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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
This Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was commissioned by Living Earth Foundation UK (LEF) in order to understand the progress made to date in relation to the “Waste to Wealth” (W2W) programme which is being delivered through partners in Uganda, Cameroon and Nigeria. The programme focusses on achieving 6 key results that lead to the overall objective of improvement in the lives of slum dwellers through environmental sustainability (MDG 7) and reduction in the prevalence of poverty (MDG 1).

FINDINGS
Relevance: The programme is appropriate and highly relevant in that all the partner countries face environmental sanitation issues among the urban poor. These require new and innovative ways of engaging communities and local government in seeking solutions, which is the basis of the W2W programme. By demonstrating that there is value in waste, the W2W programme has succeeded in engaging and mobilising the key stakeholders.

Effectiveness: The W2W Programme has succeeded in achieving better environments for urban slum dwellers in all the countries it operates in and in some cases has helped to increase incomes through focusing on the opportunities for recycling waste.

Areas that the programme has excelled in include:
- Achieving seven PPPs between SMEs, and local councils and public institutions in Uganda.
- Supporting the existing/emerging SME business sectors in Uganda and Cameroon dealing with environmental sanitation to improve the effectiveness of their businesses and increase incomes with some reporting increased profits of between 20% and 30%.
- Demonstrating the value in waste and recycling, which has improved waste disposal practice, where segregation and rudimentary recycling is now practiced at a household level in all three countries.
- Improving the levels of environmental sanitation in the urban communities in all three countries through a combination of more effective community driven clean-up activities, and in the segregation and recycling of waste at a household level, which has also had a positive impact on health.

Areas that the programme has achieved promising outcomes in include:
- Teaching new skills in recycling to SMEs, Associations, CBOs and individuals.

Areas that require further work include:
- Ensuring all PPPs are economically viable, sustainable and more closely linked to measurable improvements in environmental sanitation.
- Capacity building of Local Authorities to engage in PPPs with SMEs.
- Improved south–south linkages between partners for shared learning.
- Activities related to advocacy to enable communities to engage more fully with local councils to access their rights and entitlements. This will also support long-term sustainability of W2W related activities.

Efficiency: Generally, the W2W programme has been run efficiently. In particular,
- Some activities, such as community sensitisation and mobilisation, have shown results beyond expectations with quite modest expenditure.
- The additional expense of accredited OCN training is justified since it promoted intense engagement of beneficiaries, resulted in immediate and beneficial impacts for recipients, and has the potential to have long lasting benefits for them in terms of business and career development.

Sustainability: One outcome in evidence throughout the target areas is the commitment demonstrated by communities in environmental sanitation activities that have led to, arguably, the most significant improvements in their environments and health. This is very likely to be sustainable.

Functional training in charcoal briquetting, composting, plastic recycling and weaving, and construction of low energy and fireless cookers, has led to some good examples of business success and significantly improved incomes. However, many have struggled to use their new skills to develop a profitable business from waste recycling, due mainly to lack of capital and inadequate business/entrepreneurial skills.
The 4 PPPs achieved by SMEs with public institutions in Kampala are viewed as sustainable, since these institutions have both the will and ability to pay for their waste to be collected. This is most unlike the 3 PPPs with Nansana Town Council, that are based on the assumption that poor households can pay for their waste to be collected, which will not be the case for many. The SMEs’ inability to collect service fees from some households and the irregularity of payment from others, coupled with lack of enforcement by Nansana Town Council does not appear to be a sustainable business model for these PPPs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Review the Programme and Revise the Logframe: Revise wording of Results 1, 2 and 3, to reflect their contribution towards improvements in environmental sanitation, health and well-being. This would lead to adaptation of the logframe and would enable LEF and partners to clarify attribution for these outcomes.

Capacity Building of Partners: Review the capacity needs of Partners and engage with them to provide the types of capacity building required to undertake or continue the implementation of this programme, for example, a scheduled staff development programme. There are funds available for part time Monitoring Officers and partners need to be encouraged to actively ensure that these positions are filled.

Promote Better Cooperation across all Local Councils: A critical success factor of the W2W programme is the level of cooperation shown by local councils, which has been very varied across the three countries. To improve the level of cooperation the programme should:

- Establish a joint W2W forum that brings all programme area councils and council staff together within a given country. These would serve to promote more connectivity between councils and the programme, allow the sharing of information and examples of best practice, and, perhaps, add a competitive edge to the work of councils as it relates to W2W activities and objectives, thereby facilitating the programmes outcomes more widely.
- There has been a reluctance to start south-south linkages between councils until the PPPs are underway. However, by bringing these forward they may have the potential to kick-start the process for achieving other PPPs in Douala and Port Harcourt.
- It may be useful to revise the conference/workshop event from a “showcase” to a “real time learning opportunity” which can analyse some of the issues around enabling environments for, and barriers preventing, PPPs.

Better use of South-South Linkages for Learning: Use the South-South Links to create a hub for being a genuine learning experience internally, that is for the three project partners and for them to engage in sharing information and experiences with external actors in order to obtain support, information and interest from them.

Strengthening Community Level Advocacy and Focusing on Sustainability: Further work needs to be done to ensure sustainability is much stronger than it currently is in this programme. Overall, the sustainability of some of the outcomes and impact of this programme are hugely dependant on the types of policy and practice changes that can be achieved both at local/national level and at community level. This means that the advocacy component of this programme is vital to achieving lasting changes. In particular, it is critical that communities learn practical skills so that they can demonstrate their ability to hold their duty bearers to account for provision of local level environmental sanitation.

Sustainability could also be strengthened by:

- Reviewing and strengthening post-functional training to support sustainability in terms of long term outcomes for this specific target group such as enhancing their ability to generate an income.
- Ensuring that PPPs are linked to sustainable financial benefits, since this will be critical to supporting sustainability in terms of continuation of SMEs themselves and also for their future ability to seek business finance and other business-related opportunities.
- Building the capacity of partners so that they have the ability to continue the work started by this programme (and previous ones). Where relevant building capacity so that they can access other sources of funding is a good starting point.
1. INTRODUCTION AND STRUCTURE

This Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was commissioned by Living Earth Foundation UK (LEF) in order to understand the progress made to date in relation to the “Waste to Wealth” (W2W) programme which is being delivered through partners in Uganda, Cameroon and Nigeria. The report is structured into five broad areas. Section 2 gives an overview of the W2W programme. Sections 3 covers the purpose of the MTE and methodology used, and Section 4 highlights the constraints. Section 5 looks at the findings on relevance, effectiveness (linked to the expected results from the programme), efficiency and sustainability. Finally, Sections 6 and 7 focus on conclusions and recommendations that aims to assist in supporting this programme to achieve the anticipated outcomes and overall objective.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

2.1 Background

The W2W programme is delivered by Living Earth Foundation through three partners: Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (FCTV) in Douala, Cameroon; ANPEZ Centre for Environment and Development (ANPEZ) in Port Harcourt, Nigeria; and Living Earth Uganda (LEU) in Kampala, Uganda. Both FCTV and LEU have grown out of country branches of LEF. The partnership with ANPEZ is new and started when the affiliation with Living Earth Nigeria Foundation (LENF) was dissolved due to irreconcilable differences at the commencement of W2W.

The W2W programme was based on LEF’s and LEU’s experiences and learning from two earlier projects in Uganda, both delivered by LEU between 2002 and 2008. First, the UNDP “Public Private Partnerships for the Urban Environment” (PPPUE) project, was a pilot programme of UNDP’s global initiative on public-private partnerships, which spanned 2002 to 2004. Second, the Comic Relief funded “Urban Livelihoods” Project (ULP) from 2004 to 2008.

LEF felt that these projects had resulted in an excellent product that had the capacity to be scaled up in Uganda and exported to similar poor urban areas in other countries. The European Commission’s call for funding proposals under “Non-State Actors and Local Authorities in Development” presented LEF with an opportunity to bring together the elements of the two previous projects and build on their existing partnerships with LEU to scale up in Uganda, and with FCTV and LENF to cascade W2W across poor urban settings in Douala, Cameroon and Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Nine urban slums were selected; three in each of Douala, Kampala and Port Harcourt, and these are detailed in Annex I, along with their population statistics. At the commencement of W2W all 9 areas shared similar characteristics of poor environmental sanitation; high incidences of water-borne and vector-borne diseases, such as cholera and malaria; poor water and sanitation; high under and unemployment and extreme poverty. Most of these areas were inaccessible to local government garbage collection services or simply were not on the radar to be serviced by the local government or contracted private waste collection companies. The intention was to begin the programme in all three countries at approximately the same time: June 2010. A combination of co-financing delays and a breakdown in the relationship with LENF in Nigeria resulted in a staggered programme start up. LEU started W2W in June 2010. Both FCTV and LENF commenced in October 2010. However, after LENF parted company with LEF, the programme did not resume until August 2012 with the new Nigeria partner, ANPEZ.

