



Patrick Higdon <phigdon@worldconnect-us.org>

Updated Banda USAID Cost-Effectiveness Argument

Patrick Higdon <phigdon@worldconnect-us.org>
 To: Pamela Nathenson <pnathenson@worldconnect-us.org>
 Cc: Sarah Haas <shaas@fandm.edu>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:27 PM

Hi Pamela,

I had Sarah do a deep dive in USAID-land to find any and all documentation from the Rwanda Integrated Water Security Project (RIWSP) that we often use to compare to our Banda projects. As a reminder, this is the public face of the project: (<http://map.usaid.gov/PublicProjectDetail?id=a0cd000000am57AAA&cid=Rwanda>), which supposedly provides some roll up results data for the lifespan of the project. Some of what Sarah found actually refutes what's listed at that link (e.g. the project actually ended in May 2015), so we decided to reframe the analysis to show the expected (meaning USAID reviewed and approved) results from the final full fiscal year of the project, which is the final year for which there is any sort of documentation for the project. There is no comprehensive Final Report in the USAID library, as far as we can gather. Read on for the detail.

Sarah, I did some work on the analysis paragraph at the bottom. Take a look and compare it to yours so you can see the changes.

In total, World Connect invested less than \$15,000 in two projects in partnership with Kageno Rwanda, and we accomplished the following quantifiable outputs in eight months:

- 1 cell-level water committee for governance, and 8 village-level tap committee
- 1 public improved sanitation facility (town center), 4 improved latrines, indirectly impacts 6,000 Banda residents
- 73 women and children representing 18 households with access to improved latrines
- 1,100+ individuals representing 271 households with sustainably improved access to water
- 3,000+ meters of trenches dug by residents for expanding water access

The following outputs were anticipated in FY 2014 of the Rwanda Integrated Water Security Program (RIWSP), which had a 3.2+ million dollar budget allocation:

- 36 village water committees were elected and trained on system sustainability
- 3 public improved sanitation facilities (one hospital and two health centers), 45 improved latrines
- 1,000 people representing 150 households with access to rainwater harvesting
- 10,000 individuals total with sustainably improved access to water
- 11 institutional settings (schools and health facilities) with improved water infrastructures

Our argument is that the World Connect projects were significantly more cost-effective than the RIWSP project. The budget for RIWSP was 213x the budget for the World Connect projects, yet the RIWSP anticipated results in FY 2014 certainly weren't projected to be anything near as exponentially great. RIWSP was projecting to establish 4x the number of water committees, to establish three public, improved latrines facilities to World Connect's one, and to install about 2x the number of actual latrines when both household and community-level latrines are taken into account. Both projects led to sustainably improved, community-managed access to water for their target populations, with the World Connect project reaching 1,100+ individuals across 271 households, and the RIWSP project expected to reach 10,000 individuals across an unknown number of households; RIWSP does project 1,000 of the total 10,000 individuals to be reached at the household level with rainwater harvesting, 150 households total. Both projects had or projected additional outputs, such as the World Connect project mobilizing 3,000+ meters of trenches to be dug by residents to lay pipe for their new water system, and the RIWSP project establishing improved water infrastructures in 11 institutional settings (schools and health facilities). It's clear from this data that the World Connect model for mobilizing locally-driven development provides significantly more value in terms of development outputs for the development dollars invested.

--

Patrick Higdon
 Program Manager