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Abstract

Problematic project formulation is only one aspect of ineffective development practice. While in Niamey, Niger working with international NGO Oxfam-Québec on an urban waste management project, I witnessed this in effect. I assumed a dual role as both a member of the project formulation team as well as an external evaluator and this permitted the opportunity for empirical observation and data collection. I pursued my thesis research on how poor project formulation leads to flawed project design. By looking at the case of the PGDSM-N, I analyse the disjunctures between project assumptions and reality, which will most likely produce sub-optimal results. I provide an overview of both literature and experience, on the reasons why these problems occur and the possible obstacles to more effective formulation and design. Finally, I suggest that in order to overcome this problem and achieve more effective development practice, we must consider routinely incorporating learning and adaptive techniques into our development initiatives, such as the evaluative tool of impact analysis at an ex-ante stage.
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Introduction

I have long questioned the effectiveness of international development\(^1\) as a whole. Personal and academic experiences led me to suspect that my critique lay with the process of development in practice, specifically the initial stages of project, program or policy formulation. My ten-month work term in Niamey, Niger with international non-governmental organization (NGO) Oxfam-Québec, allowed me to pursue this as a matter of inquiry. This experience was limited to the micro-level NGO-led initiatives, and therefore restricted the nature of my research to NGO projects. With the resources available to me, I dove head first into observation. In accordance with my mandate, I assisted in the elaboration and development of an urban solid waste management project to be implemented in the capital city of Niamey early in 2010. This five-year project was budgeted at approximately CAD $26 million and included stakeholders from various levels of government and multiple society-based groups. A few months in, my suspicions about ineffectiveness on the ground materialized before me and I attempted to view the project not only internally as a formulator, but as an impartial evaluator as well. I considered the role of NGO driven projects within the larger development process and posited that problematic project formulation as a symptom of ineffective development practice occurs at the project’s nascent stages, within the first few ‘steps’ of the project cycle.

By the mid 1970s, both academics and practitioners alike came to a realization that even after decades of experience in the field of international development, project implementation remained a difficult problem (Rodinelli, 1979). One of the most frequently cited causes was poor project design as, “reliable and objective data for evaluating implementation

\(^1\) By ‘international development as a whole’ I include all aspects of international development that we know of today. It includes the decision-making process, the implementation and the final outcomes. It involves those in which industrial countries play a role and those in which they do not. My critique is with the process of formulation of all kinds of development initiatives.
problems was hard to come by…” (Rodinelli, 1979). By the 1970s enough discussion had surrounded the issue to provide some indication of the magnitude of the problem. The Pearson Commission on International Development (1969) was one of the earliest attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of the World Bank’s aid initiatives. The Commission argued that because of ineffective project design and implementation, both donors and recipients have found it difficult to make effective use of aid. Similarly, the Jackson Committee’s (1969) review on the capacity of the United Nations system noted that many projects, in the strict sense of the word, were not designed at all (Rodinelli, 1979). It became apparent that change was due, and in 1982 working for the World Bank, W.C Baum introduced the ‘project cycle’ as a rational way of conceptualizing and managing projects (Biggs & Smith, 2003). The project cycle has since become standard, not only internally to the organization, but across the field of international development in various sectors where projects are continually implemented.

The structure of the project cycle varies among organizations, in the number of stages it has and even in the name each stage bears. Nevertheless the broader framework and the progression from one phase to the next remain the same and can be identified in almost all project cycles (Biggs & Smith, 2003). Generally put, the project cycle breaks down into six phases: project identification, preparation or design, appraisal or feasibility study, support or approval, implementation and supervision, and evaluation (World Bank, 1998; Biggs & Smith, 2003; Thomas 2002). Some academics and practitioners have added programming or country strategies as the first step, prior to identification, but this seems more the overarching context in which the project would be identified instead of a unique step in the cycle. The project cycle is regularly used by local and international implementing agencies, donor agencies and organizations, governments and NGOs. The widespread use of the project cycle has made it a common feature in developmental discussion, as it has remained a central tool in micro-level
development management, practice and specifically project formulation since the mid 1970s onwards (Biggs & Smith, 2003).

My critique of the effectiveness of development practice at the micro-level, specifically related to NGO projects, is mainly tied to project formulation. Project formulation occurs at the initial stages of the project cycle, namely in the identification, and design and preparation phases. It is these beginning stages of the project cycle which I believe are often flawed. A poorly formulated project could very well result in sub-optimal implementation and performance of project objectives and even produce undesirable outcomes on the ground. One symptom of ineffective project formulation is the manifestation of disjunctures between project assumptions and reality on the ground. Personal experience with the NGO project showed how these disjunctures could eventually hinder a project’s success.

Both normative and critical literature take a stance on the project cycle and its use in development practice. Traditionally, academic literature and texts written by donors advocated the project cycle for its ability to organize and streamline the development process. This body of literature is mostly theoretical and ‘process’ focused, in which there is a natural expectation of positive results if the cycle were applied well. These perspectives draw on underlying assumptions of the project cycle approach yet fail to address the issues that stem from them. For instance, proponents of the project cycle assume that each step would be followed and completed most diligently, including recommendations from stakeholders at every stage from identification to evaluation (Biggs & Smith, 2003). In reality this assiduousness seems uncommon. A second assumption taken for granted is the expectation that adjustments will be made during the project cycle in response to ongoing events. The idea that the stages should be repeated if necessary is embodied in the use of a cycle rather than a linear form to
represent the life of a project (Biggs & Smith, 2003). But as experience on the ground shows, projects usually take on a linear form with a start date, a finish date, and project milestones along the way. Rarely does one come across a project repeating its cycle for a second time, let alone a third or a fourth. Ineffective project formulation was not resolved by the project cycle, and its proponents were mistaken to think the application of the cycle alone would improve development practice.

A second set of literature focuses on the dissatisfaction with results in developmental practice. Taking a critical stance, these studies and texts mostly from the world of academia and NGOs, are focused on project outcomes and results and criticize the project cycle in practice and sometimes even the use of projects (no matter how they are applied) in general. They attribute the weakness of the project approach to the lack of participatory methods and to faulty donor-recipient relations. Common critical discourse includes imperialistic donor behaviour, imposition of westernized concepts, paternalistic control over resources, etc. (Koehn & Ojo, 1999; Thomas, 2002). Authors in this school tend to use participation rhetoric and champion participatory methods, without deliberating about other causes of problematic project formulation. In an attempt to improve micro-level development practice the literature mostly advocates approaches such as Community Based Management (CBM) in response to common project management techniques. It also prescribes forms of participatory research such as Participatory Action Research (PAR) or Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) when critiquing research and data collection methods in the identification and project design phases (Blackburn, Chambers & Gaventa, 2002). It has been generally agreed that to be effective in the 21st century, there was a need for community empowerment, building capacity for self-sustained and self-reliant development, and decentralization of donor powers and responsibilities (Koehn & Ojo, 1999). Though it might seem that not all projects require extensive community participation in order to be successful, this school of thought advocated
that some form of local participation should always be present in at least the first few stages of design, if not in the initiative’s entire process. Nevertheless, this perspective also did not ensure an adaptive process which urged learning and adjustment throughout the life of the project from design to evaluation. Overtime critics and practitioners alike once again noted a lack of substantial change. That development in practice was still not providing the desired results and that merely participation was not making ends meet.

Sporadically across the field of development, from the worlds of donors, social groups and academia, questions arose. Why is it that staff in development agencies and development practitioners in general, appear to make the same old mistakes rather than learn from them (Thin, 1998)? Why were the lists of ‘lessons learnt’ and recommendations provided today the same as decades before (Thomas, 2002)? Even keeping in mind bureaucratic practices, why aren’t organizations encouraging internal learning environments to limit repetition? In practice, participation rhetoric alone does not seem to accomplish the task. The idea of community participation has been so widely expressed and the terminology so randomly used, that the main difficulty lies in the application of this concept (Davidson et al., 2007). It has therefore been suggested that there is a need to tackle the organizational design of the project as a whole and broaden our perspectives from a project management point of view (Davidson et al., 2007). In line with my personal observations, a relatively small body of literature suggests that the problem of ineffective development practice lies in the lack of adaptive learning throughout the development process, but specifically during project formulation. Although there has been a decline in paternalistic donor behaviour, and an increase in participatory approaches, development projects still seem ineffective as agents of change2 (Thomas, 2002). It is not a question whether the project as a concept is obsolete. Projects are needed at the micro-level of the state and society to materialize development objectives and goals. They are

2 In the sense that the overall effectiveness of sustainably achieving development goals through projects is still questionable
the vehicles by which international aid is justified and funneled into a country. The problem is that few people are learning from practice and applying the lessons to immediate and future actions. Even within the participatory school there is generally a lack of self-critique and analysis, which provoked the new wave of adaptive management techniques and promoted the concept of learning while doing. Within the realm of NGOs, Habitat International is an example of an organization attempting to incorporate learning techniques and accordingly adjusting project design to reality (Davidson et al., 2007). As a donor organization, the World Bank attempts to address the issue by engaging in systematic listening to beneficiaries as an approach to development learning, known as Beneficiary Assessment. Academics suggest that the answer lies in looking at the development organization or executing agency to examine the way things are actually managed and structured and understand why the project cycle is used differently across organizations and institutional contexts (Biggs & Smith, 2003).

Since this perspective is still relatively new, the body of literature is small and the insight of practitioners and academics still fresh; various proposals on how to change our approach such as the ones above, have been introduced. In the hope of contributing to the exploration, one may also consider the regular and effective use of evaluative tools. One of the most promising tools is the impact analysis at an ex-ante or mid-term stage of the project cycle, because it can promote adaptive management, new learning and optimal project formulation.

The following sections will first analyse the disjuncture between assumptions and reality that arose from problematic formulation of the PGDSM-N though it took what some would call a participatory approach, and assess the perceptions of various parties involved as I worked both as an evaluator and an intern to the project. They will explore the possible reasons that these disjunctures occur, and will finally reflect on a tool that could potentially minimize the problem.
Background

On July 15th 2008, I arrived in Niamey, Niger to begin my 10-month work-term with international NGO Oxfam-Québec (OQ). Within the first few days of my arrival my mandate had been established. My primary role was to assist in the elaboration and development of the new *Projet de Gestion des Déchets Solides Ménagers à Niamey* (PGDSM-N), an urban solid waste management project to be implemented in Niamey at a citywide scale. Initially part of a team with two other people, I worked on the project design, which was modeled after the original PGDSM project in Bénin. From October 2008 onwards, the team was reduced to two people including myself as we worked full-time on the initial stages of the project cycle. I added two more activities to my mandate, the most important being a basic evaluation of a pilot project which was in the midst of completion on my arrival to Niamey, Niger.

Context of Niamey, Niger

Niger has a population of approximately 15.3 million, of which 16% is urban, and the annual rate of growth of the urban population is 4% (CIA Factbook, 2010). With about 62% of the population living below the poverty line and the GDP per capita (PPP) at $627, Niger ranks 134th out of a 135 countries on the 2009 United Nations Human Poverty Index (UNDP, 2009). Landlocked in sub-Saharan West Africa, the economy is dominated by agriculture despite being plagued by droughts and desertification (World Bank, 2010). As the population continues to grow at an extremely fast pace (approximately 3.5%), the overall welfare of the people in this poverty stricken country is at risk as the burden on resources increases.

The political fabric of Niger has been unstable over the past few years. Since early 2007 the Northern region of the country has been a conflict ridden zone, rife with armed
attacks and kidnappings by alleged rebel groups. Political turmoil was further perturbed by the military coup in February 2010, which ousted President Mamadou Tandja who had attempted to prolong his presidency by changing the Constitution and dissolving the National Assembly and the Constitutional Court (World Bank, 2010). Periods of political instability, at times exacerbated by droughts and famine, have led most of the population to distrust the capacity of the government to provide for their basic needs. Left with only day-to-day survival mentality, Nigeriens tend to have no immediate concern or plans for the future (A. Mega, personal communication, August 3rd 2008).

Approximately 80% of the population claims to be of Muslim faith (CIA Factbook, 2010). Personal experience on the ground demonstrated the strong tendency towards a traditionalist, patriarchal society. Though not necessarily fundamentally religious, the population strains at emanating religiosity in every day life. For example, alcohol is widely available but is consumed in a clandestine way. Social and cultural norms are married to religious interpretations, and are an undercurrent in many parts of secular society. Working on the ground also demonstrated the influence on politics and daily issues by religious leaders or figureheads. The “Imams” are respected within society and are readily invited to forums, workshops, council meetings and any other policy dialogue spaces. I personally experienced their power of rhetoric to restrain policy within religious parameters based on their individual interpretations of the Qu’ran.

The city of Niamey is formally known as *la Communauté Urbaine de Niamey*. In 2002, under the law *N° 2002-014*, the city was divided into five towns each with its own decentralized district government and elected mayor (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). Respectively, they are known as *Commune Niamey I, II III, IV and V*. Due to successive periods of drought in the rural areas over the last decade, the population in Niamey has grown rapidly. This growth puts a strain on the city’s infrastructure and housing. Niamey is not only the capital but also the
economic hub of the country, where almost 15% of the population practices small-scale agriculture and/or market-gardening. Large amounts of waste, bio-degradable and not, line the city streets.

Under the Constitution, collection and removal of urban waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Municipal government, which in turn levies a waste removal tax on the residents of the city to finance the operation. To date, there is no dependable garbage collection service provided by the municipal government. Spread thin over a large geographical space, the densest areas of the city are at the center alongside the Niger River in Commune Niamey II. The collection of household waste in Niamey prior to the introduction of the PGDSM-N was at best an informal system which lacked structure. In an unorganized and uncoordinated manner various actors from both private and public sectors, specifically the district-level governments, were involved in the collection and transportation of the garbage from the households to the landfill sites. Individual garbage collectors were badly organized and poorly equipped, and to the delight of the neo-liberals freely entered and exited the market at their own discretion. The labour supply for this work was theoretically limitless, as any able person (most likely male) needing extra cash could pick up a wagon and travel door to door. These private collectors would unload their carts at unregulated and inadequately maintained public dumping sites throughout the city, which only heightened the unsanitary conditions already present. Run down trucks and low-volume bins funded by the district governments, limited the frequent removal of the garbage from these sites to the landfill which itself was abysmally below any environmental standards. In essence, the low capacity of the government handicapped its role as a service provider and provoked an alternate yet still ineffective waste removal system.

In a situation such as this, I believe the most rational and logical way to address the issue is through a collaborative approach encouraging public-private partnerships between the
actors. This esemplastic technique could ensure the active and equal participation of all actors to uniformly and effectively provide the service by sharing roles and responsibilities in a systematic way. This concept is reflected in the strategy of the PGDSM-N as it aims to establish a shared waste management system, which encourages the involvement of various actors such as government, private organizations, NGOs and social groups. But the bigger question is whether the implementation of the PGDSM-N is a good idea at all.

The issues that arise about this sort of project can be summarized in two questions. First, is it an overall good idea to implement a trans-nationally borrowed PGDSM to fit the context of Niger? Second, in the situation that the PGDSM-N will be implemented regardless of whether it is a good idea or not, is it designed to optimally perform on the ground? To answer in short, there were no steps taken by project formulators to find out whether it was a good idea or not and as I came to find poor project formulation practices created flaws in the form of disjunctures between project assumptions and reality. This indicated the project was no longer adequately reflecting the needs on the ground and would most likely not optimally perform.

The primary problem seems to be that there was not enough information present to establish the desirability of the project and make informed decisions. For example, in my data collection I gathered vital information on the income and expenditure habits of households, the effects of forced subscription on their overall welfare and the willingness of women and male labourers to participate in the project. This information should have been present to make informed decisions about desirability and design, but the project formulation process lacked the methods to acquire it and instead made inaccurate assumptions. The problem of lack of information overlapped both the rationale process and the design process of the project, as assumptions were rife throughout the first steps of the project cycle. As I discuss later in the

---

3 Meaning a project of this scope, magnitude, style and type.
paper, assumptions rationalizing the project were based on the fact that it was borrowed and assumptions made in the design of the project was based on imprecise perceptions of reality. These assumptions can be generally attributed to the lack of information, but are specifically due to socio-political barriers, organizational obstacles and challenges within interpersonal interactions and the working environment. Incorporating learning and adaptive management techniques would have forced formulators to continuously acquire the proper information, lessening the frequency of assumptions and mistakes made.