2.2 Aims, Objectives and Intended Results of the Project

The overall objective of W2W is to:

Reduce the prevalence of poverty in the context of sustainable development thereby contributing to the achievement of MDG 1 in reducing poverty by 50% by 2015. Additionally it was anticipated that the project would contribute to target 4 of MDG 7 (ensuring environmental sustainability), namely to achieve a significant improvement in the lives of slum dwellers by 2020.

The specific objective is to:

Improve environmental sanitation services in 9 poor urban communities in the cities of Douala, Port Harcourt and Kampala, through public private partnerships involving local authorities and pro-poor social enterprises.

There are six intended results (outcomes) which broadly cover:

• improvements in levels of environmental sanitation due to PPPs with local government/other actors;
• emergence of a business sector dealing with environmental sanitation;
• improved awareness on rights to a clean environment;
• enhanced capacity among local authorities to engage in PPPs with the less formal private sector;
• South–South linkages between partners for shared learning and exchanges of best practice;
• Scaling up the approach to other urban centres.

3. **PURPOSE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION & METHODOLOGY USED**

3.1 **Purpose**

The specific purposes of the MTE, as expressed in the Terms of Reference (ToR, see Annex II), are to:

- Provide an independent assessment of the progress and performance of the project to date against targets including agreed activities; expected results and project objectives;
- Measure and report on achievements and early signs of change and impact.

3.2 **Methodology**

A detailed description of the methodology used in this Mid-Term Evaluation can be found in the consultants’ Inception Report¹, including the evaluation framework, which steered this MTE.

3.2.1 **Evaluation Criteria & Questions**

The MTE used the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability². For the purpose of this study, the EC interpretation of the DAC criteria have been used³. The six key, or strategic questions developed for this evaluation were derived from the six intended results of W2W, as detailed in the logframe. These intended results are shown in Annex III (Table A2), along with their respective strategic questions as they relate to the DAC evaluation criteria for Effectiveness and Sustainability. Relevance and Efficiency are dealt with through two further global strategic questions⁴, also shown in Annex III (Table A3).

3.2.2 **Evaluation Tools & Data**

Primary data was collected with the aid of three tools: semi-structured interviews; focus groups; and observations (Douala and Kampala). Interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with a selection of all stakeholders, including staff of LEF; country partner staff, local government officials, other NGO/agency staff, those running small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), and a selection of those from amongst the target communities; a list of all can be found at Annex IV. Secondary data was derived from baseline surveys, evaluation results, donor proposals and reports, monitoring data, and existing data/statistics, and these documents are listed in Annex V.

4. **LIMITATIONS TO THE MID-TERM EVALUATION**

4.1 **Country Programmes at Different Stages**

In the evaluation of a multi-country programme such as W2W, analysing each country programme at the same stage in the project life-cycle has the advantage of lending itself to a more rigorous cause-effect and country-context analysis. As it stands, Nigeria’s programme is in its very early stage of inception, Cameroon’s is at its mid-term and Uganda’s is in its final year, and this has limited the MTE and allowed only a snap-shot analysis of the programme in Nigeria. However, this situation does present greater learning opportunities for ANPEZ and FCTV.

4.2 **Field Study**

The evaluation is limited to one key six day field visit to Douala, with two days spent in Uganda. Data from Nigeria was collected through a combination of Skype, telephone, and email. This has led to some inconsistencies in the range and depth of data collected from the three countries. However, the purpose of this MTE was not to evaluate W2W in Nigeria per se, but rather to review progress and offer further learning from successes and challenges identified from work in Douala and Kampala.

---

⁴ "Global" questions are those that relate to all W2W results 1 to 6.
4.3 Requirements for Additional Data Collection

Analysis of the logframe revealed that some of the objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) of achievement are expressed rather more like outputs, and are less helpful in illustrating the programme’s distance travelled in meeting its intended outcomes. Therefore, the evaluators devised a new set of indicators for the evaluation framework, to supplement those felt most useful in the logframe’s current form, and this resulted in the need for some additional data and these requirements were passed to country project managers. There were varying degrees of success in the collection of this data, and this has impacted on the degree to which the questions posed in the evaluation framework can be answered.

4.4 Measuring Change in Relation to Baseline Surveys

Baseline surveys were carried out for all three countries. The information and recommendations contained in these surveys has been useful in terms of shaping the design of the interventions and presenting good pre-proposal and pre-design assessment information. Nonetheless, certain important weaknesses have been noted, primarily in the weak connectivity between the indicators in the logframe and the core areas covered by the baseline. In particular it is difficult to: i) extract quantitative information that could usefully present a “before” picture in the core areas; and ii) understand how the baseline surveys have been used to track change over time.

5 FINDINGS

The analysis considers relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Key findings are presented below for each of the 6 evaluation questions posed in the evaluation framework (Annex III).

5.1 Relevance

“To what extent are the objectives of W2W consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donor’s policies, and the quality of the programme?”

The programme is appropriate and highly relevant in that all the partner countries face environmental sanitation issues among the urban poor. These require new and innovative ways of engaging communities and local government in seeking solutions, which is the basis of the W2W programme. By demonstrating that there is value in waste, the W2W programme has succeeded in engaging and mobilising the key stakeholders. In terms of waste collection and recycling, this was happening to varying degrees in these communities pre-W2W. Private entities such as SMEs were engaging directly with local authorities in forms of PPPs pre-W2W, for example, in Port Harcourt, and large private waste collecting companies were subcontracting SMEs in pre-collection, as was the case in Douala. In Kampala, “illegal” waste collectors have a long history and many had informal contracts with businesses and institutions to collect and dispose of their waste. However, this was happening in a sporadic and unstructured way.

What the W2W programme has achieved is to broaden the scope of potential participation, strengthen capacity to engage at this level and facilitated a more structured approach to PPPs between local council’s and SMEs.

Overall, while the programme remains relevant, questions arise over the emphasis on certain recycling activities in relation to country context. For example, composting opportunities in Douala are quite limited due to its low-lying, flood-prone environment. A further example is plastic recycling in Port Harcourt. There is currently no demand for used plastic bottles there, yet communities have been sensitised by the project to the potential economic benefits of collecting them for re-sale. Clearly, markets for plastic bottles might emerge in due course, but in the meantime many local residents are simply storing them in the hope that they might be able to sell them on sometime in the future.

In terms of continued relevance, there are also some questions around certain activities and the need to stay ahead of fast changing developments in waste management and recycling. The “boom and bust” in plastic recycling that was observed in Kampala due to the recent opening of a Chinese owned plastic bottle recycling plant, illustrates the speed of change in the recycling landscape. While this factory afforded employment opportunities to some local people, most local plastic collectors were put out of the plastic bottle collection business. Already in Douala, SMEs involved in plastic recycling believe that the market is saturated, just two years into the programme. Of course, being a business related development programme, W2W’s beneficiaries will be subjected to market forces that are beyond the control of the

---

5 This is viewed as a key weakness of the log frame, and means that much of the data currently being collected during ongoing monitoring will not help identify successes, or otherwise, in meeting intended outcomes.

6 Key Informant Interview, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
programme. The question is, did W2W build their capacity to adapt and diversify in a free market economy? To answer this, it would be instructive to track a selection of SMEs, Associations, CBOs and individuals – those at the lower end of the value/supply chain that are most susceptible to market forces - to establish whether the training and support received from W2W imparted the resilience to adapt, diversify and succeed in such a fluid market environment.

5.1.1 Gender
Although the programme mentions the focus on gender, it was not apparent to the evaluators how this had been planned for and integrated into the overall programme.

5.2 Effectiveness

![To what extent have the activities of “Waste to Wealth” contributed the programme’s intended results, and how have assumptions affected the project’s achievements?](image)

In assessing effectiveness the evaluation team has considered the evidence that the W2W programme has made progress in relation to its intended 6 outcomes (or results as they appear in the multi-country logframe), and how these have fed into achieving the programme’s overall objective.

5.2.1 Result 1

**Sustained environmental sanitation improvement, with subsequent benefits in health and well-being for the inhabitants, in the 9 target urban communities through improved service provision as a result of partnerships involving local governments, the private sector and civil society.**

**Obtaining PPPs:** The PPPs mentioned in Result 1 are described by LEF as the apex of activities in the W2W programme. Therefore any movement towards PPPs for poor urban SMEs is both relevant and points towards achievement of this result. It is to be noted that this is the only result that specifically mentions obtaining PPPs and links this to improvements in environmental sanitation, health and well-being.

LEU’s W2W programme in Uganda has demonstrated most success, which is to be expected since this programme is near the end of its three-year term and has built on previous project experience:

- Three SMEs supported by W2W have signed memoranda of understanding (MOU) with Nansana TC, in Kampala, for the collection and disposal of waste.
- Three other SMEs in Nansana are close to signing MOUs.

