. Partnerships of the project with communities have been reported under different outputs above. Indicators that the partnership worked effectively are the adoption of the stipends for the Community Facilitators by the CDCs, the use of the infrastructure maintenance fund to support the CHDF.

### **Asset disposal and value obtained by DFID**

98. UNDP developed asset disposal and transfer plan in consultation with DFID. Some of assets (e.g. furniture, electrical equipment) was handed over to federations as well as to Municipalities to help continue on-going activities. High value assets including all vehicles will be transferred to National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP). UNDP shared final asset disposal and transfer plan with DFID.

## **H: MONITORING & EVALUATION**

### **Evidence and evaluation**

99. UPPR results were monitored and evaluated annually since 2010. Overall M&E for the project had been weak. Analysing these reviews, a common thread emerges with respect to evaluation. The project design did not include a theory of change. While this is now a standard practice for

DFID programming, its absence in this case need not in itself be an issue. Many projects have delivered strong outcome results without an organizing theory of change.

100. With the benefit of hindsight, the summary implicit theory of change was that *if* the project:
- i) builds the capacity of local communities to take charge of their own development;
  - ii) provides them with the money to improve their environment and livelihoods;
- and*
- iii) supports central and local government to develop policies and programmes on urban development that take more account of the needs of the urban poor
- then in the short to medium term (project outcome or purpose)*
- i) the communities will use their capacity and mobilise additional assets to continue improving their livelihoods and living environment;
- and in the medium to long-term (goal or impact)*
- ii) government urban policy and practice will take better account of the needs of the poor;
  - iii) the urban poor will see sustainable improvements in their livelihoods and urban poverty will be reduced.
101. As been reported earlier, the result of the theory of change not being articulated has led to
- iv) An under-estimation of the community development outcomes – although was substantial focus on them at the output level.
  - v) An unrealistic expectation of seeing significant improvements in livelihoods in the lifetime of the project that could be attributed to it
  - vi) Underestimating the difficulties of achieving changes in urban policy, particularly at the central level.
102. The project was initially designed with the goal to reduce poverty/improve livelihoods through community empowerment. In this framework, the outcome was community empowerment in the form of increased mobilisation, organisation, and individual endeavour (through education and business grants). The outputs were the means to catalyse and support this community capacity and empowerment through training and by removing barriers such as poor infrastructure or access to finance.
103. If the outcome had been more clearly specified as seeing community capacity being used to continue to deliver development services and benefits following the scaling-back of project support, then the outcome studies might have concentrated more on studying local communities, their capacity and whether it was being developed and used effectively. All the signs are that it is, but it has not been the focus of any of the “outcome” studies. Instead, UPPR produced a number of ‘outcome studies’ that, while rigorously produced and informative, at times did not manage to capture the substance of what was achieved by the project with respect to facilitating sustainable change for its beneficiaries.
104. The project did however adapt to emerging opportunities, which is evidence of a project that is learning from its own experience. Annual reviews have noted how UPPR anticipated some emerging trends in these areas and adapted to others. Most notably, the primacy of secure land tenure and housing among the concerns of the project’s beneficiaries chimes with recent research on these issues, and UPPR’s ability to adapt its project to accommodate this has to be applauded.
105. Any future Urban Development project should have a clear sense of what success will mean for the project, tied to a basket of meaningful indicators that can be revisited as relevant throughout the implementation period. UNDP should be explicit with DFID and its own project staff about what change it aims to achieve and how it is going to define it. Likewise DFID should communicate its expectations of the project openly and work with the project staff to develop indicators that meet DFID standards and are useful and relevant to the outcome at hand. Above all, this requires communication, vertically and horizontally, to ensure that results are both achieved and evaluated effectively.

### **Monitoring progress throughout the project**

106. UPPR commissioned an independent review of its M&E systems and instruments in February 2012. This identified a number of weaknesses. In response, the Research Evaluation and Learning Unit (RELU) was established with key staff in place by 2013. Given the lack of baseline data, it was agreed that a formal evaluation process was of little value, and RELU was tasked with devising a strategy for aggregating the project's information and demonstrating achievements through a combination of quantitative and qualitative studies.
107. The 2014 Annual Review argued that "The establishment and effective operation of the RELU has made a significant contribution to the quality of data being generated by the project. While it will not be possible to quantify and attribute impact to the project, it will be possible to draw conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the UPPR approach." Unfortunately, as UPPR draws to a close, the staff that was driving the improvements from within RELU left the project. In the most critical period, UPPR again struggled with the massive quantities of data produced through the project.
108. UPPR should develop a set of core messages on the project success and use the evidence it has generated to back these up in all future discussions on the project.

### **Review process**

109. This Project Completion Review took place in Bangladesh between 14-25 June 2015. The review team comprised three external consultants (Team Leader, M&E and social development) and three members of DFID staff, two from DFID Bangladesh (partnerships and infrastructure) and one from DFID India (economist). The review team had access to UPPR project reports.
110. The team visited Sirajgonj, Khulna, Gopalganj and Dhaka to see project activities. In addition, meetings were held with project staff and GoB staff in Dhaka. Meetings were held and direct feedback obtained from a wide range of people including CDC leaders and members in the settlements supported by the project, UPPR partners, local government Mayors, Ward Councillors and staff. The team also met with the Government of Bangladesh, including the Secretary LGD and the Chief Engineer LGED. UPPR project staff and DFID and UNDP staff were also consulted.
111. The UPPR team provided a report of progress against milestones that was used as the basis for the team's work. A presentation of the team's preliminary assessment was given the DFID, UNDP and UPPR. This final report, based on the review, was produced by DFID Bangladesh.