After my arrival to Niamey, within the first few weeks I was brought up to date on the Commune Niamey II pilot project on a small-scale waste management system, which was scheduled to close by August 2008. This pilot project had been implemented two years prior and matched the PGDSM-N in design. From the documentation and discussion in the field it is unclear whether this pilot project was specifically designed to test the PGDSM model in Niamey or was simply an activity to use up unspent funding and balance the budget. Whatever the reason, vital information was revealed which was extremely germane to the effective design of the future PGDSM-N. I had the opportunity to work on the final project document which summarized all the activities and results achieved over the past two years. The pilot project had been implemented in the four most densely populated neighbourhoods which were surrounded by the major street markets and were located at the center of the city in Commune Niamey II. Due to high traffic in the area, sanitation was an acute problem as heaps of garbage hung on almost every corner and filled almost every sewage drain. The goal of the pilot project was to address this issue. Because the project was coming to an end, I realized that these neighbourhoods and the households within them were beneficiaries who had experienced a ‘small-scale PGDSM-N’. They would also be among the target beneficiaries of the future implementation of the PGDSM-N.
After wrapping up and closing the pilot project, our small team of three moved on to the much larger PGDSM-N dossier. In September 2008, the OQ PGDSM-N team and 10 representatives from different local partners in Niamey who were the focal points of the PGDSM-N, made a field study visit to Cotonou, Bénin. Since it had already been decided by OQ administration that the PGDSM-N would be modeled after the project in Bénin instead of being designed from scratch, the objective of the visit was to acquire hands-on experience and a visual understanding of how the project worked. For approximately one week we worked closely with the OQ team in Bénin who had been running the original PGDSM for the past 12 years, and made visits to various project sites to study how the project functioned on the ground. On our return to Niamey, we began to design a PGDSM project for Niamey, emulating the original structure and components of the project in Bénin. By this point I had become fully equipped and well versed in the project dialogue and design.

Project Description

The PGDSM-N is a five year project budgeted at CAD $26 million to be executed by Oxfam-Québec and implemented in 2010. The key actors involved in the project include the design team at Oxfam-Québec/Niger; the administrations of OQ offices in Niger, Bénin and Canada; the Nigerien ministries of health, environment, urbanization and city planning and the interior and public security; the municipal government; the five decentralized district governments; various society-based groups in composting and market-gardening; local garbage collection and transportation NGOs; households and donors. The project document states that the ultimate goal is to contribute towards improving the sanitary and hygiene conditions for the city of Niamey (Oxfam-Québec, 2009). Its specific goal is to support the implementation of a shared urban solid waste management system across the five Communes
or town districts within the city of Niamey. The project activities have been divided into five categories: pre-collection, collection, landfill, awareness and communication and project management. The first three of the five categories are the major components or phases of the waste management system identical to the ones in Bénin which the PGDSM-N aims to imitate in Niger. The pre-collection includes the collection of waste directly from the households. At this stage individual garbage collectors travel door to door (to the households subscribed to the service), fill up their wagon and make their way to the closest *point de regroupement* (See Appendix A), a regulated dumping drop-site, to unload the waste into large metal containers. The collection phase is expected to fall under the tutelage of each respective district government which will most likely contract out to a private organization or local NGO. This phase includes the transportation of the household waste now aggregated in the large containers, from the *point de regroupement* to a permanent regulated landfill site. The last phase is the monitoring, maintenance and management of the landfill site, which is the responsibility of the municipal city government. The fourth and fifth categories are not directly related to the waste management network but are attributes which will contribute to the success or failure of the system in place. The defining characteristic of the system is the cooperation and collaboration of all parties involved, within and between each phase of the system. The PGDSM-N management team at OQ is responsible for ensuring a collaborative stakeholder environment so that the system can run smoothly. According to the project document, the direct beneficiaries of the PGDSM-N are: the municipal government, the garbage collectors, local NGOs, recyclers, local authorities, and the indirect beneficiaries are the over 40 000 households within the five districts of the city (Oxfam-Québec, 2009).

As previously mentioned, the PGDSM-N was fundamentally modeled on the original PGDSM implemented in Bénin twelve years earlier. Having had direct exposure to the design process and being a member of the formulation team, I observed that there was a slight
attempt, to adapt the project to the local context. Though the two countries share a border, they are fairly different in various aspects. Economically, physically, socially and culturally, the capital city of Cotonou contrasts to its Nigerien counterpart. I noticed that simple modifications were undertaken after the decision to bring the project to Niger. For example, the environmental and climate components were adapted to suit Niamey’s drier weather and siltier land, but this did not seem to suffice to fully adapt the project to local contexts. Observation of the process showed that social and cultural contexts were either deliberately disregarded or unintentionally overlooked, as impending deadlines and bureaucracy superseded meticulous design. The core structure, or the ‘axes’ of the project remained identical to the one in Bénin, so despite the minimal alterations, the design of the project is more or less the same. It seemed that throughout the formulation process in Niamey the judiciousness of the project design and the project formulators never came into question. The project was evidently not based on a needs assessment of the country. It was put forward to the local partners by international NGO OQ, but its applicability to local situations was never assessed. It seems the assumption was that the contexts did not differ enough to justify designing the project from scratch and that the differences were not substantial enough to pose as an obstacle in the future. This prevented any detailed needs assessment and gathering of information to take place. Furthermore, it was apparently in the interest of OQ to duplicate project design instead of incurring startup costs to initiate a brand new project. This assumption that both locations were similar enough was the basis of the rationale to trans-nationally replicate and implement the project. As a fail-safe the OQ team made a superficial attempt to contextualize the project as experience in the field and discussion with colleagues demonstrated it was verbally acknowledged but was clearly overlooked in the design. Furthermore, any attempt by the OQ team in Niger to appropriate the project and transfer all project data to Niamey was met with resistance from the OQ team in Bénin. This eventually generated tension in the professional
relationship between both OQ national offices, causing more uncertainty about the legitimacy of decision-making process and the tenability of the project design.

As time passed I began to view the project from an analytical standpoint and as a member of the project design team I noticed the project was laden with assumptions. Overall two sets of assumptions became obvious, though they did overlap on some issues. First, the largest assumption made was that Niamey resembled Cotonou enough to justify the transnational borrowing and copying of the PGDSM. As mentioned this allowed OQ to rationalize the introduction of the project in Niamey but also allowed it to draw a veil over their own vested interests in pursuing the implementation of the project, such as monopolizing the waste management sector. The second set of assumptions involved the project design. Various project expected outcomes and activity components were based on assumptions with respect to the situation on the ground, which in reality were inaccurate causing flaws in the design. Being a member of the design team, I took the opportunity to explore this further as my thesis research and assumed the role of an evaluator. This dual role gave me the benefit of the inside track, but also allowed an opportunity to step back and objectively assess the process of project formulation.

*Data Collection Methodology*

I conducted primary research by surveying a sample population of 200 households, all from the four beneficiary neighbourhoods of the pilot project completed in August 2008 in *Commune Niamey II*. I selected these neighbourhoods because they had already been exposed to a quasi-PGDSM-N on a much smaller scale and thus provided an ex-post scenario. In a team of four, composed of myself and three government officials from the district

---

4 It is also worthy mentioning that this dual role may have also shaped my perceptions and critique of the project itself. Therefore, all data analysis and observations provided by my experience should be considered in light of my place in the broader context.
of Commune Niamey II, we randomly selected 50 households per neighbourhood. Going door to door, we approached household members and asked whether they would voluntarily participate in a brief questionnaire which I designed and wrote up in French. Respondents about evenly included both males and females. For those who had trouble understanding French, the questions and their respective answers were orally translated into the dominant local languages of either Hausa (Houssa) or Zarma (Djerma). Primary research on the garbage collectors was also gathered by randomly surveying a total of 34 garbage collectors who happened to come by the pilot project’s point de regroupement in a span of approximately 1 hour. As most of them had only rudimentary French language skills or were illiterate, almost all the questionnaires had to be verbally translated by the dumpsite security guard who was there as a government employee of Commune Niamey II. I also conducted key informant interviews with representatives from the district, municipal and ministerial levels of government, as well as a representative from the OQ project team.

From an anthropological point of view, various barriers and problems were confronted in this primary data collection. Participatory observation led me to believe that answers respondents gave to certain ‘trigger’ questions might be skewed and not representative of the reality. This can be easily attributed not only to the fact that I was a foreigner and a female in a patriarchal Muslim society, but also to the fact that I was accompanied by government officials who are usually considered as of higher authority in local social ranking. I noticed that ‘trigger’ questions usually included ones related to cultural or social norms with religious or traditional undertones. These questions touched on topics such as allowing women of the household to work as recyclers, ranking gender issues as a priority to society, and gauging the meaning of community and participation. The social and economic rank of the questioners, including myself, posed as barrier to accumulating reliable data. Other barriers included political interests of those closely tied to the project and the wish of certain stakeholders to be well-perceived by
other stakeholders, resulting in biased and superficial responses in interviews and questionnaires. Nevertheless in spite of some ambiguity in the responses, generally the statistics were strong enough to confirm some of my initial suspicions that data from the ground was not being accurately represented in the project design.

Along with my primary research, I conducted secondary research in an attempt to find a proper framework by which I could organize my analytical approach. I am borrowing from the World Bank’s *Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA)*, a macro-level analytical framework for policy analysis. I scaled it down to apply it to my own micro-level research on effective project formulation and used some of its tools in my data collection methodology. Perusing the PSIA documentation, I formulated my survey questionnaire and designed my analytical framework. I decided to borrow what the PSIA calls ‘impact channels’ as a means of categorizing the findings from my primary research on the disjunctures between project assumptions and the realities on the ground. Focusing on three separate aspects of socio-economic welfare, my analysis is broken into the categories of Labour and Prices, Access, and Assets. The following section will analyse the disjunctures which arose from the data collected, signaling problematic project formulation.
As mentioned, the PGDSM-N is fraught with assumptions and the disconnect between assumptions and reality is reflected at various points in the formulation process. The first and major assumption, positing the similarity of settings between Niamey and Cotonou, provided a means of rationalizing the introduction of the project to Niger though there seems to be no immediate empirical justification for its implementation⁵. Furthermore, the utility of the project is ambiguously portrayed in the project documents, sometimes by proclaiming how it will improve working conditions for the garbage collectors, or at other times by asserting its contribution to improving sanitary conditions of the city.

The second set is embedded in the project design, where the likelihood of expected outcomes or specific interpretations of reality were based on inaccurate postulations. This in effect created disjunctures between the assumptions within the project design and the reality on the ground. The assumptions of what project outcomes will achieve or how they will impact certain stakeholders, institutions or events, seem misguided as data from the ground demonstrates that they are weakly founded. Then there are some fallacious assumptions made about the state of the situation or the context on the ground. It became evident that the first couple of stages of the project cycle, namely the identification and design and preparation phases were almost entirely based on flawed assumptions, which will undoubtedly have effects on the eventual optimal implementation.

The project disjunctures which I observed in the field as an evaluator were evident in three separate aspects of socio-economic welfare, namely labour and prices, access, and assets.

⁵ In the case of Cotonou, an interview with the creator and director of the original PGDSM showed that the decision to implement the project in Bénin was almost entirely based on his unanimous perception of the unsanitary conditions of the city. He then designed the project under OQ and proposed it to Canadian International Development Agency for funding.
Labour and Prices

The disjunctures within the category of labour and prices demonstrate how project assumptions differ from reality. First, project formulators assume that a pool of labour resources vital to the project’s effectiveness is present and willing to participate in the project, when in reality this is not the case. Second, the welfare of households is compromised by the assumption that other project activities would not create negative externalities. In reality, there are various project activities which might have negative indirect effects on the welfare of the households, such as direct costs they will have to incur, but have been overlooked by project formulators. Lastly, the assumption by formulators that individual garbage collectors have incentive to willingly join the project is imprecise, because in reality participating in the project could actually limit their potential income.

The effectiveness of the project depends on the possibility of self-sufficiency within a community and the notion it could provide a public service for itself. In the case at hand, the provision of the service requires substantial human resources in the form of manual labour. The functionality of the project depends on effective pre-collection and the manual labour of the individual garbage collectors who take their wheelbarrow or other type of cart from door to door. Inevitably, the launching of the project and its implementation over time would demand more labour to fulfill this pre-collection requirement. It will therefore initiate change in the labour market. As far as I can tell, the project formulators assumed that the labour supply was endless and untapped. In both project documentation and conversation with OQ staff and local partners, there seemed to be no direct reference to size of available labour supply, how the project would recruit and if the laborers were willing to join the project or not. One project document clearly states that under the project, individual initiatives and community structures
already in place will be fused and managed more efficiently (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). Nevertheless, this does not address the issue of willingness and the long-term commitment of the labourers.

Data collected from a random survey of garbage collectors on the ground revealed that labourers did not seem willing to commit long term. The pattern of labour supply was more complex than the formulators realized or cared to admit. Of a total of 34 randomly surveyed garbage collectors (all male), 23 of them or 68%, responded that they considered themselves seasonal workers. A seasonal worker is defined as a worker who cultivates his rural farmland during the rainy season, and comes into the city the rest of the year to take on other work, in this case as a garbage collector. Once the rainy season returns, he goes back to his rural land to plant and cultivate until the season expires. Though the rainy season is relatively shorter, this seasonal pattern of employment indicates not only an unreliable source of labour, but that majority of workers consider the garbage collection business as a secondary income and have no intention of making it their full-time occupation. Therefore the assumption that garbage collectors will remain available to the project on a permanent basis seems unreasonable. As the data shows, those willing to work as garbage collectors are not usually urban dwellers. Observation in the field leads me to believe that this because those who agree to take on the occupation are usually the poorest of the poor and therefore not urban residents. The incorrect assumption about the labour market will eventually be an obstacle to the effectiveness of the project.

The effect of the project on the socio-economic welfare of households is grounded in a theoretical framework. Simple economic theory suggests that an increase in demand with a controlled supply will increase prices. It was suggested in the field by the OQ administrations in both Canada and Bénin, that the PGDSM-N should follow the Bénin example and implement a
forced subscription policy on households. This never appeared directly in project documents, but was repeatedly intimated. Local partners and the focal points seemed on board, and concurred that legislation should pass enforcing subscription to the project.

The indirect beneficiaries of the project have been identified as the those living in the geographically targeted urban areas, totaling in all over 40 000 households. Oddly enough, though they have been labeled indirect beneficiaries by the project formulators, they are by far the largest beneficiary group. The economic status of the households ranges from deprivation to very affluent. Though any development practitioner would hope that achieving the project goal would be without any negative effects on the welfare of the households, this aspect seems to have been neglected by PGDSM-N formulators. If lobbying by the PGDSM-N succeeds in passing the legislation on enforced subscription, it would theoretically be quite detrimental to the welfare of the households. Forced subscription would create a spike in demand for the service and because there is a limited supply, it would most likely result in an increase in price of subscription, a direct cost to households.