These outcomes seems to be attributable both to a culmination of a long relationship between LEU, LEF and Nansana TC going back to 2002, as well as the W2W programme.

Other successes that are solely attributable to W2W include:

- the waste collection contracts held by W2W supported SMEs with 4 public institutions in the Kampala City Council Authority (KCCA) area: two schools, one health clinic and one police station;
- Douala 2 council in Cameroon is close to signing their first PPP with a W2W supported SME.

Thus the programme is achieving on Result 1, judged by the number of PPPs/MOU being signed.

Regarding Nigeria, the Ministry and Local Authority gave some insights as to the types of PPPs relating to environmental sanitation. In the Port Harcourt area there are two types of licenced waste collectors, those that have government contracts who are hired to pick up general waste and those that have contracts with private businesses e.g. schools, restaurants, hospitals, etc, who sign contracts with these bodies. This second group is required to be registered, licenced, have the necessary equipment and areaudited by the Ministry of Environment. The licencing applies to all involved in the waste management sector and is primarily to control access to landfills. There are significant challenges for potential businesses to enter this arena, primarily the cost of equipment, for example, compactors which can cost anything between £10,000 and £20,000. The key issue for the Ministry of Environment appears to be ensuring that that there are certain minimum standards, so the question is whether these standards need to be lowered to encourage those with less access to finance to enter into the business. The route for this programme may be to consider how to support SMEs to access private or commercial funding so that they can invest in equipment and to consider ways in which SME operations be financed if they want to step up a level.
Links between PPPs and Improvements to Environmental Sanitation, Health and Well-Being of Communities: While there is good evidence of improvements in environmental sanitation health and well-being, these are not always linked to PPPs or always connected to Result 1. In terms of the extent to which PPPs have led to the environmental sanitation benefits and subsequent improvements in health is not so clear. Analysis of the six Nansana-based SMEs, indicates that, collectively, they can service up to one-quarter of the programme’s original target of about 2,800 households in Nansana. So, working at current capacity, these SMEs could have a significant impact on the environment and health of residents in Nansana. This is not the case, however, in the two KCCA project areas (Kawempe and Rubaga), since PPPs are not related to household waste collection, or in Douala or Port Harcourt, where it is too early for programme related PPP contracts.

What is apparent is that improvements in environmental sanitation are being achieved under Result 3 through awareness raising. Across all three countries, stakeholders reported high levels of change being achieved in relation to improvements in environmental sanitation as a direct result of the W2W programme. Most community members, community leaders and local council personnel indicated that:

- the appearance of the area had changed for the better with significantly less household waste discarded indiscriminately, although this was still in evidence in some areas;
- plastic bottles that had, hitherto, blighted target areas by blocking drainage channels and exacerbating flooding, had completely disappeared, resulting in significantly less flooding;
- in all 3 countries, communities mentioned the decrease in vector-borne and water-borne diseases, such as malaria and cholera, which they attributed to cleaner environments.

There is very little quantitative data available on health, either before or at the time of the evaluation, but there was ample anecdotal evidence that the health status of communities has improved across the whole project area since W2W. Some quantitative data is available for cases of Typhoid and Malaria in Mambanda (Douala 4), which show a decline in recorded cases between 2010 and 2011 of 30% and 42%, respectively. Furthermore, and in Douala 2, no cases of Cholera had been reported in over a year: in contrast, this area saw 297 reported cases in 2010, which led to 2 deaths. Many ascribed these significant improvements in health to W2W, but some, including international NGOs and Local Councils, held the view that it had been a joint effort with W2W taking a lead role.

Similarly to environmental sanitation improvements, health improvements do not sit comfortably under Result 1 since they are attributed mainly to community action, changes in attitudes to waste and community efforts and may be better placed, after some revision to their description, under Result 3 and, to a lesser degree, under Result 2 (see Section 7: Recommendations).

Taking a broader, more holistic approach, it is clear that changes are being achieved under other results and together they are all contributing to improvements in environmental sanitation, health and well-being of communities. If the Results were articulated in a way that made this connection more apparent, the subsequent changes necessary to the logframe and monitoring framework would enable all drivers of sanitation improvements to be tracked, and facilitate the process of demonstrating success and attribution. This does not impact negatively on the overall objective of the programme but on attribution and targets of various activities under Results 1, 2 and 3, and some revision of these could benefit the programme in Douala and Port Harcourt.

5.2.2 Result 2

The emergence of a skilled and effective business sector wherein social enterprises, founded by and in poor urban communities, derive wealth from the provision of environmental services and derivative recycling and re-use activities. The role of women in this sector will be promoted.

Result 2 involves a range of activities aimed at two distinct groups:

- SMEs that were already working in environmental sanitation – these were targeted with intensive OCN accredited business training, coaching and high levels of post-training support;
- Other organisations, individuals, CBOs and Associations – these were targeted with functional training and a lower level of post-training support consisting of enabling them to network and seek out other opportunities.

7 Official data supplied by the District Medical Officer at Bonassama Hospital, Douala, Cameroon.
8 Information supplied by Mr Moses Wouolonwouo, Head of Hygiene, Sanitation & Environment Douala 2 Council.
The greatest levels of change were found with the first target group in Uganda and Cameroon, where W2W has successfully harnessed the energy of existing SMEs to progress their businesses. In both countries the programme was successful in:

- enabling SME’s to rethink their business plans and approaches;
- enabling them to make significant business and market developments, and improve their profits by between 15 and 30%;
- supporting SMEs to develop the supply chain for recycling.

Although there is no comparison group to offer definitive attribution, it is likely that the rigorous capacity building approach adopted by W2W for these selected 40 SMEs in Cameroon and Uganda, in which personnel received London Open College Network (OCN) accredited training in business development, was the key to this success.

Apart from growth in income, an important consequence is that W2W has helped the select 40 SMEs in both countries to develop a whole supply chain from collectors, dealers/purchasers/transporters, and processors of the end products; and this is most apparent in Douala. Previously, SMEs involved in manufacturing products from waste plastics had to be involved in the whole supply chain, from collection, washing, cutting/shredding through to manufacturing. However, with W2W there has been an emergence of a host of actors who form critical links throughout the supply chain. This includes specialist collectors, cutters and grinders, and manufacturers. This has led to a well organised supply chain, and has meant that some manufacturers have withdrawn from collection and been able to focus efforts on production; resulting in a supply chain of specialist and more efficient ways of working.

One unintended consequence was observed in Douala. The lucrative nature of plastic recycling has brought with it other, less desirable consequences, where local investors not associated with W2W have started to buy up large quantities of waste plastic, which they store until manufacturers experience a deficit in their raw materials. These people are then in the position to manipulate prices to gain higher profits. Whilst this is perfectly legal, it does pose a significant threat to SME’s profitability and growth. This was a major concern to those SMEs represented on a focus group in Douala, but, collectively, they were putting into operation two measures that they thought could minimise the impact of this new manipulative practice. First, many of the manufacturers had signed contracts with waste plastic collectors to ensure a regular supply of raw materials – these were often between SMEs supported by W2W, but some had contracts with SMEs that had no association with the programme; second, they had started the process of forming a Plastic Waste Recycling Association, which they felt would add strength to their businesses by forming strong relationship throughout the supply chain and offering a more stable environment for business sustainability and development.

These outcomes were attributed by these SMEs to the OCN training and ongoing support received from the W2W programme, and is illustrative of an organised and effective business sector. This is a key success of the W2W programme since it has led to a strengthening of these existing SMEs and helped to build their resilience and strategic thinking in what is a challenging business environment.

For the second target group, they received non-accredited functional training in a range of activities, including plastic collecting, charcoal briquetting, composting, and handcrafts. There are some excellent examples of successes amongst this beneficiary group, and case studies showing a selection are given in Annex IV, alongside an indicative example of the challenges faced by some. The types of successes include:

- introduction of recycling technologies that has added to the portfolio of income generating activities for the more entrepreneurial among the beneficiaries;
- at least two examples of groups accessing microfinance to grow their businesses;
- graduation of some into the higher tier SME group to benefit from the more intensive support. Three prime examples spanning Cameroon and Uganda have shown strong growth as a direct result, and one of these - Gic Diaspo Mboa, in Douala – is close to signing the first PPP with Douala 2 council.

Some of the challenges faced by this group included difficulties in being able to:

- turn the training received into income earning opportunities/business ventures;
- to participate fully in the recycling supply chain.

While many were able to use their new found skills to supplement household incomes there may have been expectations raised that more support would be given to help with setting up business ventures. This is not a criticism of the programme per se, but points towards the need to review the management
of expectations, consider how to transition this group from the training and consider whether stronger outcomes could be achieved through a different/additional set or level of post training support.