An increase in prices will have serious repercussions on the welfare of the households. Of those who responded that they were subscribed to a service at the time of questioning, 40% of the respondents said they paid more than 2,001 CFA ($4.45 CDN) per month for garbage collection and 24% paid between 1,501 and 2,000 CFA ($3.34-$4.45 CDN) per month. Though the amount seems small, in relative terms it constitutes a dent in monthly income. From the sample population, roughly 44% of the respondents claimed they earned between 21 000 and 60 000 CFA ($46.72-133.48 CDN) per month. This indicates that expenditure on monthly garbage collection consumed from 3% to 10% of most of the population’s monthly income. In the short run, any increase from current prices for the garbage collection service would be detrimental to most of the households, assuming that income remained relatively stable over the same course of time.
Another direct cost the households would have to incur is the incorporation of a sanitation tax. The sanitation tax was recommended by the project formulators based on the experience in Bénin, as a means to raise funds for a more sanitary city. If implemented, this legislation would introduce a city-wide sanitation tax to not only raise funds but to enforce environment and sanitation standards. Once again, it is not explicitly written in any of the current project documents or proposals, but it was another topic of discussion among the focal points and the OQ team. An interview with the representative of the municipal government indicated that it favoured both the forced subscription and the sanitation tax, and he expected that legislation will pass on both counts (Representative of Communauté Urbaine de Niamey the municipal government, personal communication, April 10th, 2009). Essentially, if all goes as planned, households would have to incur a double-fee for one service: a subscription fee by the project and a sanitation tax by the government.

Lastly, there is no direct or indirect reference anywhere in the project documents or in the discussions that took place, to project externalities affecting other markets. An increase in demand for the garbage collection service is bound to affect prices in complementary private markets, such as materials and equipment and may negatively affect those who can least afford it, namely households.

The third assumption under labour and prices once again has to do with the individual garbage collectors and their willingness to fully participate in the PGDSM-N. Project documents clearly state that garbage collectors will be organized and ‘professionalized’ under a specific coordinating body which will facilitate discussion between individual garbage collectors, the municipal government and other partners (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). The number of individuals and structures involved will be reduced and limited to ensure effective management over the group. The coordinating organization will receive administrative and
financial training and the individual garbage collectors will receive skills training, uniforms and equipment (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). One may generally conclude that under this systematic organization individual garbage collectors will to an extent be unionized under the banner of the PGDSM-N. The assumption the project formulators make is that this proposition will suffice as an incentive to individual garbage collectors to willingly join the project. Probing and informal conversation also gives reason to believe that the Bénin experience showed that organizing and ‘professionalizing’ the garbage collectors will in fact increase their overall income. Hearing of these experiences the OQ project team in Niger expect the same results.

Observation in the field and inference from the household surveys show that ‘professionalization’ as an incentive might be an incorrect assumption. A trend in responses to the survey seems to demonstrate that households which indicated that they had not subscribed to an organized garbage collection service, but used the services of private individual garbage collectors paid a higher fee. An anomaly in the research methodology might have skewed this observation, as a large number of respondents demonstrated limited knowledge on the distinct difference between being ‘subscribed’ or ‘not subscribed’.

Nevertheless, empirical observation led to the general conclusion that private non-organized garbage collecting individuals usually earned more than their organized counterparts. This can be attributed to the fact that private individuals have the ability to negotiate their price on a day to day basis, depending on weight of garbage, etc. On the other hand, garbage collectors

---

6 I observed that there were instances in which a respondent would answer that he or she was subscribed to the service, but on the same survey would answer that he or she was unaware of the pilot project in their neighbourhood which was providing the subscription-based service.
organized under the system must abide to fixed subscription rates\textsuperscript{7}. In some cases the difference between earnings was quite substantial. The project formulators assume that supplying training, a better quality working environment and organizing workers under a system will suffice as incentive to partake in the project. But as data shows, workers could potentially earn more by remaining in their current form of employment and therefore will most likely not be as willing to join the project\textsuperscript{6}.

Overall, an analysis on the prices and labour aspect of socio-economic welfare demonstrates a three-fold disjuncture between project assumptions and reality. First, the formulators assume that there is an availability in labour which the project would be able to tap into to fulfill its necessary labour requirements. Second, the formulators overlook and maybe unintentionally fail to acknowledge the effects of various project activities on the welfare of the households. Finally, formulators assume the willingness of the individual garbage collectors to join the project, though as the data shows the incentives might not outweigh the greater potential for income. Whether this assumption was merely a misjudgment or was deliberate is more difficult to discern.

\textsuperscript{7} The PGDSM project in Bénin provides insight as to how the prices to households for the service will be determined. In Cotonou, the targeted neighbourhoods are divided up into zones, in each of which responsibility for the garbage collection service belongs to a different local NGO. Though all NGOs are regulated under the PGDSM project, each NGO has the prerogative to set the price within their respective zones depending on negotiations between households and garbage collectors, and data provided by the PGDSM management team (PGDSM Bénin staff member, personal communication, March 11th, 2009). Therefore, though all the zones are inter-competitive, once the price is set within a zone, all garbage collectors working there would earn the same wage rate. The lingering question is whether the set wage rate is more than the garbage collector could have earned as a private individual collector (as demonstrated by the data in Niamey) or less.

\textsuperscript{6} Experience from Bénin shows that the implementation of the project monopolizes the garbage collection service sector in the city and therefore squeezes out any non-involved party from the market. In the end individual garbage collectors might not have a choice but to join the project to keep their livelihoods.
Access

The category of access as a component of socio-economic welfare, can be understood through three issues: the availability and awareness of the service provided, the dependability of service provided and the sustainability of the service provided. The project formulators seem to have assumed that upon implementation, access to the garbage collection service should generally increase and consequently sanitary and environmental conditions in the urban population should improve. But on closer inspection of realities at the community level and the perceptions of the stakeholders involved access to the service may not improve as expected.

First, the mandate of the PGDSM-N is to increase the availability of garbage collection service to urban households. This is clearly stated in several project documents as a short-term projected outcome. As it stands, the project is geographically confined and is only implemented within the ‘urban zone’ of the capital city, as defined by the PGDSM-M. By doing so, formulators have excluded neighbourhoods and communities which are quite large and densely populated but lie outside the delineated zone. For example, there are settler communities in the ‘Ceinture Verte’ or the Green Belt within the city of Niamey which is supposed to be environmentally protected. The waste disposal of these squatting communities is inadequate, creates extensive pollution and endangers the only green space in a city experiencing desertification. It is unclear why these communities were excluded, but the assumption that implementing the project only in the ‘urban zone’ would improve access has

---

9 The city of Niamey suffers from urban sprawl and is growing rapidly outwards, which contributes to lower population densities. In response to this context, the PGDSM-N has delineated a border within the city and enclosed it as the ‘urban zone’.

10 From what I inferred on the ground, it is not successfully being protected and this is mostly due to the lack of enforcement and regulation of the area. Since it is neither fenced off nor supervised, squatters have found it easy to create settlements in the area.
actually limited availability of the service and therefore the project cannot achieve its goal to improve environmental and sanitary conditions in Niamey.

Access to a garbage collection service is not necessarily guaranteed by spreading more service outlets and increasing availability. Access also depends on the awareness of the project’s service across the communities. When designing the awareness and communication component of the project, formulators are not specific on the types of communication methods they intend to use. While evaluating the pilot project it became clear to me that the project team posted signs, implemented the project and simply assumed beneficiaries would respond. Data collected from household surveys demonstrate that though the pilot project had been implemented for the past two years it was not widely recognized by the households as a form of service provision. When asked questions that reflected the levels of awareness, 70% of the respondents said that they did not recognize, nor could they differentiate between garbage collectors who were a part of the project and those who were not. Furthermore, 82% of the respondents claimed that they did not know when the project began in their community.

During the implementation of the pilot project, awareness materials and publicity on the project was done mostly through written media and all of it in French, as opposed to oral and broadcasting media in the local languages, though only about 30% of the households have anywhere from four to six individuals who can read and write in French. This communication barrier is further exacerbated by the fact that the majority of individuals who can read and/or write in French are school children and not the decision-making head of the households. This is an impediment in a traditional Muslim society like that in Niger, where children are spoken to and not heard. In fact, only 20% of the households had a head of household who had an education level higher than ‘Collège’, which is equivalent to somewhere between high school and undergraduate university studies in a North American education system. Moreover, 25% of the households within the sample population had a head of household who had no
education at all and therefore could be assumed as illiterate in the French language. Access was therefore limited because of improper awareness tactics. All project documents are elusive on specific details and there is no conclusive evidence whether the PGDSM-N intends to take the same approach. But because experience on the ground and personal observation shows that the OQ project formulation team did not explicitly and wholly consider the lessons learnt from the pilot project, repetition of these mistakes is very likely.

The second issue is the dependability of service. Founded on the notion of self-sufficiency, the project requires continuous and high rates of subscription to ensure a constant inflow of funding to keep the service running. The assumption is that once the project is implemented, continuous and high rates of subscription will naturally transpire\(^\text{11}\). In reality, there are several direct and latent factors which influence the number of people who subscribe to a waste management service. Results from the surveys suggest a positive correlation (Pearson’s correlation is .142 with a .051 Significance (2-tailed)) between education and subscription to the waste disposal service. From this it can be inferred that an indirect factor contributing to the decision to subscribe is level of education.

Another factor determining rates of subscription is location. From the sample population, 12.5% of respondents did not pay anyone, whether a service or private collectors to collect their garbage. Trends show that a majority of these respondents were all from the neighbourhood of Zongo, which is located a couple of hundred meters away from one of the point de regroupement for the pilot project in Commune Niamey II. The data show that of those who responded that they do not pay for their garbage to be collected, 48% stated that they disposed of their garbage themselves. As in the case of Zongo, if households are in

\(^\text{11}\) As previously mentioned legislation to force subscription is intended. Yet, casual conversation with the representative from the Commune Niamey II government office indicated that in reality, though legal enforcement is in place households do not necessarily comply. For example, the waste removal tax levied by the municipal government is generally not paid by the majority of the households.
walking-distance of a point de regroupement, evidence shows that they prefer to dispose of their garbage themselves rather than subscribe and pay for a service. According to the project proposal, the PGDSM-N plans on constructing 38 points de regroupement within the delineated urban zone of the project (Oxfam-Québec, 2009). Therefore it can only be expected that as more sites will become available over a larger area, a greater number of people will prefer not to subscribe to the service and self-dispose, a possible alternative to the project’s current method. The project formulators seemed to have failed to consider these underlying factors because as it stands the project design in no way addresses these issues.

Lastly, the degree of access can be affected by the sustainability of the service provided. This issue is not directly addressed in the project activities or design, and seems to be an overarching expected outcome, which most development projects wish to achieve. It is not unreasonable for the project formulators to assume that the PGDSM-N inherently carried long-term sustainability, as it replicated the PGDSM in Bénin which has been active for over 12 years and is reasonably self-sustaining (Director of PGDSM Bénin, personal communication, September 4, 2008). Nevertheless, sustainability depends on various factors such as high population density a case where Cotonou supersedes Niamey, but also cohesion between the project stakeholders. It seems that the project formulators assumed a natural cohesion between parties, as no mechanisms are in place to ensure that an esemplastic environment persists. My dual role as an internal and external participant permitted me to observe the perceptions of various stakeholders within the project on the undertaking of roles and the division of responsibilities. Both informal conversation and statistics from the household surveys demonstrate a discrepancy between these perceptions, which could eventually affect long-term sustainability. Statements in project documents and discussion with the project partners led me to conclude that the success and sustainability of the project relies heavily on the district level of government to participate in the implementation process. It is specified that
each respective Commune Niamey I, II, III, IV and V is expected to be at the forefront when managing the project within its town-district, under the stewardship of the municipal government (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). Data from surveys suggest that the households’ perception of who should spearhead the project is incongruent to the project team’s. When asked, 57% of household respondents stated that they do not believe their district government (Commune Niamey II) could provide essential services to the community. Furthermore, when asked “Do you trust the Commune Niamey II?”, 47% responded with a “No”. Therefore one can easily deduce that unlike the project formulators, the households do not view the district governments as having authority nor as having their trust.

Beyond micro-level cohesion between the population and the NGO project such as stated above, cohesion must also be present between stakeholders at the macro-level between the NGO project and higher authorities. A key informant interview with the representative from the Ministère de l’Environnement et de la Lutte contre la Désertification, the ministry of environment and a focal point to the project, indicates a dissatisfaction with the approach taken by Oxfam-Québec. The interview demonstrated that OQ had deviated from the national strategy on waste management as specified by the Ministry, thus creating tension. Simple body language and demeanor indicated irritation with the unfolding of events and the oversight by the project formulators of the Ministry’s role in the process. This tension between parties would most likely cause a difficult future relationship and a threat to sustainability.

To summarize, this category addresses the three issues of availability and awareness, dependability and sustainability as components contributing to the overall access to service. The disjunctures between assumptions and reality occur at various points and could at times be deliberate and at times miscalculations. Having not learned lessons from the pilot project, the current project design fails to include specific adaptations that might be necessary to
properly raise awareness and increase availability of the service to the general population. Second, the project formulators seemed to have disregarded the underlying factors to the rate of subscription which in essence provides the funding to ensure dependability. Finally, the assumption by project formulators that there is natural cohesion between stakeholders is mistaken. Reality shows dissension between various parties could eventually corrode long-term sustainability.

Assets

The category of assets as the third component of socio-economic welfare can be divided into various sub-categories. Assets can be classified as natural, financial and social.

The nature of the project concerns natural assets specifically. The project document states that the final expected impact is to achieve the improvement of hygiene and sanitary conditions for the population of the city of Niamey (Oxfam-Québec, 2009). A report on the initial waste management conditions of Niamey, published by OQ justifies the implementation of the project on the grounds that it will reduce deforestation practices, discourage the use of uncontrolled and unauthorized open dumpsite and generally contribute to the maintenance of natural assets (Oxfam-Québec, 2008). Therefore, by proposing the PGDSM-N for implementation the project formulators necessarily assume that environmental and sanitary conditions are a top priority. Data from the household survey show from a list of six issues of concern that only 16% of the sample population ranked a sanitary environment as a first priority problem to address (See Appendix B). The population seemed to distinguish health and hygiene as an issue that bore on health care services and other issues pertaining to health, whereas sanitary environment was understood as a clean, unpolluted, hygienic space. Generally the survey indicated that the population considered health and hygiene an issue of
highest priority, the quality and access to education as the second most important problem to address, and a sanitary environment of third priority. A sanitary environment is low on the list of priorities, with almost 40% of the population ranking it in either 4th, 5th or 6th place.

Financial assets are also affected when we consider the appreciation of natural assets in monetary terms. Project documents clearly state that esthetic value is imperative and formulators define it as one of the goals for the project to achieve. One can reason that improving sanitary conditions and creating an esthetically pleasing environment could eventually increase property values. Though this might be a foreseen benefit resulting from the implementation of the project, the project formulators overlook the negative outcomes this goal could have on the least fortunate. Only approximately 30% of the population who actually own the land on which they live might experience the benefits of an appreciation. If in fact esthetic value improves and demand for housing increases, 70% of the population might have to incur an increase in rent-fee, a further detriment to the welfare of poor households.

Lastly, the effect on social assets of stakeholders is generally overlooked in a technical environmental project such as this one. Experience in the field with the formulation process led me to infer that improving gender relations is an issue of interest to the OQ team. The project was designed to incorporate a recycling sector into the waste management system, with the hope of giving women the role of recyclers. This is how the project works in Bénin. Project formulators replicated this component of the project and expected it to flourish, just as it did in Cotonou. But data from the household survey shows that 41% of respondents said they would not accept/allow women of the household to work as récupétrices or recyclers for the project. Subsequently, 11% of respondents said acceptance would depend on various factors such as the women’s choice, working environments, etc. With these statistics, it is unlikely that
the project can expect high levels of participation by women. The project would benefit from taking into account other underlying issues concerning gender relations, such as cultural and religious factors, rather than simply expecting participation. After all, maybe the reason this component was so successful in Bénin has something to do with the fact that the religious breakdown and culture is not predominantly Muslim. Another social concern is the social stigma present against garbage collectors. The project takes a positive stance on ‘professionalizing’ the sector to mitigate negative perceptions and stigma against the workers. The fact is that trends in the survey show that very few people view the occupation with disdain and discriminate against the workers. Therefore, there is no immediate need to increase society’s appreciation of the work being done. Though this is not a problem for the project, it is an example of a disjuncture between assumption and reality and how misconstrued perceptions lead to false justifications.
Why Do Disjunctures Occur: The Challenges

As previously mentioned, ineffective project formulation due to the poor execution of the first couple of phases of the project cycle can cause disjunctures. Logically, one might ask what are some possible reasons these why disjunctures occur and what are some barriers to more effective project design? This section considers some of the obstacles and challenges impeding the path towards effective and optimal project formulation. A simple taxonomy helps categorize these endemic challenges under three headings. First, there are obstacles at the macro level which may be defined as socio-political barriers and issues within the development business as whole. Second, there are obstacles at the meso level such as organizational deficiencies and overall functioning of NGOs. Lastly, there are problems which could arise at the micro community-level caused specifically by interactions between people and the working environment. The following overview of challenges and obstacles to optimal project formulation in international development is not meant as a comprehensive list of issues, but as a combination of insights from the literature and my personal experience in the field.

Socio-political barriers and the development business as a whole

The first concern which is usually dominant, is the possibility of politically driven motivations for the project. This can be a concern when the project primarily involves existing departments, ministries, political parties or government officials within the project country (Goodman & Love, 1979 p.4). An on-site example drawn from the PGDSM-N case study is the arbitrary foisting of the private organization HYSACAM (Hygiène et Salubrité du Cameroun) on the waste management project in Niamey. The federal government, under the direct auspices of the President of Niger, signed a long-term contract with this private garbage collection
organization from Cameroon to clean up the streets of Niamey. The burden fell on local district
government offices which had to put up approximately 50% of the fee. This private actor was
imposed onto the waste management collection system and therefore the PGDSM-N team
was forced to include them into their design. Rumour had it that this organization was hired
directly by the President whose daughter was engaged to a Cameroonian. Despite the
reasons, the more realistic approach of involving local NGOs in the garbage collection service
had been overruled by a political agenda.

Though it is more likely for political involvement to become an issue when political
actors are directly involved in the project, one must not overlook the overall politically charged
atmosphere of development assistance as a whole. From this perspective, regardless of
whether the project is directly linked to a political source or not, all development assistance
and particularly development projects are inherently value-laden and not without vested
interest (Bartlett, 1988; Zetter & Hamza, 1997). The simple fact of picking one important
development issue to address over another reflects the tendency towards one value versus
another. Furthermore, the various discrepant interests of multiple stakeholders and inadequate
dialogue between them may lead to internal conflicts and dilemmas. Those with the strongest
voice are more likely to be considered over those with the most accurate information (Olander
& Landin, 2005). For example, observation on the ground led me to generally conclude that
communication between the actors in Niger, specifically within the PGDSM-N is limited by low
levels of linkage and bridging. In cases such as this, project assumptions begin to revolve
around vested interests and the strongest lobbier rather than actual realities on the ground.

The process of project formulation begins with the identification of needs, preparation
and design phases, and formulators generally look at the country’s strategic plan and
development objectives to identify development priorities. In the case that the strategic plans
do not accurately reflect the population’s needs, a problem arises for effective development.
The national policies reflected in these documents could be politically driven for the sake of attracting international aid or achieving other political goals, and would not legitimately represent the most pressing developmental issues (Goodman & Love, 1979 p.4). Moreover the instability of political economy in some countries may lead to clientelistic behaviour, with promises being made in turn for political support.

Lastly, a less direct but still noteworthy issue is the geo-political arena. It is common for geo-political attitudes and shifting agendas in international relations to have drastic and lasting effects on the developing world (Zetter & Hamza, 1997). Simple budgetary cuts in developed countries could have deep-seated effects on the type and duration of development projects, usually resulting in formulators trying to sell their project to donors at the cost of forsaking accuracy. In the case of the PGDSM-N, it seemed that project components which were successful with donors in Bénin, were forced into the Niamey project whether or not it suited the local context. A case in point is the establishment of a female-based recycling sector which at the surface promotes gender equity, but seems unrealistic in the Nigerien context.

Organizational and NGO functioning

At the meso level in the field of development, organizational culture and overall functioning of the NGO may be a possible barrier to effective project formulation when specifically considering NGO projects. A common problem is the lack of trained manpower and local-level administrative capability to design and manage projects (Goodman & Love, 1979 p.11; Dietz & Pfund, 1988 p.139; Honadle, 1979 p. 12). It is observed that there should be quality managers on the field who have the ability to understand the potential intertwined relationships between facts and events in relation to the local environment and the people. Both in the literature and on the ground there is strong emphasis on the need for technical
expertise. Observation from the field and discussions with administrative staff for the Niamey project showed that there was no expert on the ground with technical experience pertaining to the project's subject matter, whereas in Bénin the founder and director of the project was an environmental economist. Moreover, there was no sign of a formal needs assessment ever having been done in the sector of the project. Sifting through Oxfam-Québec documents gives strong reason to believe that the identification and selection of the project were based on the NGO's country mandate (established the Montréal office) instead of a credible assessment of the population's needs. Furthermore, the design of the project was primarily based on the internal experience of the NGO and its success with the PGDSM in Bénin instead of ground realities in Niger. The fact that the PGDSM-N imitates its counterpart in Bénin and that the PGDSM has become a defining signature of OQ, projects the organization's priority to brand their work rather than customize it. Though copying can be a positive learning experience, the problem is the lack of sufficiently tailoring the project so that it can optimally perform in Niamey.

Another issue with low-capacity local administration is that as the project cycle progresses, short-term problems bombard the managers and formulation team and force them to divide their attention among numerous situations. This in turn makes it extremely difficult for small, local-level NGO administrations to engage in sustained planning of future activities since most of the resources are dedicated to current issues (Honadle, 1979 p.12). Whether the assumptions made will hold or not in the long-term is not at the forefront in project design. Conventional wisdom and personal observation on the field also suggest that, most likely due to the limited resources and minimal expertise, there is a general lack of learning lessons from past experiences. For example, learning lessons from a pilot project which is deemed as a useful way to test, refine and improve project design is a rare occurrence (Finsterbusch & Van Wickin III, 1988). Generally local administrators of NGOs who have head offices in developed countries, are overruled or technically dominated by the
overseas administration which can lead to poor identification of the needs of the primary beneficiaries on the ground and tension between trans-national offices. I had this experience in my time on the field observing the bureaucracy and inner-workings of Oxfam-Québec, as the Montréal head office always had last word whether their decisions were the most favorable to the beneficiaries or not.

Lastly, NGOs and internationally based ones in particular often assume the role of interpreting the needs of the project communities and perhaps even projecting their own interests onto communities (Zetter & Hamza, 1997). This causes one to question the validity and credibility of the information as it might not truly come from local sources, but might simply be external interpretations of a geographically distant situation. The fact that the PGDSM-N project was introduced in the first place is an example of how an international NGO projected the needs of the locals, when in reality it was not a priority.

Community level: interactions between individuals and the working environment

Lastly, at the micro or community level of the development realm barriers to effective project formulation can arise. They tend to manifest themselves in the interactions between individuals and the working environment. Academics and researchers acknowledge the importance of research tools recognizing and adapting to a diversity of settings (Dietz & Pfund, 1988). The research tools, methods of data collection and the group of researchers themselves should be flexible enough to be useful across cultural, political and natural environments. They should acknowledge the multidimensionality of the settings and the project’s implications on them, and should understand that assumptions made do not hold in all cases. My personal experience on the ground collecting raw data in Niamey confirms the findings in the literature which state that there is a general skepticism of the reliability and
validity of traditional data collection methods such as surveys (Dietz & Pfund, 1988). This is because they are used among people who could be unfamiliar with these methods and may mistrust the surveyor. Contrarily, experience on the ground also showed that those in a position of authority such as government officials, perceived the general public with distrust. In an interview with a representative from the Commune Niamey II (district government body, and partner for the Oxfam-Québec pilot project in 2007-2008), this government official stated that, “when questioning households about the government, you will never get the truth” (Representative of Commune Niamey II, personal communication, April 22nd, 2009). The perception of state-society relations was the same on both ends, as the public mistrusted the government officials and vice-versa. Furthermore, respondents may also have a tendency to embellish the truth, again due to mistrust or to fulfill certain cultural and social obligations or norms. Ground experience also revealed other sources of error in the data such as: problems with translation into the local language, misinterpretation of the question or incorrect wording when asking the question, pressure from the surveyors to answer a certain way, trigger words which provoke a conformed response rather than true perceptions, and concepts or terms which mean different things to the local people. For example, in the last case, evidence strongly suggests that the households took the word ‘participation’ to mean only the fulfillment of cultural injunctions of attending birth or death ceremonies in the community, and it did not extend to other forms of participation. Overall, though these issues may skew certain information they are still pertinent and viable sources of gathering data for the decision-making process.

Literature and personal experience suggest that participation oriented management or forms of community-based management do not guarantee the willingness of local community members to participate in designing the project (Zanetell & Knuth, 2004). Within the literature, research shows that willingness to participate may be influenced in the short-term by factors
such as perception of the state of the problem and future concern about the problem. More significant factors which affect community participation include things such as sense of community or political agendas, which could all influence the assumptions made (Zanetell & Knuth, 2004 p. 803; Zetter & Hamza, 1997). Furthermore, observation on the ground of the working environment at Oxfam-Québec demonstrated that the interactions between actors might have been participatory in name but were hierarchical by nature. Though the NGO claimed to be working in a participatory manner, the partnership dynamic observed between local actors and Oxfam-Québec staff reflected a subordinate relationship between parties rather than a collaborative one, most likely due to race and economic standing. This power dynamic resulted in a low sense of ownership on the part of the local actors and misguided assumptions on the part of Oxfam workers. It was as if we had approached them with a design in mind rather than with a blank slate, open to their creation. Therefore, even under participatory approaches, project assumptions can be made which do not entirely reflect the realities on the ground.

This overview of obstacles and challenges at various levels in the field of development provides a synopsis of the reasons why project formulation can go awry. Most importantly, these challenges are endemic and project managers and formulators have been dealing with them or some form of them since the inception of international development project formulation. The most obvious reason seems that development practitioners and academics alike have failed to learn from past experiences, to emulate previous works, and evolve when necessary. The adaptive learning process within the field of development is stunted, too often the managers and formulators continue to try to re-invent the wheel (Staudt, 1991).
What Can Be Done: A Recommendation

This section examines the potential of evaluative tools to optimize project implementation, minimize the disjunctures and maximize overall benefits of development initiatives. The incorporation of evaluative tools at the most advantageous point in time could achieve a broader goal of increasing the effectiveness of development practice and the efficiency of development initiatives.

Evaluation is a term generally employed in the field of development when referring to the notion of systematically and objectively assessing and determining the worth, significance and condition of a particular project, program or policy by careful appraisal and study. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) compiled a glossary of key terms used in evaluation and results based management, which states that the aim of evaluation is to “determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development...effectiveness, impact and sustainability” (OECD, 2002). It should provide relevant and useful information to enable the “incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors” (OECD, 2002). It is a heuristic process that promotes the assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, ongoing or completed development intervention. In broader terms, evaluation as a process must be useful, credible, transparent and free from bias to successfully affect decision-making through lessons learned (World Bank, 2010b). It plays a dual role in assessing the performance of development initiatives to provide shared accountability for the achievement of their initial objectives and in improving these initiatives by disseminating the lessons learned from the evaluation findings (World Bank, 2010b).

Evaluation can be applied through various tools and approaches. Of interest specifically is the branch of evaluation which determines the impact of a development initiative. A socio-
economic impact analysis\textsuperscript{12}, a form of impact evaluation, can be used as a tool to achieve the broader desired outcomes of conducting an evaluation. In general, impact analysis is a means of analyzing, monitoring and managing the social and socio-economic consequences of development (IAIA, 2003). It can best be understood as a framework for the evaluation of the social and economic impacts on humans and on the ways in which communities and various stakeholders interact with their socio-economic surroundings (IAIA, 2003). Impact analysis is a way to assess changes in the well-being of individuals, households, communities, firms, government bodies, institutions and other stakeholders, that can be attributed to a particular project, program or policy. The central question determining the utility of an impact analysis is: what difference would it have made to those affected by the intervention if it had not taken place? The most direct route to answering this question is to identify a control group and develop a counterfactual, as similar as possible to the baseline of the original recipient group. Though in practice it may be difficult to apply it painstakingly, this enables a comparison between the two groups and allows for the establishment of ‘definitive causality’, or a probable causal chain, attributing the observed changes to the project, program or policy reform (World Bank, 2010c). Impact analysis is unique in its heuristic nature. Its utility as a learning tool builds on the aggregate bank of local and international knowledge through participatory processes to analyse the concerns of interested and affected parties by involving stakeholders (IAIA, 2003). Furthermore, the analytical process helps develop an understanding of iterative change and chain reactions, as one begins to consider the consequences of second or higher order impacts, cumulative impacts, and most importantly the notion of causality. It is therefore a useful tool in promoting a more adaptive approach to project formulation and is beneficial in mitigating disjunctures between project assumptions and reality.

\textsuperscript{12} As opposed to environmental, economic/financial, technological, and other types of impact analysis used in other disciplines and sectors. From this point onwards, impact analysis will always refer to the socio-economic type, which is the analysis of impacts of the social and economic nature and their affect on the overall welfare of populations.
The nature of an impact analysis can differ from one level of state to the next which may inhibit putting it in practice. It differs between macro, meso and micro levels. The most obvious reason for these discrepancies is that at each level, especially in an underdeveloped country, there is a wide disparity in access to resources and capital which in turn affect the nature of the analysis. In development projects, which are manifestations of micro level development initiatives, resources for evaluation usually are very limited. On the other hand development programs (more characteristic of larger-scale, macro development) typically allocate a percentage of total funds to evaluation, though still very small in relative and often absolute terms (Dietz & Pfund, 1988). Nevertheless, the utility of the tool across levels does not differ as on might expect. Impact analysis is a useful tool at both macro or micro levels of state. It would differ in its methods and techniques from one level to the other, but the usefulness of its results would be equally beneficial.

The composition of the analysis changes across time as well. An impact analysis can happen prior to (ex-ante), during (mid-term), or after (ex-post) the implementation of the development initiative. Its characteristics change, like they do across space, but most importantly from one point in time to the next the degree of utility also changes. A socio-economic impact analysis as an ex-ante tool can guide the design of the development initiative to increase effectiveness and make it better fit its social, economic and political environment. In addition, its utility as a predictive tool can lead to measures of mitigation that minimize negative or undesired impacts (Finsterbusch & Van Wickin III, 1988). It is useful to its current development initiative as well as providing lessons learned for future interventions. On the other hand, a mid-term analysis and especially an ex-post impact analysis, can only be used to provide guidance for future projects as it is usually one of the last activities prior to closing the project. It occurs at a point when its retrodictive nature does not fully exploit its capacity as a
tool for current and future improvement. It therefore has less overall utility than its ex-ante counterpart.

In line with recommending a new learning approach in development, an ex-ante socio-economic impact analysis has the potential as a tool to improve poor project formulation and therefore the outcomes of development initiatives. It takes a proactive stance to the development process to improve development outcomes and optimize effectiveness, instead of simply identifying or improving negative outcomes. It can contribute to the process of adaptive management and implementation of development initiatives and gives the opportunity to inform the design and operation of the planned intervention (IAIA, 2003). The substantial significance of impact analysis has been widely recognized in various fields and disciplines (Bartlett, 1988). Analysing a project before it is launched can be useful in reducing redundancies, inefficiencies, disjunctures between project assumptions and realities and the likelihood of making grave mistakes.

Research suggests that the results derived from conducting an impact analysis are not trivial. The difference in the effectiveness of a project that has been subject to analysis compared to a project that has not been examined, is in fact quite substantial as the case of Niamey demonstrated. The results of a brief analysis demonstrate a discrepancy between the reality and the counterfactual and suggest the utility of an impact analysis as a tool to correct the project while still in the stages of design to optimize effectiveness.