5.2.3 Result 3

**Improved awareness among all stakeholders of the rights and entitlement of poor urban dwellers to a clean environment and of the potential to harness local cost-effective resources to deliver these rights.**

There is considerable evidence, in all nine W2W areas across the three countries, that people are very much more aware of their rights to a clean and health environment. While communities generally seem to accept that local councils are unlikely to solve fully their environmental sanitation problems all these communities have been sensitised and were mobilised into improved waste management practices resulting in:

- less fly tipping;
- more instances of segregation of household waste;
- more recycling of organic waste; and
- regular community driven clean-up events.

These changes are also mentioned under Result 1. This shift in attitude and practice of communities can be partly attributed to W2W. Some local councils and other NGOs also appear to have contributed by assisting in these efforts to varying degrees in the three countries.

As a result of these activities, the level of engagement between local councils and communities has improved across all three countries, as a direct result of W2W. In all nine programme areas, local councils have recognised that waste management must be addressed holistically, with households, CBOs, SMEs, larger private companies and the local council all having a role to play. This has led to an enabling environment for these actors and with the interventions of W2W there has been a proliferation in activities that, collectively, have had significant benefits on environmental sanitation, health and, in some cases, household income.

One such activity, is community clean-up events. Although such events were in evidence pre-W2W in many of the target areas, this programme has strengthened them where they existed and in some instances, like in Port Harcourt, mobilised communities for the first time, most particularly through the supply of basic equipment (spades, wheelbarrows, gloves and masks).

Where there seems to be fewer outcomes is in relation to the wider advocacy activities. Examples of communities lobbying local councils in order to claim these rights are few, and successful outcomes are fewer still.

5.2.4 Result 4

**Enhanced capacity among local authorities to engage in public-private partnership (PPP) development, particularly involving the less formal private sector.**

Over all three countries and programme areas it is only Nansana TC in Kampala that has received training through the W2W programme\(^9\). Therefore, there is limited evidence to analyse the effect of enhanced capacity in local councils with regard to PPP development. Primarily, it is Nansana’s example that will be drawn on to demonstrate change. However, since capacity can be built through alternative means of engagement, other country specific examples will be illustrated.

Overall, the administrative climate and, in some cases, legislative framework has shifted in favour of stronger engagement between local councils and SMEs, and the general acceptance by councils of the need for a multi-actor, multi-sector approach has been at the forefront in facilitating these changes.

**Uganda:** LEU and W2W suffered a tremendous set back with the abolition of KCC and recentralisation of powers to the newly formed KCCA, which took the best part of a year. As a result, no formal capacity building has taken place in the local authority and less progress has been made in some key areas of the programme, including PPPs. In Nansana, however, significant progress has been observed, including the delivery of OCN-based, non-accredited training to key personnel within the town council. Here, the town council have zoned the area, allocated the right to work/undertake collection of household waste by

\(^9\) This was not accredited OCN training, but it was based on the OCN curriculum. This was a necessity because of the delay caused as a result of the abolition of KCC and the year it took to form the new KCCA. LEF and LEU concluded that it would not be efficient to deliver the OCN training to Nansana council alone, so went for a more efficient alternative under the circumstances.
named SMEs to certain areas, and have signed 3 MOUs with W2W supported SMEs to collect household waste. They have been supported to monitor and evaluate these contracts effectively. Moreover, in November 2012 Nansana TC passed a new public health byelaw that puts the legal responsibility on producers of waste to pay for this to be collected and disposed of, and LEU through the W2W programme played a significant role in this outcome. Nonetheless, there are significant problems with lack of byelaw enforcement, which has made business extremely difficult for household waste collectors in Nansana.

**Cameroon:** A broader national level policy change by the Prime Minister in 2012, not linked to W2W activities, has created an enabling environment his is likely to support the programme’s key objectives further.

FCTV has made very encouraging advances in Douala 2, and is primarily as a result of their key contact who is the Head of Sanitation and Hygiene and formerly employed by the Ministry of Health, so has a background that is sympathetic to the causes of W2W. Here, a strong relationship has been built and significant progress has been made in terms of joint campaigns, community sensitisation, engagement with SMEs, and in the process working towards PPPs, which appears to be a very real possibility in the near future - perhaps within three months. This has been achieved without any capacity building interventions from W2W. Douala 4 and, to a lesser degree, Douala 3 councils have offered rather more challenging environments for productive engagement. Nonetheless, overall the whole programme area has seen the creation of an enabling environment for SMEs on behalf of the three councils. Once council capacity building has been completed and micro-project committees established, and with the anticipated first PPP in Douala 2 acting as a “showcase” of effective collaborative engagement, there is a likelihood that the process of achieving PPPs will be fast-tracked across all council areas. Currently, there is no forum where personnel from each of the three councils can meet over W2W-related issues. The creation of such a forum might help to catalyse efforts across Douala 3 and 4, offering opportunities to learn from Douala 2 and, perhaps, adding a competitive edge that might accelerate programme efforts.

5.2.5 Result 5

**Improved South-South linkages and networking between partners and associates to increase learning, information dissemination, consensus building and advocacy skills with which to influence policy makers.**

There were some good examples of South-South linkages being created and influencing the implementation or design of activities, or parts of the programme. For example, LEU shared knowledge, skills and expertise in carbonisation of organic waste and briquetting as well as legislative frameworks around PPPs. In turn, Cameroon shared use of training materials for low energy cooking stoves from Cameroon, and assisted with music and video production.

Significant advances have also been made as a result of W2W in forming linkages in other African countries, most notably in Sierra Leone and Kenya through other donor funding. Here, LEF have facilitated linkages with W2W in Uganda and Cameroon, and there are prospects of similar strategies being initiated and/or augmenting existing programmes in Sierra Leone and Kenya.

Overall, however, these linkages have been less effective in terms of country partners learning from project challenges or failings, and have been largely used as a means to showcase successes. Both LEU and ANPEZ found the networking platform, termed the basecamp, less useful than FCTV since documents in French were not accessible to them.

One view expressed was that the quality of information available on the basecamp was generally poor, and country partners should consider first how the information they upload could be of help to other projects, rather than to just showcase or to have a record of their work. It was felt that uploaded information would be considerably more useful if it included notes on methodology, successes and failures, what was learned from the process and what had changed as a result. In this way, they were of the opinion that the basecamp would be much more useful and become a real learning tool for all three projects. Furthermore, it was felt that there was a need for more mentoring and coaching of country partners and understanding of what they did, what challenges they faced and how they dealt with them. Improved communication, and the level of sharing and support is critical.

A key activity under this result is inter-country visits by local council personnel, which offer the opportunity for learning around PPPs with small and/or informal SMEs. To date, such activities have yet to commence since it was the view of LEF and country partners that it would be most effective after PPPs had commenced in both Kampala and Douala, since local council staff would meet after having experiences to share. However, and in view of the challenges faced in achieving PPPs, bringing local councils together
from the three countries before achieving PPPs in Douala and Port Harcourt could act as the catalyst to accelerate progress towards achieving them. Such engagement is likely to cultivate a greater sense of ownership of, and higher level of engagement with W2W, which appears to be lacking in some areas; most particularly in Douala 4.

5.2.6 Result 6  
**Scaling up of the approach and methodology to other urban centres within the three target countries.**

Most activities in this area of the programme are designed for its later stages. For Douala and Port Harcourt it is too early in the programme’s progression for most of Result 6 related activities to have begun in earnest. For Kampala, however, activities such as PPP seminars and the production of the PPP toolkit, which should have been implemented, have been delayed pending an assessment of the impact to project as a result of the abolition of KCC and formation of KCCA. Nonetheless, FCTV and LEU have developed and are implementing a media campaign, while ANPEZ is in the early stages of producing their own W2W music video.

LEU’s strong media campaign, including radio broadcasts and a music video, has ensured that word of the W2W programme has spread across the country and has generated keen interest from other local councils and municipalities across Uganda, for example, Buliifa; Kasese; Hoima; Lira and Miyana Districts; and Jinja Municipality. The former Town Clerk of Nansana is now based in Jinja Municipality and has kept up the good working relationship formed in Nansana; LEU were invited to deliver functional skills training to community members from the Municipality, and he has plans to use his W2W experience and knowhow to develop similar activities there. Recently, the Minister of Local Government has shown great interest in the programme and recently invited SMEs supported by W2W to an event in Kampala to showcase their products. Furthermore, a company based in South Sudan has shown interest in purchasing charcoal briquettes from manufacturers in Kampala, and this has been achieved as a direct result of this media campaign.

FCTV are at the same level of progress as LEU, since they have not been hindered by any dramatic changes in local government structures. They too have mounted a strong media campaign, which includes radio programmes (in French and English) and the production of a music video. Similarly to Uganda, FCTV have disseminated the details of W2W extensively through their media campaign; most particularly through the music video. Other councils have shown interest in the W2W programme and these include Douala 1, Douala 5, Douala 6, and Manoka - an Island in the Wouri estuary; and other cities, such as Kribi in the Central Region, and Bafoussam in the Western Region.