Mitigating disjunctures also depends on the understanding of how far the effects of a project can spread. On the ground there is a general misconception about the reach of micro-level initiatives. The trickle-down effect is a common notion in the field of development identifying the percolating effects of top-down decisions to lower strata of state and society. A contrasting argument is the idea that decisions and actions taken at the micro levels of state and society could potentially bubble up in a scaling-up-like effect. Unexpected actors or
institutions could be influenced or get involved. This perspective is one that usually gets overlooked, further emphasizing the significance of conducting a well-designed impact analysis on a micro-level project. Not only may effects multiply vertically to the top, but they may multiply horizontally beyond the scope of the project, creating spill-over effects into other areas of society. The effects produced will not necessarily all have a negative value, but will be unanticipated and therefore whether they be positive or negative, the resulting implications will disrupt external non-involved parties or systems. An impact analysis could gauge spill-over effects of the project not only to forewarn non-involved parties, but to mitigate negative repercussions. With an impact analysis at an ex-ante stage for micro-level initiatives, inefficiencies could be avoided and resources could be properly allocated. Thus, the overall utility of impact analysis as a tool does not vary from macro to micro, but unfortunately in reality the comparative frequency of its usage does.

Evaluation techniques in general and impact analysis in particular are rare across the field of development. Most attention is usually focused on more famous variants such as, technology analysis/assessment, cost-benefit analysis, and environmental impact analysis (Bartlett, 1988). Social issues are rarely given adequate emphasis in international agreements and declarations, and therefore it is unusual to see analyses directed at them (IAIA, 2003).

The previous section explores some reasons why the problem of poor project formulation persists and the same principles among others could apply to explaining the general failure to use this analytical tool. Impact analysis is generally considered unfeasible and therefore is negatively perceived by development practitioners. Field experience showed that some constraints include resource limitations and cultural barriers. Impact analysis and other types of evaluation most commonly require a relatively large amount of financial and human resources due to the requirement for technical expertise. There can also be social barriers between those assigned to collect data to be analysed and the recipients of the development
initiative in question (Dietz & Pfund, 1988). There are many logistical reasons for resistance to an impact analysis that may be surmountable, but it is the larger socio-political barriers in a development context and general vested interests in a development initiative that are cause for more astute reflection. It is not excessively political, but impact analysis is not a neutral, value-free mechanism and usually draws in at least some unpleasant politics (Bartlett, 1988). Furthermore, the question of feasibility is a common barrier to micro-level analysis as most people are inclined to surmise that the cost outweighs the possible micro-level benefits. Though it is possible that impacts could bubble up, the constraints inhibiting the widespread and common use of impact analysis are exacerbated at the micro-levels of society, as there are relatively less resources and possibly more actors with each lesser degrees of power.

Though the general disuse of the tool across the field of development is uncommon, it holds an overall potential to reduce problematic project formulation. In applying this tool at the beginning stages of the project cycle, disjunctures between project assumptions and realities on the ground can be minimized. Nevertheless, more research is needed to find way to confront constraints and overcome barriers hampering its widespread use.
Conclusion

My overall experience in Niamey, with this micro-level NGO project validated my initial suspicions of the ineffectiveness of development initiatives in practice. The poor formulation of an initiative inevitably leads to various issues which limit the optimal desired outcomes. My up-close experience permitted me to engage in the formulation process and observe the mechanisms at play. The role I occupied as both formulator and evaluator allowed me to differentiate between the level of our contribution we make in reality as development practitioners and the potential to do better. In the end, I draw three things from my experiences. First, in the field of international development, which is the quintessential pursuit for the betterment of quality of life of those less fortunate and predominantly concerns the lives of human beings, there are too many mistakes made. Second, in the quest to do better and minimize these mistakes there are many obstacles along the way, some of which are surmountable and others which are more difficult to overcome yet unfortunately more important to our success. Third, the key to this endeavour is learning. From the simple self-critique and reflection on ones actions to the multimillion dollar studies and evaluation methodologies, learning in all its forms should be prevalent in the practice of development. Even in the case where it may not seem feasible, learning adaptation can still be applied in its most basic form. The case of the PGDSM-N is illustrative of how devoid development practice is of learning techniques but is also a demonstration of the possibilities to apply basic learning strategies in attempts to minimize mistakes and optimize results.
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Appendix A
Point de regroupement for the Commune Niamey II pilot project. This area was constructed to serve as a dumping site for the garbage collectors to empty their carts and dispose of the household waste they collected. The metal bins then get transported by large trucks to the landfill site, where they are emptied and returned. These dumping sites are a vital component of the PGDSM-N integrated waste management system.
Appendix B
1. Combien de gens habitent dans votre concession ?
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26 et plus

2. Quel est le niveau d'étude de la personne la plus scolarisée (fait à l'école) dans votre concession ?
   - Aucune
   - Alphabétisation
   - Primaire
   - Certificat
   - Collège
   - Plus

3. Quel est le niveau d'étude du chef de ménage ?
   - Aucune
   - Alphabétisation
   - Primaire
   - Certificat
   - Collège
   - Plus

4. Quel est le problème le plus important pour vous ? (1 = le plus, 6 = le moins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environnement sain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité/accès à l'éducation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiène et santé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité des voiries (état des routes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droits civiques et égalité entre les hommes et les femmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accès à l'eau potable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Est-ce que vous êtes abonné à un service de collecte de déchets ?
   - Oui
   - Non

   a. Si oui, ça fait combien de temps ?
      - Moins de 6 mois
      - 6 mois - 1 an
      - 1 an - 1 an 1/2
      - 1 an 1/2 - 2 ans
      - Plus de 2 ans

   b. Si non, pourquoi ?
      - Trop cher
      - Pas au courant des services offerts
      - Je me débarrasse de mes déchets moi-même
      - Autre: ____________

6. Combien payez-vous pour la collecte des déchets ?
   - 1-500 F CFA par mois
   - 501-1000 F CFA par mois
   - 1001-1500 F CFA par mois
   - 1501-2000 F CFA par mois
   - Plus de 2001 F CFA par mois

7. Depuis combien de temps le projet de collecte des déchets d'Oxfam-Québec a démarré ?
   - 6 mois
   - 9 mois
   - 1 an
   - 2 ans
   - 3 ans et plus
   - Je ne sais pas

8. Pouvez-vous reconnaître les gens qui collectent les déchets faisant partie du projet ?
   - Oui
   - Non

9. Est-ce que le prix de la collecte des déchets a changé depuis le démarrage du projet ?
   - Augmenté
   - Diminué
   - Non, c'est le même prix

10. Combien de fois par semaine vient-on ramassé les déchets dans votre concession ?
    - 1 fois
    - 2 fois
    - 3 fois et plus
11. Est-ce que le ramassage des ordures est plus fréquent ou moins fréquent qu'avant le démarrage du projet ?

☐ Plus fréquents  ☐ Moins fréquents

12. Est-ce qu'il y a moins de dépotoirs sauvages (pas aux endroits aménagés) dans votre quartier qu'il y a six mois ?

☐ Oui  ☐ Non

13. Est-ce que votre quartier est plus propre qu'il y a six mois ?

☐ Plus propre  ☐ Moins propre  ☐ Pareil

14. Pensez-vous que la ville de Niamey est sale et a besoin d'être nettoyée ?

☐ Oui  ☐ Non

15. Quelles sont vos principales dépenses (1 = le plus coûteux 7 = le moins coûteux)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le plus coûteux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le moins coûteux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logement
Nourriture
Vêtements
Déchets ménagers
Éducation
Santé
Divertissement/loisirs

16. Combien de membres de la concession peuvent lire et écrire en français ?

☐ Aucun  ☐ 1-3  ☐ 4-6  ☐ 7-9  ☐ 10 et plus

17. Est-ce que les collecteurs du projet sont plus, moins ou aussi polis que les autres collecteurs ?

☐ Plus polis  ☐ Moins polis  ☐ Aussi polis

18. Combien gagnez-vous par mois ?

☐ 0-20 000 F CFA  ☐ 21 000-40 000 F CFA  ☐ 41 000-60 000 F CFA  ☐ 61 000-80 000 F CFA  ☐ 81 000-100 000 F CFA  ☐ 101 000 F CFA et plus

19. Que pensez-vous des collecteurs de déchets ? (Encerclez toutes les réponses qui correspondent à votre opinion)

a. Ils sont sales  d. Ils sont une classe démunie  g. Ils sont dangereux
b. Ils font du bon travail  e. Ils sont respectables  h. Ils sont comme n'importe quel autre employé
c. Ils sont serviables  f. Ils sont bien payés  i. Neutre, je n'ai pas d'opinion

j. Autre : ____________________________

20. Qu'est ce que vous pensez du métier de collecteur de déchets ?

☐ Moi, ou quelqu'un dans ma famille pourrait le faire  ☐ Ni moi ou quelqu'un d'autre de ma famille ne ferait ce métier

21. Etes-vous fier du projet de collecte de déchets ?

☐ Oui  ☐ Non  ☐ Indifférent
22. S'il y a lieu, est-ce que vous paieriez la taxe sanitaire ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

23. Si l'abonnement était obligatoire, vous abonneriez-vous ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

24. Qui doit s'occuper du problème des déchets ?

☐ La Commune ☐ Les ménages ☐ La ville ☐ Les ministères ☐ Le Président ☐ La société civile

25. Accepteriez-vous qu'une femme de votre cour travaille comme récupératrice ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non ☐ Ça dépend : __________________________________________

26. Croyez-vous que la Commune II puisse vous fournir les services essentiels ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

27. La Commune II est-elle disponible pour vous aider à résoudre des problèmes à votre quartier ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

28. Croyez-vous que votre quartier est mieux, pire ou pareil que (les 3 autres quartiers) ?

☐ Mieux ☐ Pire ☐ Pareil

29. Faites-vous confiance aux gens qui ne sont pas de votre quartier/communauté ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

30. Pensez-vous que les quartiers et la Commune peuvent travailler ensemble de manière harmonieuse ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

31. Vous habitez ce quartier depuis combien de temps ?

☐ 1-3 ans ☐ 4-6 ans ☐ 7-9 ans ☐ 10 ans et plus ☐ Ma famille habite ici depuis des générations

32. Aimez-vous vivre dans ce quartier ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

33. Avez-vous confiance en la Commune II ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

34. Connaissez-vous le Comité de salubrité de votre quartier ?

☐ Oui ☐ Non
35. Si vous avez un problème avec le collecteur de déchets (par exemple : il n’est pas venu chez vous depuis 3 semaines) à qui vous plaignez-vous ? (Encerclez toutes les réponses qui correspondent à votre opinion)
   a. A personne  
   b. A vos amis  
   c. A votre famille  
   d. A la Commune II  
   e. Au CSQ  
   f. Aux autres communes  
   g. A la ville (CUN)  
   h. A la police  
   i. Au collecteur lui-même

36. Seriez-vous d’accord à ce que le projet de déchets d’Oxfam-Québec s’étende à d’autres quartiers, même si cela implique le partage des coûts et des bénéfices (exemple : risque de réduction des services) ?
   ☐ Oui  ☐ Non  ☐ Ça dépend :

37. Durant l’année, vous êtes-vous réunis avec les autres du quartier pour résoudre un problème commun ?
   ☐ Jamais  ☐ Une fois  ☐ Plusieurs fois  ☐ Fréquemment

38. Comment classeriez-vous la solidarité dans ce quartier ?
   ☐ Très faible  ☐ Faible  ☐ Moyenne  ☐ Forte  ☐ Très forte

39. Supposse qu’un de vos amis dans ce quartier a le choix entre les deux options ci-dessous, lequel va-t-il choisir ?
   ☐ Une cours de 10 m2 pour lui seul  ☐ Une cours de 25 m2 partagée avec une autre famille

40. Si votre voisin ne profite pas d’un projet, sachant que les autres en profitent, est-ce qu’il donnera quand même de son temps pour la bonne marche du projet ?
   ☐ Oui  ☐ Non

41. Si votre voisin ne profite pas d’un projet, sachant que les autres en profitent, est-ce qu’il contribuera quand même financièrement au projet ?
   ☐ Oui  ☐ Non

42. êtes-vous d’accord ou en désaccord avec les phrases suivantes :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D’accord</th>
<th>Désaccord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La plupart des gens dans le quartier sont généralement honnêtes et on peut leur faire confiance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je me sens accepté comme un membre du quartier ou de la communauté</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les gens sont plutôt préoccupés avec le bien être de leur famille et ne sont pas concernés du bien être de leur quartier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La plupart des collecteurs de déchets sont généralement honnête et on peut leur faire confiance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merci!
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### LISTE DES ACRONYMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyme</th>
<th>Signification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACDI</td>
<td>Agence canadienne de développement international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUN</td>
<td>Communauté urbaine de Niamey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIEPA</td>
<td>Décennie internationale de l’Eau potable et de l’Assainissement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Déchets solides ménagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDSM</td>
<td>Gestion des déchets solides ménagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LES</td>
<td>Lieu d’enfouissement sanitaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG</td>
<td>Organisation non gouvernementale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDSM</td>
<td>Projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SOMMAIRE DU PROJET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titre du projet</th>
<th>Projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers dans la ville de Niamey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zones d’intervention</td>
<td>dans la Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (5 communes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durée du projet</td>
<td>5 ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principaux partenaires identifiés</td>
<td>Communauté urbaine de Niamey (voir annexe 1 : Convention cadre de partenariat signée en mai 2008) et les cinq (5) communes de Niamey identifiées.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalité</td>
<td>Contribuer à l’amélioration des conditions d’assainissement et d’hygiène de la population de la Communauté urbaine de Niamey (CUN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>Appuyer la mise en œuvre de la gestion partagée des déchets solides ménagers au sein de cinq (5) communes ciblées de la CUN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effets (résultats à la fin du projet – moyen terme)**

1. Le système de pré-collecte des déchets solides ménagers (DSM) et de dépôt dans des sites intermédiaires servant de point de regroupement des déchets est opérationnel, efficace et pérenne au sein de la communauté urbaine de Niamey.
2. Les filières de valorisation (récupération, réutilisation, recyclage) des matières organiques et non organiques sont opérationnelles, efficaces et financièrement viables.
3. La ville de Niamey assume techniquement et financièrement son rôle et ses responsabilités en matière de collecte, d’acheminement et d’enfouissement des déchets solides.

**Extrants (résultats à court terme)**

1.1. Les structures de pré-collecte sont organisées et sont renforcées dans leurs capacités de concertation, de gestion et d’intervention dans leurs zones respectives.
1.2. La population est sensibilisée sur la démarche de GDSM, sur l’importance de s’abonner à la pré-collecte et sur ses avantages.
1.3. Un cadre de concertation entre les différents acteurs est mis en place.
2.1. Les récupérateurs sont sensibilisés à la valorisation des matières non organiques et organiques.
2.2. Les récupérateurs sont appuyés dans l’aménagement de kiosques de stockage et de vente des matières récupérées ainsi que dans la production et distribution de compost.
3.1. Un lieu d’enfouissement sanitaire (LES) est mis en place et un mode de fonctionnement entre les transporteurs et gestionnaires de LES est élaboré.
3.2. La CUN et les communes ciblées sont renforcées dans leurs capacités techniques et de gestion en matière de collecte et d’enfouissement des DSM.

**Groupes cibles (bénéficiaires directs et indirects)**

**Directs** : La Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN), les divers acteurs de la GDSM (les pré-collecteurs/trices, les récupérateurs/trices, les ONG de collecte, les autorités locales).

**Indirects** : La population (les ménages) des cinq communes de Niamey ciblées par ce projet, qui verront leurs conditions d’hygiène améliorées.

**Budget sommaire estimatif du projet** : 26 millions $CAN (à valider selon les interventions retenues).
2. DESIGNATION DU CONSULTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Au siège social</th>
<th>Au Niger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M. Jacques Langlois  
Directeur, développement de projets internationaux  
Email : langloisj@oxfam.qc.ca  
Tél : (514) 937-1614  
2330, rue Notre-Dame Ouest, bureau 200  
Montréal, (Québec), CANADA, H3J 2Y2 | Mme IBRAHIMA Fatima  
Représentante au Niger  
Email : ibrahimaf@oxfam.qc.ca  
Tél : (227) 20.75.47.05  
BP 10 383  
Niamey, (NIGER) |

Début des activités de l’organisation : 1973, 100% propriété canadienne

Taille :  
a) 144 employés, contractuels (excluant les nationaux) et volontaires, dont une centaine sur le terrain ;  
b) plus de 150 employés nationaux annuellement dans l’ensemble des pays d’intervention.