5.3 Efficiency

**To what extent have the resources/inputs and activities been transformed into results – outputs, outcomes and impacts?**

Generally, the W2W programme has been run efficiently. In particular:

- Overall, the planned complement of staff at a country level (mentioned in the proposal and budget) was correct to deliver the programme successfully;
- Some activities, such as community sensitisation and mobilisation, have shown results beyond expectations with quite modest expenditure;
- The additional expense of accredited OCN training is justified since it promoted intense engagement on behalf of beneficiaries, resulted in immediate and beneficial impacts for recipients, and has the potential to have long lasting benefits for them in terms of their business and career development;
- The training of local trainers to deliver OCN programmes is also viewed as a very efficient means to an end.

There is an underspend on the budget and the staggered implementation together with context changes have been key in contributing to this. This is an opportunity to review activities and budget to see what changes, if any, need to be made.

There needs to be further attention paid to some key areas that have the potential to impact on efficiency and affect the overall outcomes:
• There are funds available for part-time Monitoring Officers in Cameroon and Nigeria and partners should be encouraged to recruit dedicated personnel for this role. This might assist in partners being more able to meet reporting deadlines especially where these reporting deadlines are tied to the release of funds which could have a knock-on effect on and impact activity schedules;

• Further activities under Result 2, around post functional training support, could be considered as only 11% of the overall budget has been spent. As this has been identified as an area that requires strengthening or adaptation there is scope to review the activities that relate to this, and improve outcomes;

• There is scope for considering a staff training programme to build capacity of partners. This links strongly to sustainability and as the country staff training budget has been almost untouched, with only FCTV using around one-third of their allocation, this could be reviewed. Training needs assessment have been prepared by partners, and this could be followed up with the partners being supported and encouraged to have a staff development plan in place and to implement it.

• The question of outsourcing needs to be explored more fully so that detailed discussions can be held around which activities lend themselves to outsourcing. This might assist in activities getting underway in a timelier manner, where possible and relevant, without the local partners feeling that they are responsible for delivering every aspect of the programme.

5.4 Sustainability

“What is the likelihood of benefits produced by W2W to continue to flow after external funding has ended, with particular reference to factors of ownership by beneficiaries, policy support, economic and financial factors, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality, appropriate technology, environmental aspects, and institutional and management capacity?”

5.4.1 Communities

One outcome in evidence throughout the nine programme areas, across all three countries, has been the commitment demonstrated by communities in environmental sanitation activities that have led to, arguably, the most significant improvements in their environments and, subsequently, health. All areas feature regular clean-up events, including unblocking drainage channels, and as the practice becomes embedded within communities, these activities attract participation from increasing numbers of local residents (women, men and young people). In some programme areas such events were happening before W2W, but they were sporadic, poorly attended and ill equipped. After W2W’s community sensitisation and with the availability of basic equipment, such as brooms, spades, wheelbarrows, gloves and face masks, clean-up events have become more effective, less time consuming and safer. The keen support and occasional participation by local council staff has also helped to generate more interest and sustained momentum.

This is a significant change supported by W2W and since the communities have now a clear understanding of the connection between sanitation and health, and what they can achieve in their own environments, this is likely to be sustained long-term. This should not take the place of local council responsibilities to their residents, but be an activity in support of this.

5.4.2 Associations and CBOs

Almost 500 individuals and members of Associations, CBOs and, to a lesser degree, recognised SMEs in Douala and Kampala have received functional training in charcoal briquetting, composting, plastic recycling and weaving, and construction of low energy and fireless cookers.

Some recipients of functional training, like the Association des Fille/Femmes Handicapée pour L'intégration Total au Développement (AFHALITD) in Douala, and Luluna in Kampala (see Annex V), have shown strong development and are likely to continue and expand their work. However, the overwhelming majority of trained beneficiaries do not have access to, or are unaware of where to access, the necessary capital or business support to start or grow their income generating activities and those participating in focus group discussion expressed frustration in that they were not able to use their newly acquired knowledge and skills. As discussed under Result 2, Section 5.2.2, this situation appears to have arisen as a consequence of poor selection of beneficiaries or inadequate post-training support, or a combination of the two. It seems, therefore, that this area of the programme might have benefited from further discussion with the country programme managers on how initiatives with this target group could have been made more sustainable. For example, linking new businesses with mentors and business finance/credit opportunities and forming business support networks could have been integrated more
robustly into this initiative. It is concluded that, as the programme stands, such community-based income generating activities are unlikely to be sustainable in other than a very few cases, significantly reducing its potential longer term impact.

5.4.3 SMEs and PPPs
It is only in Nansana TC in Kampala that the programme has achieved agreements with local authorities via the MOUs, which are considered as PPPs within the framework of the programme. The sustainability of these MOUs, in their current form, is uncertain for three key reasons.

First, these MOUs do not have a monetary value directly between the SME and Nansana TC. The onus is on the SME to collect payment from the household and many households in the programme area are unwilling or unable to pay for their waste to be collected. Nansana TC’s new byelaws places a legal obligation on households, companies and institutes to pay for the waste they generate to be collected and disposed of to landfill, but there is considerable scepticism on behalf of SMEs that these byelaws will be enforced effectively. This uncertainty was exemplified during a focus group meeting with Nansana town councillors, during which only one example could be cited of a defaulter being forced to pay arrears. Second, the issue of non-payment by households coupled with lack of enforcement of byelaws is likely to force SMEs to rethink their arrangements with the council. In the medium to longer-term this could lead to SMEs moving away from household waste to business waste collection, which comes with greater assurances of payment for services rendered. Third, because of the short term nature of the MOUs (6 months) and their lack of guaranteed income, it is proving difficult to use these as collateral to access finance to develop or diversify their businesses.

SMEs have also signed contracts with 4 public institutions and, within the framework of W2W, these are also considered as PPPs. These PPPs are likely to be more sustainable than the MOUs in Nansana, simply because these institutions have a direct contractual relationship with the services providers, unlike Nansana and households, and they have both the will and ability to pay for their waste to be collected.

5.4.4 Partner Organisations
W2W has enabled existing Country Partner Organisations (LEU and FCTV) to deepen and strengthen their ability to work with the target groups around environmental waste management and livelihoods generation. It has also enabled new relationships to be built with ANPEZ. The ability of these organisations to continue their work, to attract funding from multiple sources and to continue their engagement with the target groups will be crucial for supporting the sustainability of the other areas mentioned above. At the end of this programme, their continued involvement with the target groups is likely to be important for the short term and their ability to capitalise on the relationships they have built in their community continues to be vital. It is not clear what has been planned in terms of capacity building for these entities although there is a budget line that could be exploited for this.

5.4.5 Business & Information Hubs
Sustainability of the above areas would be strengthened and supported through these information and business hubs that were set up as part of the programme in each area. The issue is what steps have been taken to ensure that these will be sustained after the programme. Information from Uganda indicates that steps have been taken to do so. For example, the Makerere University Business School will take over the running of the Business Hub. The Information Hub is being located at the Rubaga Divisional Headquarters and will be operated by an NGO. Initiatives like this will ensure that these Hubs will continue to function after the end of the programme provided these are planned ahead and steps are taken to pass on responsibility to other institutions.

Overall, in terms of sustainability, while there are some initiatives that are likely to continue, more work needs to be done to ensure that the significant gains made by this programme are not dissipated at its end.

6 CONCLUSIONS
This section follows the key headings as outlined in Section 3 the TOR (Annex II).

6.1 Working Well/Most Change
- Obtaining PPPs/MOUs in challenging environments.
- Building community awareness and action around environment cleanliness. Engaging communities to keep environments clean and in segregation of waste at household level all led to improvements in appearance of environments and reduction in flooding.
- Contributing to improvements in health and reductions in water-borne diseases.
• Understanding and demonstrating the value in waste and recycling. For existing SMEs, Associations and CBOs, W2W has provided them with new opportunities to expand their work. For existing SMEs receiving targeted support, putting into action business coaching and training from W2W programme has generally supported them to expand their businesses and increase incomes.
• The setting up of the Committees/PAPs provided strong support and buy in from a range of stakeholder, particularly some local council staff, for the overall success of W2W.