A. NATURE DES ACTIVITES PRINCIPALES, DOMAINES DE SPECIALISATION

Oxfam-Québec est une organisation canadienne non gouvernementale, sans but lucratif, non confessionnelle et non partisane, vouée à la coopération et à la solidarité internationale. L’organisation s’emploie à renforcer ses partenaires et alliés des pays en développement dans la conception et la mise en œuvre de solutions durables à la pauvreté et à l’injustice. Elle mobilise la population du Québec afin de permettre l’expression de sa solidarité.

Pays africains d’intervention d’Oxfam-Québec : Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Maroc, Niger, République démocratique du Congo (RDC), Rwanda, Sénégal, Soudan, Togo.

Priorités :
- Obtention de solutions durables à des besoins fondamentaux des populations des pays en développement.
- Renforcement organisationnel/institutionnel des organisations partenaires et société civile.
- Développement des capacités des populations touchées par les projets.

Secteurs d’intervention et d’expertise :
- environnement;  
- renforcement institutionnel et organisationnel;  
- santé;  
- droits humains fondamentaux;  
- développement économique (et AGR);  
- édification de la paix;  
- protection des enfants et des jeunes;  
- éducation/alphabétisation;  
- sécurité alimentaire et secours d’urgence;  
- reconstruction / réhabilitation.

Groupes cibles : les femmes, les jeunes et les personnes réfugiées
Partenaires privilégiés d’Oxfam-Québec :

- structures de l’État (Ministères, directions régionales, autorités locales, organisations parapubliques, agences gouvernementales);
- organisations non-gouvernementales (ONG), opérateurs terrains;
- associations de type intermédiaire (à rayonnement régional, national ou transnational), réseaux et collectifs d’ONG.

Sources de financement :

En plus des résultats de ses propres campagnes de levée de fonds, Oxfam-Québec dispose de financements provenant des bailleurs de fonds suivants :

- ACDI : Agence canadienne de développement international
- HCR : Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les Réfugiés
- Union européenne / ECHO
- Membres d’OXFAM International
- Nations unies (PNUD, UNICEF, FNUAP)
- BM : Banque Mondiale
- MRIQ : Ministère des Relations Internationales du Québec
- FTQ & CSQ : Fédération des Travailleurs du Québec et Centrale des Syndicats du Québec
- Cirque du Soleil : Fondation One drop
- FED : Fonds européen de développement

Membres d’OXFAM :

Oxfam-Québec est un membre fondateur d’OXFAM International, un réseau qui regroupe treize organisations OXFAM dans le monde et qui travaille dans plus de 120 pays.

B. EXPERIENCE D’OXFAM-QUEBEC EN GESTION DES DECHETS SOLIDES MENAGERS

Depuis 2001, Oxfam-Québec intervient au Bénin, en appui à la mise en œuvre, de façon participative, à la gestion partagée des déchets solides ménagers. Ce projet, qui se poursuit encore en 2008, a permis de contribuer à l’amélioration des conditions d’assainissement et de santé de la population des villes de Cotonou et de Ouidah, par une amélioration de l’efficacité et de la durabilité du système de pré-collecte et de valorisation des déchets solides ménagers au sein de ces villes. Grâce à la sensibilisation, à la mobilisation et à la volonté des divers acteurs impliqués (État, autorités locales, ONG de pré-collecte, pré collecteurs, maraîchers, population des ménages, etc.), la GDSM est devenue la responsabilité de tous et a ainsi permis le retour de la salubrité au sein des villes de Cotonou et de Ouidah et à l’amélioration des conditions de vie des populations touchées.
C. EXPERIENCE EN GESTION DE PROJETS ET GESTION ADMINISTRATIVE

Oxfam-Québec, dont le chiffre d'affaire annuel était de 29,5 millions $Can (18,9M euros) en 2006-2007, dispose d’une expertise démontrée de 35 ans en gestion administrative et de projets. Uniquement au cours des dernières années, Oxfam-Québec a géré plus de 120 projets de développement durable, de réhabilitation, de reconstruction et d’aide humanitaire dans 18 pays. Ces projets, dont les budgets varient entre 5 000 $ et 9 millions $Can, impliquent la mise en place de mécanismes et d'outils de gestion rigoureux et à la fois accessibles aux partenaires sur le terrain. Oxfam-Québec applique l'approche de la gestion axée sur les résultats (GAR) dans la gestion de tous ses projets sur le terrain. Parmi les projets d'envergure que l'organisation gère actuellement, notons le Programme d'envoi de volontaires financé par l'ACDI au montant de 25 millions $US sur 5 ans (2004 à 2009).
3. MISE EN CONTEXTE

Le Niger est un pays enclavé de 1 267 000 Km² dont la frontière la plus méridionale est à plus de 600 Km de la mer (golfe de Guinée). L’environnement naturel austère est marqué par un régime climatique caractérisé par une pluviométrie faible, variable dans l’espace et dans le temps et des températures élevées qui ont tendance à accentuer son aridité.

Le développement socio-économique du Niger en général et celui des 265 communes en particulier est largement tributaire des questions environnementales tant en milieu rural (gestion des ressources naturelles, problèmes climatiques), qu’en milieu urbain (pollutions, nuisance, gestion des déchets).

L’assainissement

L’assainissement en général et la gestion des déchets solides ménagers en particulier dans les villes des pays en développement devient de plus en plus difficile à maîtriser face à l’accroissement rapide de la population. En effet, les infrastructures urbaines ne suivent pas le rythme de croissance de la population et par le fait même, le rythme de consommation. La nécessité de remédier à cette situation s’est traduite depuis 1980 au niveau international par la proclamation de la Décennie Internationale de l’Eau Potable et de l’Assainissement (DIEPA) avec comme objectifs d’atteindre des taux cibles de couverture en assainissement de 82%.

Accroissement de la population et pratiques néfastes

La Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN), à l’instar de toutes les autres capitales des pays en développement, connaît une croissance galopante. D’une population estimée à 33 800 habitants en 1960, année de l’indépendance du Niger, elle est passée à 652 401 habitants en l’an 2000 pour atteindre 924 056 habitants en 2007, soit un taux de croissance moyen annuel de 7,3%.

Cette croissance démographique accélérée découle entre autres de l’exode rural et des aléas naturels notamment les sécheresses et les famines cycliques. Cet accroissement se traduira par une forte industrialisation, une forte demande en alimentation et conséquemment par d’énormes productions de déchets (solides et liquides) dont la gestion, déjà particulièrement difficile aujourd’hui, constituera une source importante de pollution du cours d’eau qui traverse la ville. Cette situation aura des conséquences sur la santé de la population riveraine du fleuve qui vit au dépend de ce cours d’eau.

Il a été constaté également une autre pratique très néfaste pour l’environnement et de plus en plus répandue, qui consiste en la vente dans la ville (1 500 à 2 000 F CFA le chargement) des déchets, qui sont utilisés comme matériaux de remblais par les particuliers. Ces derniers s’en servent surtout pour colmater de manière grossière les zones érodées par les dernières pluies (particulièrement sur les corniches). Ces déchets se retrouvant systématiquement dans le fleuve à la suite de fortes pluies. Si l’on ajoute à cela que les plus gros dépotoirs se trouvent également en bordure des vallées fluviales, le fleuve Niger constitue, dans la situation actuelle, la plus grande décharge de Niamey.

Constat pour la gestion des déchets solides ménagers - GDSM

Fournir des services d’assainissement à cette population est un grand défi pour tous les intervenants des services techniques de la CUN, des autres Communes de l’Etat, des ONG et des Associations. Les actions
de ces divers intervenants se complètent donc pour l’atteinte des objectifs d’assainissement de la ville de Niamey.

A l’instar de nombreuses villes ouest africaines, Niamey est confrontée au problème de la gestion rationnelle et durable des déchets solides ménagers avec pour conséquences la prolifération des dépotoirs sauvages, faute de décharges contrôlées, d’un cadre permanent de concertation et de concentration des efforts entre les acteurs de la filière.

Notamment dû à des actions non concertées et mal organisées de la part des divers intervenants, l’environnement urbain de la ville de Niamey continue de se dégrader. Cette situation résulte entre autres du manque de moyens et d’autonomie financière mais aussi du fait que ces actions ne sont pas toujours conçues sur la base d’une connaissance réelle de la situation sur le terrain. Du coté de la population, le constat est que les ménages contribuent actuellement pour leur part, en dépensant des sommes relativement importantes pour l’assainissement, sans pour autant bénéficier d’un environnement confortable. Pour être efficaces, les démarches des intervenants en matière d’assainissement, doivent être basées sur les demandes effectives de la population et des capacités des autorités locales, ce qui nécessite une description de la situation actuelle de l’assainissement dans la ville de Niamey en termes d’inventaire des technologies utilisées ainsi que des comportements des ménages.

**État des lieux des lois, cadre, projet**

Dans le but d’une meilleure gestion de notre environnement et pour faire face à cette situation préoccupante qui interpelle tous les citoyens, les autorités nigériennes ont fait de la protection de l’environnement un droit mais aussi un devoir pour tous. À cet effet, la constitution mentionne que : « Tout citoyen a droit à un environnement sain [...] ».

Face à cette situation, le Gouvernement du Niger a élaboré plusieurs textes sectoriels en matière de gestion des déchets et s’est doté d’un cadre global de référence susceptible d’intégrer tous les efforts pertinents en cours et à venir dans le domaine de l’environnement et du développement durable, de manière à faciliter leur harmonisation, leur mise en œuvre et leur suivi, et d’éviter ainsi les duplications.

Les différents plans nationaux élaborés au cours de cette décennie ont mis la protection de l’environnement au centre du développement. La création d’un ministère chargé spécialement de l’Environnement et de la Lutte contre la Désertification en est le témoignage éloquent.

Après la mise en œuvre effective de la décentralisation, il s’est avéré nécessaire de donner aux gestionnaires locaux de l’environnement un outil de référence adapté au nouveau contexte. Cependant, on ne dispose d’aucun mécanisme fiable qui prend en compte les problèmes environnementaux dans la planification des communes. Cela est dû, non seulement à la jeunesse des communes, mais également au manque d’outils de gestion et d’évaluation appropriés. Les autorités communales en général et les communautés doivent disposer d’outils et être formés pour la gestion de leurs propres ressources naturelles en vue de l’amélioration de leur cadre de vie, d’où la nécessité de concevoir des outils novateurs.

Cependant malgré tout l’intérêt ainsi marqué, les résultats escomptés sont loin d’être atteints. Beaucoup reste à faire. Les différents acteurs, actifs ou potentiels, agissent de façon peu concertée et coordonnée. Dans ce contexte, leurs actions, bien que pertinentes, restent peu visibles et moins efficaces. Il s’avère
nécessaire, voire indispensable, de mettre en place un cadre de concertation et d’harmonisation des stratégies d’interventions. Ce cadre permettra de mieux cibler les actions et de consolider les acquis en vue de proposer des outils appropriés à une gestion durable des déchets au Niger.

Le Ministre de l’Environnement et de la Lutte contre la Désertification ayant en charge la politique du gouvernement en matière de gestion des déchets, entend coordonner les stratégies, afin de tirer les leçons qui permettront de mieux asseoir les bases d’une politique nationale de gestion des déchets.

**Justification**

La Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN), les cinq (5) communes de Niamey et l’ONG canadienne Oxfam Québec ont décidé de conjuguer leurs efforts par la signature d’une Convention Cadre de Partenariat en mai 2008.

Une étude prospective en vue de l’implantation d’un projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers à Niamey a été réalisée en 2008 et a permis, notamment les quelques constats suivants :

- le taux actuel d’abonnement au service de pré-collecte est d’un peu plus de 40%, mais les ménages se disent majoritairement prêts à s’abonner si les services de pré-collecte proposés rencontrent certaines normes d’efficacité ;
- les structures travaillent principalement dans les quartiers considérés comme les plus rentables, laissant ainsi de grandes sections de la ville sans couverture sanitaire ;
- Il existe 42 points de regroupement potentiellement aménageables, répartis dans les cinq (5) communes de Niamey et les conditions environnementales sont favorables à leur aménagement ;
- Les filières de valorisation des déchets organiques et non-organiques existent, mais sont peu ou pas structurées et pourraient profiter efficacement d’un appui organisationnel.

Le présent projet s’inscrit dans le cadre de la stratégie nationale de lutte contre la pauvreté (par la création d’emplois direct et indirects) tout en ayant l’ambition d’améliorer le cadre de vie des populations grâce à l’expérience avérée d’Oxfam Québec dans des secteurs tels que la lutte contre le VIH/Sida, l’entrepreneuriat des jeunes, les microprojets.
### A. DESCRIPTION DU PROJET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titre du projet:</th>
<th>Gestion des déchets solides ménagers dans la ville de Niamey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Région/Pays:</td>
<td>Niger, Communauté Urbaine de Niamey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secteur:</td>
<td>Santé, gestion des déchets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durée du projet :</td>
<td>5 ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget proposé :</td>
<td>26 millions $CAN (à valider selon les interventions retenues).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le projet proposé vise la mise en place d’une filière organisée de gestion des déchets solides ménagers à Niamey. Ce projet s’inscrit dans une gestion partagée de l’ensemble de la filière et une mise en place d’un système durable et viable pour améliorer les conditions de vie des populations.

**Bénéficiaires directs:** La Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN), les divers acteurs de la GDSM (les pré-collecteurs/trices, les récupérateurs/trices, les ONG de collecte, les autorités locales).

**Bénéficiaires indirects:** La population (les ménages) des cinq (5) communes de Niamey ciblées par ce projet, qui verront leurs conditions d’hygiène améliorées.
## B. CADRE LOGIQUE DU PROJET

| Pays/Région : | Niger, ville de Niamey (5 communes) | Durée du projet : | 5 ans |
| Agence d’exécution : | Oxfam-Québec | Budget estimatif du projet : | 26 millions 500 000 $ CAN 16 millions 300 000 € |

### Finalité
Contribuer à l’amélioration des conditions d’assainissement et d’hygiène de la population de la Communauté Urbaine de Niamey.

### Buts
1. Le système de pré-collecte des DSM et de dépôt dans des sites intermédiaires servant de point de regroupement des déchets est opérationnel, efficace et pérenne au sein de la communauté urbaine de Niamey.
2. Les filières de valorisation (récupération, réutilisation, recyclage) des matières organiques et non organiques sont opérationnelles, efficaces et financièrement viables.
3. La ville de Niamey assume techniquement et financièrement son rôle et ses responsabilités en matière de collecte, d’acheminement et d’enfouissement des déchets solides.

### Résultats attendus (Effets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Dans les zones ciblées :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Les conditions générales d’hygiène et de salubrité de la population de la Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN) sont améliorées par la mise en place d’un système de GDSM, techniquement et financièrement durable.</td>
<td>• Amélioration des conditions de salubrité (hygiène publique, propreté) • Aspect visuel des communes ciblées par le projet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicateurs de rendement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finalité</th>
<th>Hypothèses/risques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buts</td>
<td>Hypothèse : Le gouvernement maintient ses politiques et ses lois en matière d’assainissement urbain et de GDSM. Risque : changement de loi, repositionnement (réorientation) de l’État sur le sujet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Résultats attendus (extrants)</th>
<th>Indicateurs de rendement</th>
<th>Hypothèses/risques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pour l’extrait 1.1 | • Nb. de formations réalisées et nb. de participants (selon le sexe). | Hypothèses :  
• Les acteurs de la pré-collecte sont disposés à renforcer leurs capacités, à participer et à collaborer ensemble aux changements dans le processus de GDSM.  
• Les populations ciblées (ménages) sont disposées à participer au projet et aux campagnes de sensibilisation.  
• La CUN est disposée à renforcer ses capacités et à travailler en concertation avec les acteurs (intervenants) en vue de l’amélioration du processus de GDSM.  
• Les récupérateurs sont disposés à renforcer leurs capacités et à participer aux activités du projet.  
• La CUN s’engage à mettre en place un lieu d’enfouissement sanitaire (LES), suite aux recommandations d’une étude environnementale.  