6.2 Not Working as Well/Least Change
• Obtaining commercially viable PPPs and getting Local Authorities to enter into paying contracts with SMEs. The MOUs in Nansana, Uganda, while a move in the right direction, need to provide a sound commercial footing for the SMEs. A better understanding of the risks associated with government/local authority policy around PPPs, the high level of vulnerability to policy/process change and the long lead times necessary to engage with local councils, means that this was always going to be a high risk activity/outcome.
• South-South linkages relating to the basecamp. This was an exciting component of the programme and had the potential to be a crucial centre of excellence for learning. Unfortunately, this has not taken off in the way it was intended to. There are still opportunities to turn this round into a more practical and useful part of the programme.
• Post functional training support has shown weaknesses in assisting community-based enterprises to engage with local support services and mechanisms necessary for these to grow their businesses.
• Communication of expectations around programme outcomes, levels of flexibility, innovation, etc, between LEF and Partners.

6.3 Objectives, Expected Results and Activities

Do the objectives, expected results and activities remain appropriate and valid?

Generally, yes. However, there are three areas that would benefit from a review:
• LEF together with partners need to reconsider what is realistically achievable for PPPs, and what alternatives there are, given the timeframe and the difficulties in getting local councils to engage in economically viable contracts with SMEs. Clearly, LEF and LEU have already widened the scope for potential PPP granters to cover all public bodies, such as police stations, hospitals and public schools. Given the challenges encountered, perhaps the scope could be widened further to include any institute, health facility or business to help make this a more realistically achievable outcome.
• Given the saturation of the market in plastics in Douala and Kampala, and lack of current market in Port Harcourt, attention needs to be given as to whether this is an appropriate activity/approach and what needs to replace it or augment it.
• In relation to advocacy, there needs to be a review and more realistic - small and achievable - goals identified, even if this might just be communities starting to build stronger relationships and having regular meetings with their elected representatives and local council staff on issues of waste management and environmental sanitation.

6.4 Do the Planned Activities Represent the Best Means of Achieving the Results?
The activities do represent the best means of achieving the results. However, bringing forward scheduled activities concerning local councils and south-south linkages, and reviewing selection and support for beneficiaries of functional training is likely to have a positive impact on attainment of PPPs and more fruitful engagement of SMEs, CBOs and individual in recycling related activities. Together, this could accelerate efforts towards meeting the programme's overall objective.

6.5 Are Results and Objectives Achievable within the Remaining Timeframe?
Many components of the 6 results have either been achieved or are on track to be achieved, with some exceeding expectations. There are three areas that need reviewing to improve the likelihood that all expected results and objective are achieved within the remaining timeframe:
• Bring forward activities related to local authorities and south-south linkages to kick-start progress towards achieving PPPs in Douala and Port Harcourt;
• There needs to be more focus on advocacy. This is a key area of the programme that remains relatively inactive and LEF and partners need to have a better understanding of why this is so. Improved advocacy skills amongst communities and strengthened engagement with their local
councils, has the potential to impact positively on other areas of the programme, such as achievement of PPPs and the overall sustainability of the programme;

- Outsourcing of activities that have had either a late or slow start, such as advocacy training, would relieve pressure on project staff and could help to accelerate the programme in meeting objectives.

## 7 Recommendations

**What changes should be made to the project in order to maximize impact and effectiveness and ensure the achievement of the objectives within the remaining timeframe?**

### 7.1 Review the Programme and Revise the Logframe

- It would be opportune to review the overall plans for this programme and to understand what is realistically achievable within the timeframe available.
- Revise wording of Results 1, 2 and 3, to reflect their contribution towards improvements in environmental sanitation, health and well-being. This would lead to adaptation of the logframe and would enable LEF and partners to clarify attribution for this outcome. Revise the logframe and indicators in the light of the above and also moving from output type OVIs to outcome related ones that properly reflect the changes sought by the programme. For example, currently no data is collected that can indicate changes in health or income, both of which are key outcome areas for W2W.

### 7.2 Review Functional Training Selection Criteria/Post Training Support

Most slum dwellers are entrepreneurs by necessity rather than by any inherent abilities, so many lack the skills necessary to identify opportunities, seek out new markets, or identify business support mechanisms. The fact that few beneficiaries have made tangible advances in their businesses as a result of functional training, suggests that where intensive support is not going to be made available, the selection criteria might need to be reviewed, so that beneficiaries who are selected should be from an entrepreneurial business background with proven track records. This would enable beneficiaries to build on their existing business skills and acumen to make the best use of the functional training with the current levels of post-training support. Alternatively, the post training support package would need to be reviewed and strengthened so that those who do not already have the existing business skills are supported to develop their businesses following the functional training.

### 7.3 Capacity Building of Partners

Review the capacity needs of Partners and engage with them to provide the types of capacity building required to undertake or continue the implementation of this programme, for example, a scheduled staff development programme. There are funds available for part time Monitoring Officers and partners need to be encouraged to actively ensure that these positions are filled.

### 7.4 Promote Better Cooperation across all Local Councils

- A critical success factor of the W2W programme is the level of cooperation shown by local councils, which has been very varied across the three countries. What appears to be missing on a country level is a joint W2W forum that brings all programme area councils and council staff together within a given country. These would serve to promote more connectivity between councils and the programme, allow the sharing of information and examples of best practice, and, perhaps, add a competitive edge to the work of councils as it relates to W2W activities and objectives, thereby facilitating the programmes outcomes more widely.
- Clearly, south-south linkages between councils are likely to improve understanding, ownership and opportunities to learn, but this has yet to take place. There has been a reluctance to start these until the PPPs are underway. However, by bringing these forward they may have the potential to accelerate the process of achieving PPPs in Douala and Port Harcourt.
- It may be useful to revise the conference/workshop event from a “showcase” to a “real time learning opportunity” which can analyse some of the issues around enabling environments for, and barriers preventing, PPPs. It might be useful for this to be more proactive in driving the agenda forward rather than reporting on what has been achieved/not achieved when it might be too late to influence some of the outcomes of this programme.
7.5 Better use of South-South Linkages for Learning

Use the South-South Links to create a hub for being a genuine learning experience internally, that is, for the three project partners and for them to engage in sharing information and experiences with external actors in order to obtain support, information and interest from them.

7.6 Strengthening Community Level Advocacy and Focusing on Sustainability

Further work needs to be done to ensure sustainability is much stronger than it currently is in this programme. Overall the sustainability of some of the outcomes and impact of this programme are hugely dependant on the types of policy and practice changes that can be achieved both at local/national level and at community level. This means that the advocacy component of this programme is vital to achieving lasting changes.

In particular, it is critical that communities learn practical skills so that they can demonstrate their ability to hold their duty bearers to account for provision of local level environmental sanitation. Similarly, donors have a role to play in encouraging their bi-lateral partners to put in place systems that allow for transparency and accountability and that enable and encourage communities to hold them accountable. As an immediate step, the advocacy goals in the programme need to be reviewed and made more realistic so that they can be achieved in the remainder of the programme.

Sustainability could also be strengthened by:

- Building the capacity of partners so that they have the ability to continue the work started by this programme (and previous ones). Where relevant building capacity so that they can access other sources of funding is a good starting point. In addition further discussions need to take place as to partner ideas for ensuring sustainability.
- Reviewing and strengthening post-functional training (which has been previously mentioned) will support sustainability in terms of long term outcomes for this specific target group such as enhancing their ability to generate an income.
- Ensuring that PPPs/MOUs are linked to financial benefit is critical to supporting sustainability in terms of the continuation of the SMEs themselves and also for their future ability to seek business finance and other opportunities.
ANNEX I: GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF THE W2W PROGRAMME

Nine urban slums were selected; three in each of Douala, Kampala and Port Harcourt. These are shown in Table A1 with their respective population estimates, as they appear in the original funding application to the EC\textsuperscript{10}.

These estimates are from 2010 and are likely to be significantly below current populations. For example, in Kasubi Parish, there are almost 70,000 registered voters, and some estimates put the population of this parish at 120,000\textsuperscript{11}, which would make it one of the most highly densely populated areas in Africa.

Table A.1: W2W Programme Areas by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country &amp; City</th>
<th>Council/Division</th>
<th>Urban Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douala, Cameroon</td>
<td>Douala 2</td>
<td>New-Bell, Camp Yabassi</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douala 3</td>
<td>Soboum, Song Mahop</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douala 4</td>
<td>Bonassama, Grand Hangar</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Harcourt, Nigeria</td>
<td>Obia Okpor LGA</td>
<td>Mgbuosimini</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Harcourt City Council</td>
<td>Bundu Ama</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Harcourt City Council</td>
<td>Borokiri</td>
<td>53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala, Uganda</td>
<td>Kawempe Division</td>
<td>Mulago II &amp; Mulago III</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubaga Division</td>
<td>Kasubi Parish</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nansana Town Council</td>
<td>Nansana Parish</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} As they appear in the original funding application to the EC.

\textsuperscript{11} Private communication with Mr Ddungu William, a Councillor for Kasubi Parish who is represented on the PAP.
ANNEX II  MID-TERM EVALUATION TOR

Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review

Project: “Improved Living Conditions in Urban Slums – Promoting Public Private Partnerships in Cameroon, Uganda and Nigeria” ("Waste to Wealth")

1) Introduction
Living Earth Foundation (LEF), in partnership with local partners Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (Cameroon), Living Earth Uganda, and ANPEZ Centre for Environment and Development (Nigeria) is implementing a multi-country “Waste to Wealth” project which focuses on improving the living conditions and the livelihood opportunities for slum dwellers in Douala (Cameroon), Port Harcourt (Nigeria) and Kampala (Uganda).

This four-year project (2010 – 2014) is funded by the European Union (in all three countries), by Comic Relief (in Cameroon and Nigeria) and by DFID (in Nigeria).

LEF is inviting bids from external evaluators to carry out a mid-term review of the project. For cost-effectiveness reasons field work will take place in one country with consultations via email and skype in the other two countries.

2) Project overview:

Overall objective(s): Reduce the prevalence of poverty in the context of sustainable development and so contribute to the achievement of MDG 1 in reducing poverty by 50% by 2015. Additionally the project will contribute to target 4 of MDG 7 (ensuring environmental sustainability), namely to achieve a significant improvement in the lives of slum dwellers by 2020.

Specific objective: To improve environmental sanitation services in 9 poor urban communities in the cities of Douala, Port Harcourt and Kampala, through public private partnerships involving local authorities and pro-poor social enterprises.

Expected results:

1) Sustained environmental sanitation improvement, with subsequent benefits in health and well being for the inhabitants, in the 9 target urban communities through improved service provision as a result of partnerships involving local governments, the private sector and civil society.

2) The emergence of a skilled and effective business sector wherein social enterprises, founded by and in poor urban communities, derive wealth from the provision of environmental services and derivative recycling and re-use activities. The role of women in this sector will be promoted.
3) Improved awareness among all stakeholders of the rights and entitlement of poor urban dwellers to a clean environment and of the potential to harness local cost-effective resources to deliver these rights.

4) Enhanced capacity among local authorities to engage in public-private partnership (PPP) development, particularly involving the less formal private sector.

5) Improved South-South linkages and networking between partners and associates to increase learning, information dissemination, consensus building and advocacy skills with which to influence policy makers.

6) Scaling up of the approach and methodology to other urban centres within the three target countries.

3) Purpose and Scope of this Evaluation
The specific purposes of the mid-term review is to:
• Provide an independent assessment of the progress and performance of the project to date against targets including agreed activities; expected results and project objectives.
• Measure and report on achievements and early signs of change and impact.
• Indicate adjustments and changes that need to be made to ensure success.

The project evaluation will consist of the following phases:
• **Pre-evaluation preparation phase:** The project teams in all three countries will gather evidence to form the basis of a logframe review.
• **Review of evidence and ground-truthing:** The project evaluator will review the evidence in place and will carry out ground-truthing through consultation with local stakeholders.
• **Analysis and recommendations:** The project evaluator provides an analysis of impact considering the following:
  - What is working/not working and why?
  - Which activities/approaches have had the greatest/the least impact and why?
  - Do the objectives, expected results and activities remain appropriate and valid?
  - Do the planned activities represent the best means of achieving the results?
  - Are the objectives and results achievable within the remaining timeframe?
  - What changes should be made to the project in order to maximize impact and effectiveness and ensure the achievement of the objectives within the remaining timeframe?

4) Methodology:
Interested parties will be asked to tender a short outline methodology of how they would tackle this evaluation, both on a theoretical and practical basis. This should include:
• Desk research; review of evidence gathered by project team
• Review of project logframe and M&E frameworks
• Interviews with project team (field-based and through skype)
• Field visit to one country
• Interviews with key external stakeholders
ANNEX III: W2W RESULTS AND STRATEGIC EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Table A.2: Log frame Results and Strategic Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>W2W Result</th>
<th>Strategic Question</th>
<th>DAC Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sustained environmental sanitation improvement, with subsequent benefits in health and well-being for the inhabitants, in the 9 target communities through improved service provision as a result of partnerships involving local governments, the private sector and civil society.</td>
<td>Is there evidence of environmental sanitation improvements; if so, to what extent and how has this impacted on the community?</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The emergence of a skilled and effective business sector wherein social enterprises, founded by and in poor urban communities, derive wealth from the provision of environmental services and derivative recycling and re-use activities. The role of women in this sector will be promoted.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that pro-poor social enterprises providing environmental waste services have become sustainable, increased their income/wealth and contributed to the creation of an emerging business sector?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improved awareness among all stakeholders, including policy-makers, of the rights and entitlement of poor urban dwellers to a clean environment and of the potential to harness local cost-effective resources to deliver these rights.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that poor urban dwellers have been able to claim their rights in relation to a clean environment? If so, in what specific areas/ways?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enhanced capacity among LAs to engage in PPP development, particularly involving the less formal private sector. Strengthening managerial, technical and organisational abilities of municipalities and addressing statutory limitations will play a key part in achieving this result.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that LAs have improved capacity to engage in PPPs with SMEs? If so, to what extent has this happened?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improved south-south linkages and networking between partners and associates to increase learning, information dissemination, consensus building and advocacy skills with which to influence policy makers.</td>
<td>Is there evidence of south-south linkages and networking between partners and associates to increase learning, information dissemination, consensus-building and advocacy skills to influence policy makers? If so, to what extent has this happened, and what impact has this had on programmes in the 3 countries?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scaling up of the approach and methodology to other urban centres within the three target countries.</td>
<td>Is there evidence that W2W programme has been sufficiently refined to be cascaded out successfully across other regions within the three countries? If so, to what extent has this happened and has local government in other regions shown interest in W2W?</td>
<td>Effectiveness, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.3: Global Strategic Questions Relating to Relevance and Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Global Strategic Question</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To what extent are the objectives of W2W consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies and the quality of the programme?</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To what extent have the resources/inputs and activities been transformed into results – outputs, outcomes and impacts?</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX IV: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
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## ANNEX V: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN FOCUS GROUPS & INTERVIEWS

### Douala, Cameroon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FCTV</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>15.04.13</td>
<td>Joe Masend (Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fanny Matchum, (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Tonye (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouna Azumi (Project Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>SME supported by W2W</td>
<td>ADEC Business HQ, Douala 2</td>
<td>15.04.13</td>
<td>Charles Naintezem (Director, ADEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Older Community Leaders</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>16.04.13</td>
<td>Mr Mbappe Daniel (Douala 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Martin Gwewasang (Douala 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Wafo Marie (Douala 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Djuidje Marie Louise (Douala 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Bertin Tientcheu (Douala 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Stephanie Ziepop (Douala 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Young Community Leaders</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>16.04.13</td>
<td>Tekindo Antoine (Douala University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yepdi Franck (Douala University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yepnun Vieux (Douala University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bissim Samuel (Douala 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nkoumeni François (Douala, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gouod Thomas (Douala 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Douala 2 Council</td>
<td>Douala 2 Council HQ</td>
<td>16.04.13</td>
<td>Mr Moses Wouolonwouo (Head of Sanitation and Hygiene, Douala 2 Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>FCTV</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>17.04.03</td>
<td>Mr Mouamfon Mama (Project Coordinator, FCTV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>SMEs supported by W2W</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>17.04.03</td>
<td>Mr Kenmoe Jean (PLACAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Mane Wafo (PLACAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Tchouamani Jean (RedPlast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Talla Blaise (BB Corp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Djimeli Nguimto (Etablissement Djimeli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Nde (NPEPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Male (AJDD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Nguiladjoe (PANEXIM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Njoka Yevon (Green Holiday)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Douala, Cameroon (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>Adele Reproductive Health Clinic, Mabanda, Douala 4</td>
<td>18.04.13</td>
<td>Dr Martin Gwewasang (Douala4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Douala 2 Council</td>
<td>Centre d'accueil de Bepanda</td>
<td>18.04.13</td>
<td>Evelyn Baiba (Head of NGOs and Local Development, Douala 2 Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Community-Based Organisations</td>
<td>AFHALIDT HQ, Douala 2</td>
<td>18.04.13</td>
<td>Madame Marie Louise (President, AFHALIDT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Project Advisory Panel (PAP)</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>19.04.03</td>
<td>Mr Bonny Bonny (Head of Technical Services, Sanitation and Hygiene, Douala 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Josephine (Head of MJC, a social and cultural youth education association, Douala 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Other Private Waste Collectors</td>
<td>HYSACAM HQ, Douala</td>
<td>19.04.13</td>
<td>Mr Innocent Ebode (Head of Communications, HYSACAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FCTV (Field and Administrative Staff)</td>
<td>FCTV Offices, Douala</td>
<td>19.04.13</td>
<td>Fanny Muchum, (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Tonye (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouna Azumi (Project Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>SMEs supported by W2W</td>
<td>BB Corp HQ,</td>
<td>20.04.13</td>
<td>Mr Talla Blaise (Owner/Director, BB Corp)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kampala, Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>LEU</td>
<td>LEU Offices, Kampala</td>
<td>29.04.03</td>
<td>Swithern Tuwine (Executive Director, LEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Namutebi (Project Manager, LEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vivienne Onen (Field Officer, LEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Tumusiime (Field Officer, LEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>SMEs supported by W2W</td>
<td>Namirembe Resource Centre, Kampala</td>
<td>29.04.13</td>
<td>Amukwesi General Enterprises, Urban Cleaners, Green Hope Uganda, Capital Cleaning Services, Wisdom and Insight Investments and Motive Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Local Council</td>
<td>Namirembe Resource Centre, Kampala</td>
<td>29.04.13</td>
<td>Damba Emmanuel (Senior Health Inspector, Nansana TC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opuwa Ann (SME, Nansana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benadette Nasiwa (Councillor, Kawempe Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musoke Sarah (Councillor, Rubaga Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>Kasubi 2</td>
<td>29.04.13</td>
<td>Kasubi 1, 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Project Advisory Panel (PAP)</td>
<td>Namirembe Resource Centre, Kampala</td>
<td>30.04.13</td>
<td>PAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kampala, Uganda (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>KCCA</td>
<td>Rubaga Divisional HQ</td>
<td>30.04.13</td>
<td>Abel Asiimwe (Ag Town Clerk, Rubaga Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>LEU Offices, Kampala</td>
<td>30.04.13</td>
<td>Robert Bakiika (CEO, EMLI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Primrose Suites, Kampala</td>
<td>30.04.13</td>
<td>Sarah Aguti (Disaster Risk Reduction Coordinator, Plan International)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Director and Staff ANPEZ</td>
<td>Skype call</td>
<td>17.04.13</td>
<td>Niyi Lawal (Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David West Aribidokiai (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casmir Egwakhide (Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collins Ezebuio (OCN Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rukevwe Muogereh (Admin Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Akpors (Finance Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>18.04.13</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Government Representative and Project Advisory Panel Member</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>26.04.13</td>
<td>Captain Iyo Gobo, Head of Administration, Rivers State Environmental Sanitation Agency, Nigeria. Member of PAP Committee for W2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Local Authority Representative</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>27.04.13</td>
<td>LA rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Other Private Waste Collectors SME Representative and PAP Member</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>27.04.13</td>
<td>Emilia – Micro Con Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>27.04.13</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Skype Call</td>
<td>27.04.13</td>
<td>Niyi Lawal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX VI: CASE STUDIES OF CBOs SUPPORTED BY W2W