Pour l’extrait 1.2 | • Nb. de campagnes de sensibilisation et de dépliants et autres distribués. | Risques : |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pour l’extrait 1.3</td>
<td>• Plans d’action existant et rencontres de planification entre les comités.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour l’extrait 2.1</td>
<td>• Nb. de formations réalisées et nb. de participants (selon le sexe).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Les structures de pré-collecte sont organisées et sont renforcées dans leurs capacités de concertation, de gestion et d’intervention dans leurs zones respectives.</td>
<td>• Fréquence des rencontres et procès verbaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 La population est sensibilisée sur la démarche de GDSM, sur l’importance de s’abonner à la pré-collecte et sur ses avantages.</td>
<td>• existence d’une structure regroupant les acteurs de la valorisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Les structures de pré-collecte sont organisées et sont renforcées dans leurs capacités de concertation, de gestion et d’intervention dans leurs zones respectives.</td>
<td>• Matériel de formation et assistance technique disponibles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 La population est sensibilisée sur la démarche de GDSM, sur l’importance de s’abonner à la pré-collecte et sur ses avantages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Un cadre de concertation (comités directeur, de suivi et opérationnel) entre les différents acteurs est mis en place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Les récupérateurs sont sensibilisés à la valorisation des matières non organiques et organiques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Les récupérateurs sont appuyés respectivement dans l’aménagement de kiosques de stockage et de vente des matières récupérées ainsi que dans la valorisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. CADRE LOGIQUE DU PROJET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>production et la distribution du compost.</th>
<th>Pour l’extrait 2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 | Un LES est mis en place et un mode de fonctionnement (mécanisme de gestion partagé) entre les transporteurs et les gestionnaires de lieux d’enfouissement sanitaire (LES) est élaboré. | • Nb. de kiosques de stockage et de vente.  
• Utilisation du compost par les maraîchers. |
| 3.2 | La CUN et les communes ciblées sont renforcées dans leurs capacités techniques et de gestion en matière de collecte et d’enfouissement des DSM. | Pour l’extrait 3.1 |
|   |                                         | • LES aménagé et organisé (équipement acheté, quantité de déchets déversés, normes sanitaires respectées).  
• Plan de gestion partagée et de suivi des DSM, élaboré adéquatement, de façon concertée.  
• Nb d’acteurs impliqués et mobilisés. |
|   |                                         | Pour l’extrait 3.2 |
|   |                                         | • Nb. de formations réalisées et nb. de participants (selon le sexe).  
• Matériel de formation et assistance technique disponibles. |
|   |                                         | • Résistance de la part des populations ciblées (ménages) à collaborer au projet et à accepter de participer aux diverses activités de sensibilisation.  
• Résistance des acteurs de la GDSM à travailler en concertation.  
• Manque d’intérêt des acteurs quant à l’amélioration de la gestion partagée des DSM. |
But :
Appuyer la mise en œuvre de la gestion partagée des déchets solides ménagers au sein des cinq (5) communes de la Communauté Urbaine de Niamey (CUN).

(100) Pré-collecte des déchets solides ménagers (DSM)
- Formaliser les ONG (donner autorisation d'exercice).
- Mise en place d'un zonage et diminution du nombre d'intervenants.
- Appuyer la concertation et la coordination des ONG de pré-collecte.
- Former les pré-collecteurs.
- Organiser des campagnes de promotion et de visites d'échange d'expérience en GSM.
- Réaliser une étude pour le choix des charrettes adaptées, de la poubelle et du tamis.
- Équiper les structures de pré-collecte en matériel et de protection.
- Éliminer les dépotoirs sauvages.
- Appui à la mise en place d'une procédure d'abonnement obligatoire par acte administratif.
- Appuyer le rôle de la Police environnementale.

(200) Collecte des déchets solides ménagers (DSM)
- Valider les 38 points de regroupement.
- Définir des critères acceptables de gestion et d'environnement et valider ces critères.
- Organiser la concertation et la consultation des riverains des points de regroupement retenus.
- Réaliser l'évaluation d'impact environnemental des points de regroupement à aménager.
- Planifier un plan de construction des points de regroupement.
- Aménager les points de regroupement.
- Recruter les collecteurs.
- Dotation en matériel et équipement.
- Réduire le sable dans les déchets.
- Appuyer les activités de valorisation de matière organique et non-organique.

(300) Enfouissement des déchets solides ménagers (DSM)
- Étude environnementale et choix du site.
- Faire l'acquisition du site.
- Système de gestion du lieu d'enfouissement sanitaire (LES).
- Aménagement du site.
- Aménagement des bureaux.
- Dotation en matériel et équipement.
- Formation du personnel.

(400) Sensibilisation des populations à la gestion des déchets solides ménagers (GDSM)
- Préciser le contenu des messages à être abordés durant les campagnes de sensibilisation.
- Rédiger les contenus des divers messages en fonction du média utilisé.
- Mettre en place une stratégie de communication.
- Réaliser les activités d'information, d'éducation et de communication (IEC).

(500) Gestion du projet
- Démarrage du projet (mobilisation des ressources, logistique, équipement).
- Rédiger le Plan de mise en œuvre et les plans de travail annuels.
- Veiller aux communications avec le partenaire, les acteurs de la GDSM et les bailleurs de fonds.
- Suivi/évaluation, communication et gestion du projet.
- Activités d'apprentissage (leçons apprises, etc.).
- Mise en place d'un cadre de concertation.
D. ESTIMATION ACTUELLE DES COÛTS *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composante 100 : PRE-COLLECTE</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 : Formation des structures de pré-collecte</td>
<td>2 000 000</td>
<td>800 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 : Organisation et formalisation des ONG de pré-collecte (zonage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 : Appuyer à la mise en place d’une coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 : Matériels et équipements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composante 200 : COLLECTE</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201 : Valider et construire les 38 points de regroupement proposés</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
<td>1 600 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 : Eliminer les dépotoirs sauvage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 : Réduire le sable dans les déchets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 : Valoriser la matière organique et non organique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composante 300 : ENFOISSEMENT</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 : Etude et choix du site durable</td>
<td>14 000 000</td>
<td>5 600 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 : Aménagement, installation et construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 : Matériels et équipements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 : Formation du personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composante 400 : SENSIBILISATION ET COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401 : Informer la population des actions du projet</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>400 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 : Eduquer les jeunes en milieu scolaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 : Communiquer des messages d’hygiène et salubrité</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404 : Veille environnementale et assainissement : une seule police de proximité</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composante 500 : GESTION DE PROJET</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501 : Mise en place du Cadre de concertation des acteurs</td>
<td>5 500 000</td>
<td>2 200 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 : Suivi évaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 : Activités d’apprentissage et de modélisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 : Logistique de projet (salaires, matériels ...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 : Elaboration du plan de gestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$ CAN</th>
<th>FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 500 000</td>
<td>10 600 000 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cette estimation pourra être sujette à modification avant d’être traduite dans un budget définitif qui tiendra compte des interventions retenues pour financement.*
Appendix D
UNDERGRADUATE ETHICS REVIEW PROTOCOL FORM
STUDENT-INITIATED PROJECT

DELEGATED ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE reviewing this project: ____________

FACULTY SUPERVISOR:
Name Professor Albert Berry and Professor Susan Gross Soloman Personnel Number Professor Berry: 68032 Professor Soloman: 828-939
Department Professor Soloman: Political Science, Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto Professor Berry: Economics, Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto
Mailing Address 1 Devonshire Place, Toronto, M5S3K7
Phone Professor Berry: 416-946-8932 Professor Soloman: 416-946-8965 Fax Professor Berry: 416-946-8915
Email Susan.solomon@utoronto.ca, berry2@chass.utoronto.ca

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT):
Name Machal Karim Student Number 994745870
Department Department of Social Sciences, International Development Studies Co-op
Mailing Address 8 Deer View Ridge, Guelph, Ontario, N1H 6H9
Phone 416-788-0801 or before May 16th 2009 227 94225806 Fax N/A Email m.karim@utoronto.ca

COURSE:
Course Title International Development Studies: Advanced Seminar
Project Title IDSD01 Research Project: Social Impact Analysis and Social Capital Development in Urban Solid Waste Management
Course Code IDSD01 Course Start Date Fall 2009
(The student’s project will be considered completed once the course is over. It is possible, however, to submit an annual renewal form if the project continues beyond the course.)

MINIMAL RISK AND EXPEDITED REVIEW:
Risk to participants should be proportionate to student experience and pedagogical goals, with appropriate levels of responsibility and supervision. Typically, undergraduate research should involve minimal risk, which means that the probability and magnitude of harm due to participation in the research is no greater than that encountered by participants in their everyday lives. Assessing risk may to some degree be affected by discipline-specific considerations—e.g., forensics, medicine, and nursing may involve work with participants in clinical settings, with attendant requirements for oversight and team qualifications. Departments will likely want to work with the Ethics Review Office (ERO) to decide how best to handle different levels of risk. Additional on-line resources may also be helpful, including:

- www.research.utoronto.ca/ethics
- www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/policystatement/policystatement.cfm
- www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/tutorial/

To evaluate risk for this protocol, consider:

- Group vulnerability—i.e., any pre-existing vulnerabilities associated with proposed participant groups, e.g., relating to pre-existing physiological or health conditions, cognitive or emotional factors, and socio-economic or legal status.
Research risk—i.e., the probability and magnitude of harms participants may experience as a result of the proposed methods to be used and types of data to be collected, e.g., relating to physiological or health issues such as clinical diagnoses or side effects, cognitive or emotional factors such as stress or anxiety during data collection, and socio-economic or legal ramifications such as stigma, loss of employment, deportation, or criminal investigation (e.g., in the event of duty to report intent to cause serious harm, subpoena, or breach of confidentiality).

Please provide over-all assessments of group vulnerability and research risk (i.e., low, medium, high) and locate the protocol in the matrix, below.

RISK MATRIX: Review Type by Group Vulnerability and Research Risk--circle one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group vulnerability</th>
<th>Research Risk</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefly explain (max. 100 words) the group vulnerability and research risk, and explain any exceptional circumstances (e.g., student experience) justifying greater than minimal risk:

The group vulnerability is of medium risk because of their socio-economic circumstances. Majority of the subjects will be of lower socio-economic status and of lower income. They will be few that are literate. Mostly with low-levels of education, few within the population sample will be able to speak French and therefore a translator will be needed. There is very low research risk involved because the intended methodology and data collection do not harm the subjects in anyway. The subjects will answer a set of questions on a voluntary basis. There is no obligation to participate.

CO-INVESTIGATORS:
Are co-investigators involved? Yes ☐ No ☒
If YES, provide the name(s) and contact information on a separate sheet.

HOST SITES:
Indicate the location(s) where the research will be conducted:
University of Toronto ☒
Affiliated teaching hospital ☐ _______________________________ (specify site(s))
Community within the GTA ☐ _______________________________ (specify site(s))
Other ☒ Oxfam-Québec, Niamey, Niger _________________________ (specify site(s))

N.B. If the research is to be conducted at a site requiring administrative approval/consent (e.g., in a school), please include all draft administrative consent letters. It is the responsibility of the researcher to determine what other means of approval are required, and to obtain approval prior to starting the project.

Other Research Ethics Board Approval:
(a) Does the research involve another institution or site? Yes ☒ No ☐
See Appendix A
(b) Has any other REB approved this project? Yes ☐ No ☒
(c) If YES, please provide a copy of the approval letter upon submission of this application.
(d) If NO, will any other REB be asked for approval? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, please specify which REB __________________________

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND OBJECTIVES:
Briefly describe the pedagogical goal and scholarly motivation for the project.

**Objective 1**: Conduct a socio-economic impact analysis on Oxfam-Québec’s *Projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers* (PGDSM), an urban solid waste management project.
Research questions:
- What are the specific direct social impacts of an urban waste management project on the targeted beneficiaries?
- What are the specific indirect social impacts of an urban waste management project on the targeted beneficiaries?
- Overall, does the project have a positive or a negative social impact?

**Objective 2**: Illustrate the opportunities within the PGDSM for social capital development or enhancement between and within the targeted population.
Research questions:
- How does or can the project impact the targeted population’s organizational patterns, interaction within social groups, linkage between social groups, etc.
- Through what aspects of the project do these take place?
- Overall, to what extent does the project have the potential to develop or enhance social capital within its targeted population?

METHODS AND DATA:
- If the research takes place in a controlled environment (e.g. clinic, laboratory, formal interview or tests), describe sequentially, and in detail, all procedures in which research participants will be involved.
- If the research involves naturalistic or participant observation, please describe the setting, the types of interactive and observational procedures to be used, and the kinds of information to be collected.
- If the research involves secondary analysis of previously collected data, describe the original source of the data and measures that have been taken to protect data subjects’ identities.
- If the project involves using specialized methods with participants, describe the student’s relevant past experience, or the nature of any supervision they may receive.

N.B. Attach a copy of all questionnaires, interview guides or other test instruments.

The research will primarily take place in Niamey, Niger. The research groups being studied will be purposive samples, selection based on social variables and available access. A first group of random-stratified sampling will be surveyed by means of a survey questionnaire. This group will consist of households that will be randomly chosen from four specific neighbourhoods that have been pre-selected. The reason for their pre-selection is that they are recent beneficiaries of a pilot urban solid waste management project that was completed in August 2008 and that was also implemented by Oxfam-Quebec. This group will provide an ex-post scenario and the opportunity to evaluate project impacts after project completion. Every house within this sampling frame will have an equal chance of being selected. It is
intended that an approximate couple of hundred households will be randomly sampled, each survey lasting between 10 and 20 minutes. The survey will consist of questions that generally concern individual perception of impacts on prices, access to the service (quality and availability), and social and human assets. They will also be questioned on their willingness towards the project, general perception of their environment and their opinion on the formalization of the specified labour market. The questions will resemble those in the provided sample interview guide.

A second group of key informants have been identified for open-ended interviews. These informants include a representative from each of the following echelons: project level, district level, municipal level and ministerial level. Each interview will take approximately 45 minutes to an hour. See Appendix B and C for general question categories and sample interview guide. In addition, the research involves participant observation of all the project stakeholders (including the households, key informants and any/all other project stakeholders) to note their roles and relationship with one another.

I will be administering the questionnaires to all the households, with a translator present if need be. I will be interviewing the key informants on a one-to-one basis.

The research will also take place in Toronto, Canada, at the University of Toronto. It will mostly involve secondary analysis of literature and other data sources, including media reports, sources from the World Bank, peer-reviewed journals, and if need be email correspondence with project contacts that have already been established.

PARTICIPANTS, INFORMANTS, OR DATA SUBJECTS:
Describe the individuals whose personal information is to be used as part of the assignment (i.e., in terms of inclusion and exclusion criteria, especially where active recruitment is involved). If the assignment involves working with a vulnerable population, describe the student’s relevant past experience, or the nature of any supervision they may receive.

The individuals being surveyed by questionnaire will be from randomly selected households from four neighbourhoods within the local population of Niamey. All individuals from these households have an equal chance in participating in the survey. Due to the socio-economic state of the majority of the population, there is increased likelihood that these individuals are of lower socio-economic status. Nevertheless, since the research project is analyzing the impact of an urban waste management, there is very little risk towards these individuals in participating in the research. Little to no personal information will be divulged. Furthermore, having been here for 7 months this student has had personal experience interacting with said socio-economic groups and will take all cultural and traditional requirements into consideration. Other individuals approached will include municipal and ministerial personnel.