Almost 500 individuals or members of SMEs, CBOs and Associations in Cameroon and Uganda have received functional training in a range of recycling activities, including charcoal briquetting, composting, plastic recycling and plastic weaving. There are some very positive successes in this area of the programme, but challenges remain.

The production of charcoal briquettes is an area that has developed well in Kampala since W2W began. This is generally taking place on a small scale, for example, production of between 250 kg and 1 tonne per month. These small-scale producers use their own organic waste and buy additional materials from their neighbours (or sometimes given free) to produce carbon in small carbonisation retorts supplied by LEU, and hand mould briquettes for their own use and to sell to neighbours. One particular success of the W2W programme has been in its engagement with Luluna Communal Environmentalists (Box A.1), which has seen the strong growth of this CBO into a small scale production SME.

Box A.1: Luluna Communal Environmentalists

From the humble beginnings of three young people in Bwaise slum, Kampala, and with W2W accredited OCN training, Luluna has developed into a small industrial company employing 15 people producing up to 150kg of charcoal briquettes per day. The raw materials for these briquettes is household organic waste, which is then dried, carbonised and briquetted using cassava starch as a binder.

They boast a customer base of about 50 clients whom they supply briquettes in bulk on a weekly basis, in addition to a number of other community members that make small daily purchases.

Luluna strongly attributes their achievements to the Open College Network (OCN) accredited training offered to them through W2W. In a statement made by the organisation’s Chairperson, Mr. Rogers, he said “the OCN training has really helped us especially in areas of marketing and we also ensure that we get customer feedback on our products which has helped us serve them better.”

Luluna’s average monthly profits amount to approximately USh3,000,000 (£750).

Clearly, there is a large potential market for these environmentally friendly briquettes, but these cottage industries producing them have, in general, been unable to develop the technical or financial “critical mass” to grow their business. Luluna was the only example of a W2W supported CBO in Kampala that had reached a small industrial level, and the situation was much the same in Douala.

There are a number of factors that may have contributed to this outcome. First, most people living in slums and informal settlements are entrepreneurs by necessity rather than any inherent abilities or calling, so many lack the necessary skills to identify opportunities, seek out new markets, or identify mentors and other business support mechanisms. It is not surprising, therefore, that many such businesses either fail or reach a “glass ceiling” very rapidly and are unable to grow. Second, the basis of selecting beneficiaries might be counter-productive to the aims of this element of the programme. That is, beneficiaries should not be selected on the basis of most in need (level of poverty) but, rather, on entrepreneurial business background and track record. This might seem counter-intuitive for a development programme, since it is likely to exclude most very poor people, but with limited resources it is a necessity. Following this “business-like” route would also avoid building expectations that cannot be met, as was the case of Mary from Kasubi that is recounted below and in Box A.2. Third, and judging by the large number of enterprises that have failed to develop, there seems to be weaknesses in the programme’s strategy to link enterprises with existing support mechanisms, which might be local mentors, business incubators, micro-financiers, or simply community-based saving and loan schemes.
A case in point is Mary from Kasubi slum in Kampala. She was a beneficiary of functional training from the W2W programme, and she learnt how to make “fireless” cookers, which are essentially insulated baskets that retain the heat of hot food so that it continues to slow cook in the pot without direct heating (see Box A.2). However, Mary, like many other beneficiaries of functional training, has been left unable to build her business and she appears unaware of local support mechanisms or services, which illustrates a weakness in the programme’s post training support. This has led many, like Mary, to very frustrated and rather disillusioned by W2W.

**Box A.2: Production of Fireless Cookers – the case of Mary, Kasubi, Kampala**

Mary was one of over 200 community members that received functional training from the W2W programme in Kampala. She learnt how to make “fireless” cookers, which are designed to retain the heat of the cooking pot so that food continues to slow cook without direct heating.

Mary said “With these fireless cookers you just boil the food first, then put the pan in the fireless cooker and the food continues to cook, and it keeps food hot for the whole day. Since using this cooker I need to buy less than one-quarter of the charcoal I used to need. Many people want these fireless cookers, but since I don’t have the capital I can usually only make one each month, which only gives me a profit of between USh100,000 to USh150,000 (£25 to £38). All I need is some capital to buy the basic materials, since I have enough time to make 10 cookers per month and I know I can sell them all. At the moment this work can barely help me pay my rent.”

Another example of success is a disabled women’s group, Association des Filles/Femmes Handicapées pour L’intégration Total au Développement (AFHALITD), that received training in weaving of waste plastic bags through W2W (Box A.3).

**Box A.3: Association des Filles/Femmes Handicapées pour L’intégration Total au Développement (AFHALITD)**

Conceived by Madame Marie Louise (pictured right), AFHALITD was formed in 1994 to assist women living with disabilities in the Douala 2 of Douala city, Cameroon. The main thrust of the association is to help disabled live an independent life; one in which they are able to live a dignified life and look after their children/families, and on in which they are not condemned to begging on the streets.

Before W2W, some of the 60 members earned income from dressmaking, however, the majority relied on donations from well-wishers to the Association for the purchase of mobility aids, such as wheelchairs and crutches, or their members, and help the least fortunate with their living expenses.

However, AFHALITD was selected by FCTV as one of the Associations that could most benefit from W2W’s functional training opportunities in recycling to generate income from waste. Subsequently, three of their members received training on how to pre-treat and weave waste plastic bags into saleable products, such as key holders, bags and hats (above left). These three members have trained four others, so the Association has 7 members that are now able to weave plastics to generate income. Madame Marie Louise said “We are very grateful to FCTV and the W2W programme for giving members of our Association the abilities to earn income, and some of the first time in their lives, and this has given our membership great pride and a new level of independence.”
Since the training, some members can now earn between CFA30,000 and CFA50,000 per month (£40 to £70), and more if they sell at shows and exhibitions. One major concern of Madame Marie Louise was that all their weaving was done by hand and this limited their production; she felt that a weaving machine would boost their production and income – a proportion of which is passed to the association to support less able members.

This issue faced by AFHALITD, which it has in common with many community-based enterprises supported by W2W, is their inability to access microfinance to build their business. The market appears to be there to support increased production of these waste plastic bag handcrafts, but this could only happen for AFHALITD through the purchase of weaving machinery, most particularly in view of the physical challenges their members face.