RECRUITMENT:
Where there is formal recruitment, please describe how and from where the participants will be recruited. Where participant observation is to be used, please explain the form of insertion of the researcher into the research setting (e.g., living in a community, visiting on a bi-weekly basis, etc.) Where relevant, please explain any non-research relationship between the student and the research participants (e.g., teacher-student, manager-employee, nurse-patient).
**N.B. Attach a copy of any posters, advertisements, flyers, letters, or telephone scripts to be used for recruitment.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recruitment will be taking place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RISKS:**
Indicate if the participants might experience any of the following risks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Yes □</th>
<th>No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Physical (e.g., bodily contact, administration of any substance)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Psychological/emotional (e.g., feeling embarrassed, anxious, upset)?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Social (e.g., possible loss of status, privacy, reputation)?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is there any deception involved (see “Debriefing”, below)?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Are risks to participants greater than in their everyday life?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>No ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered **Yes** to any of the above, please explain the risks, and describe how they will be managed, and how they are proportionate to student experience and pedagogical goals.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENEFITS:**
Discuss any potential direct benefits to the participants from their involvement in the project. Comment on potential benefits to the student, the scholarly community, or society that would justify involvement of participants in this study. (See the note on courtesy copies of final reports in the “Debriefing” section, below)

Potential benefits may include an improved impact of the project if the study is taken into consideration by the implementing organization, Oxfam-Québec/Niger. The household participants are all the intended beneficiaries of the project. The government employees and personnel are also major stakeholders in the project. Therefore, if the results of the research are applied to or considered by the project, all participants will see the benefits upon the implementation of the project.

**COMPENSATION:**
Will participants receive compensation for participation?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation Type</th>
<th>Yes □</th>
<th>No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If **Yes**, please provide details.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Where there is a withdrawal clause in the research procedure, if participants choose to withdraw, how will you deal with compensation?

N/A

CONSENT PROCESS:
Describe the process that the student will use to obtain informed consent. Please note, it is the quality of the consent not the format that is important: if there will be no written consent form, please explain (e.g., if culturally inappropriate). If the research involves extraction or collection of personal information from a data subject, please describe how consent from the individuals or authorization from the custodian will be obtained. For information about the required elements in the information letter and consent form, please refer to: http://www.research.utoronto.ca/ethics/eh_u_inf.html

N.B. Where applicable, please attach a copy of the Information Letter/Consent Form, the content of any telephone script, letters of administrative consent or authorization and/or any other material which will be used in the informed consent process.

Those individuals that will be randomly surveyed from neighborhoods will be verbally informed of the research project and permission to use the information provided will be requested. It will be verbal consent due to the fact that many of them will be unable to read, understand and sign a consent form in French. These individuals will be kept anonymous throughout the research process as well as in the drafting of the final report. The individual questionnaires will only be identified by a code number that will represent the neighbourhood and the household number surveyed (ex: DZ_01). If there is a necessity to refer to a specific questionnaire, it will only be referred to as “household #X, of neighbourhood Y (ex: household 01 of Dezeibon)”. Once the questionnaire is completed, it will be impossible to link the responses to a specific household. Those individuals who will be informally interviewed will be verbally informed of the research project and its goals and will be requested to sign a permission slip acknowledging the use of their information for the purpose of the project. These individuals will only ever be referred to as “representative of Y (organization/institution)” See Appendix D.

If the participants are children, or are not competent to consent, describe the proposed alternate source of consent, including any permission/information letter to be provided to the person(s) providing the alternate consent as well as the assent process for participants.

N/A

Where applicable, please describe how the participants will be informed of their right to withdraw from the project. Outline the procedures which will be followed to allow them to exercise this right.

Some of the data will be anonymous and therefore withdrawal from the research once they have provided the information will not be possible. Key informants who give informal interviews will be informed of their option to withdraw at a later (maximum) date if they wish to
do so. Contact information will be provided where they will be able to reach this student, and request that their information not be incorporated into the research project.

Indicate what will be done with the participant’s data and any consequences which withdrawal may have on the participant.

Once a participant as clearly indicated their wish to be withdrawn from the research all data gathered from him/her will be deleted. Due to great distance between University of Toronto and the research site (Niamey, Niger), it will not be possible to return any of the data/information collected from that participant.

If the participants will not have the right to withdraw from the project at all, or beyond a certain point, please explain.

The participants, who are able to withdraw from the project after the information is provided, will have a time limit to make that request. This is due to the fact that beyond a certain point the data would have already been incorporated into the conclusion of the study and the final paper. It would be necessary for the participant to inform before this time so that this student can take necessary precautions if needed.

**PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY:**
Will the data be treated as confidential? Yes ☑ No ☐

If Yes, please describe the procedures to be used to protect confidentiality during the conduct of research and in preparation of the final report.

A large part of the data collected will be anonymous and as a result, confidential. Interviews and other information gathered from specific sources will be kept safely with this student. The permission forms to be signed by participants guarantee confidentiality and also state that the information collected will only be used for this particular research project and will not be disclosed to any other person or institution. No names will be used in the final report.

Explain how written records, video/audio tapes and questionnaires will be stored (e.g., password protected computer, double locked office and filing cabinet), and provide details of their final disposal or retention schedule.

All electronic data will be stored on this student’s personal computer which is password protected and firewall protected. While still on site, any hard copies of the information provided will be stored in the Oxfam-Québec double locked office. Upon returning to the University, all hard copies will be brought back and stored in safe keeping. After the final report, all hard copies will be disposed of and all the electronic data will be backed-up, password/firewall protected and stored.
If No—i.e., confidentiality is not appropriate in the context of this assignment—please explain (e.g., participants are key informants with established reputations in their field).

N/A

DEBRIEFING:
Explain what information (e.g., research summary) will be provided to the participants after participation in the project. If deception will be used in the research study, please explain what information will be provided to the participants after participation in the project—if applicable, attach a copy of the written debriefing form.

N.B. Please note that all copies of the students’ final reports—e.g., for circulation as courtesy copies, or future writing samples—must clearly indicate on the cover page the instructor, course number, and department or program at the University of Toronto that the report was prepared for.

An explanation of the research objectives and questions will be provided to the participants verbally before they provide any information. A research summary will only be given to those who request it after their participation in the project. The final report for the research project will be available and offered to the organization Oxfam-Québec/Niger as a courtesy copy.
SIGNATURES:

As the Principal Investigator on this project, my signature testifies that I will ensure that all procedures performed under the project will be conducted in accordance with all relevant University, provincial and national policies and regulations that govern research involving human participants. Any deviation from the project as originally approved will be submitted to the Research Ethics Board for approval prior to its implementation.

Signature of Principal Investigator: Machakaxim  Date: February 12th 2009 (Undergraduate Student)

As the Faculty Supervisor on this project, my signature testifies that I have reviewed and approve the scholarly merit of the research project and this ethics protocol submission. I will provide the necessary supervision to the student researcher throughout the project, to ensure that all procedures performed under the research project will be conducted in accordance with University, provincial and national policies and regulations that govern research involving human subjects. This includes ensuring that the level of risk inherent to the project is managed by the level of research experience that the student has, combined with the extent of oversight that will be provided by the Faculty Supervisor and/or On-site Supervisor.

Signature of Faculty Supervisor: ____________________________ Date: ____________

As the Undergraduate Coordinator, my signature testifies that I am aware of the proposed activity, and understand that the level of risk inherent to the project should be managed by the level of research experience that the student has, combined with the extent of oversight that will be provided by the Faculty Supervisor and/or On-site Supervisor.

Signature of Undergraduate Coordinator: ____________________________ Date: ____________

As the Departmental Chair/Dean, my signature testifies that I am aware of the proposed activity, will allocate space and other resources required, and will provide administrative support to the research activity. My department, faculty or division will oversee the conduct of research involving human subjects to ensure compliance with University, provincial and national policies and regulations. My signature also reflects the willingness of the department, faculty or division to administer the research funds, if there are any, in accordance with University, regulatory agency and sponsor agency policies.

Signature of Departmental Chair/Dean: ____________________________ Date: ____________
Je, soussignée Mme IBRAHIMA Fatima, Représentante d'Oxfam-Québec/Niger, autorise Machal Karim (n° d'étudiant 994745870), étudiante universitaire premier cycle à l'Université de Toronto Campus de Scarborough, classe IDSD01, à analyser les impacts sociaux du futur Projet de Gestion des Déchets Solides Ménagers (PGDSM) d'Oxfam-Québec, et à l'utiliser comme sujet d'étude pour son projet de recherche, dans le cadre du programme « International Development Studies, Co-op ».

I, undersigned Mrs IBRAHIMA Fatima, National Representative of Oxfam-Québec/Niger, hereby authorize, Machal Karim (Student# 994745870,) undergraduate student in the International Development Studies Co-op Program at University of Toronto Scarborough Campus, to use Oxfam-Québec's future Projet de Gestion des Déchets Solides Ménagers (PGDSM) as the unit of study for her IDSD01 research project in accordance to the aforementioned program of study.

Mme IBRAHIMA Fatima
Représentante Oxfam-Québec/Niger

Le 15 janvier 2009

Des actions concrètes pour un monde meilleur !
Sociétés affiliées : OCSD, CLUB 2/3
APPENDIX B

General Question Categories

Stakeholders and Other Actors

Institutional Analysis

Perception of Impacts

Perceived Risks and Mitigation

Social Capital and Civil Society
APPENDIX C

Interview Guide – Sample

Interviewer Name: Machal Karim
Interviewee Name:
Organization/Institution:
Date: ______________________________
Time: ______________________________
Location: ____________________________

Introduction: Je suis une étudiante universitaire de premier cycle dans le programme d’études de développement international à l’Université de Toronto. Dans le cadre de ce programme je réalise un projet de recherche analysant les impacts socio-économiques du Projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers (PGDSM), d’Oxfam-Québec/Niger. Votre participation dans ma recherche est complètement volontaire et vous pouvez interrompre l’entretien quand vous le désirez, sentez-vous libre de m’informer. Toutes les informations seront traitées de façon confidentielle et seront sauvegardées sur un ordinateur protégé avec un mot de passe. Vous ainsi que toutes les informations fournis ne seront mentionnées que seulement sous le nom de ‘représentant(e) de ________________’. N’hésitez pas à poser des questions n’importe quand durant le processus. Merci pour votre participation.

As a student in the International Development Studies, Co-op program at the University of Toronto, I will be conducting a research project analyzing the socio-economic impacts on Oxfam-Quebec/Niger’s Projet de gestion des déchets solides ménagers (PGDSM). Your participation is completely voluntary and if at any time during the interview you wish to terminate participation, please feel free to let me know. Your information will be kept confidential and safe on password protected computer. You and any information provided by you will only be referred to as ‘representative of ________________’. Please feel free to ask questions at any time during the process. Thank you for your participation.

Questions

Parties prenantes et autres intervenants

Stakeholders and Other Actors

1. Enumérer les parties prenantes et les intervenants du PGDSM.
   List the stakeholders in the PGDSM project.
   a. Quels est chacun de leurs buts ou intérêts particulier dans le projet?
      What is each of their aims or vested interest in the project?
   b. De tous ces acteurs, quel(s) groupe(s) peut(vent) se mobiliser sous un objectif commun
      (pour entreprendre une action collective)? Comment?
      Of these, which group(s) has/have the ability to mobilize behind a common purpose (for collective action)? How so?
   c. S’il y a lieu, quelle est l’implication des intervenants locaux dans la conception du projet?
      What input did the local parties have in the designing of the project, if any?

2. Qui sont les bénéficiaires primaires du projet?
   Who are the primary beneficiaries of the project?

3. Qui peut devenir une source d’appui au projet?
   Who may become a source of support to the project?

4. Qui peut devenir une source d’opposition au projet?
   Who may become a source of opposition to the project?

5. Quel intervenant sera le plus touché par le projet?
   Who will be impacted by the project the most?
   a. Selon votre opinion, est-ce que ce sera un impact négatif, un impact positif, ou un mélange des deux?
      In your opinion, will this be a negative impact, a positive impact, or a mix of both?
   b. Expliquer.
      Explain.

6. Selon vous, quel est le rôle et l’influence d’organisation dans le PGDSM?
   According to you, what is organization’s role and influence in PGDSM?
7. Selon vous, quel est l’importance et l’intérêt d’organisation dans le PGDSM?
   According to you, what is organization’s importance and interest in PGDSM?
   a. Quel sera l’impact du projet sur organisation?
      How will organization be impacted by the PGDSM?

Analyse institutionnelle
Institutional Analysis
8. Qui sont les principaux décideurs dans le PGDSM?
   Who are the primary decision-makers in the PGDSM?
   a. Quel est leur accès à l’information?
      What kind of access to information do they have?
   b. Quelles sont leurs ressources ou leurs capacités financières?
      What are their resources or financial clout?

9. Quelles sont vos expériences et celles d’organisation avec le PGDSM et les systèmes de gestion des déchets solides ménagers? (problèmes, améliorations, approches différentes, étapes inutiles…)
   What are your and organization’s experiences with PGDSM and SWM systems? (problems, improvements, things done differently by others, unnecessary steps, etc)

10. Décrivez la relation entre organisation et les autres intervenants? (de collaboration, hiérarchique, assistance technique, donateur financier, relation patron-client …)
    Describe organization’s relationship with the other stakeholders? (collaborative, hierarchical, technical assistance, financial donor, patron-client relationship, etc)

Perception des impacts
Perception of Impacts
11. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur le marché du travail/emploi (structure du marché, demande/offre de main d’œuvre, employabilité du pauvre)?
    How will PGDSM impact the labour market (i.e. structure of labour market, demand/supply for labour, employability of the poor)?

12. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur les prix (revenus, prix des marchandises et services, changements de salaires)?
    How will PGDSM impact prices (i.e. income, prices in markets for goods and services, wage changes)?

13. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur l’accès aux services (accès aux marchés et points de services, améliorations ou détérioration dans la qualité et réceptivité des prestataires de services)?
    How will PGDSM impact access to services (i.e. access to markets and service outlets, improvements or deteriorations in quality and responsiveness of service providers)?

14. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur les contextes/acquis [matériels (ex. logement) naturels (ex. terre, eau) humains (ex. santé, compétences) financiers (ex. économiques) et sociales (ex. genre, stigmate, autorité)]?
    How will PGDSM impact assets (i.e. physical (housing, etc), natural (land, water, etc), human (health, skills, etc), financial (savings account, etc) and social (gender relations, stigma, authority))? 

Risques perçus et leur atténuation
Perceived Risks and Mitigation
15. Quels sont les risques qui peuvent atténuer/empêcher les impacts prévus?
    What are the risks that may affect presumed/intended impacts?

16. Quels sont les risques qui peuvent affecter le succès du projet?
    What risks are presented to the success of the project?

17. Une atténuation des risques est-elle planifiée? Si oui, expliquer.
    Is there any risk mitigation planned? If yes, please explain.

Capital social et société civile
Social Capital and Civil Society
18. Y-a-t-il des organisations ou associations dans le contexte PGDSM qui partagent leurs ressources?
Are there organizations or associations (institutions) that share resources?

19. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur la société civile?
   How does the PGDSM impact civil society?

20. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur les liens intra-communautaire ou le tissu social communautaire?
   How does the PGDSM impact intra-community ties (embeddedness micro level)?

21. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur les relations entre l’état et la société ou le tissu social national?
   How does the PGDSM impact state-society relations (embeddedness macro level)?

22. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur les liens extra-communautaire?
   How does the PGDSM impact extra-community ties (autonomy micro level)?

23. Quel sera l’impact du PGDSM sur la capacité et la crédibilité institutionnelle?
   How does the PGDSM impact institutional capacity and credibility (autonomy macro level)?

Conclusion: J’aimerai vous remercier de nouveau pour votre participation. Toutes les informations recueillies seront traitées de façon confidentielle et seront sauvegardées sur un ordinateur protégé avec un mot de passe. Si vous voulez vous retirer de mon projet dans le futur, n’hésitez pas à me contacter avant Septembre 2009 par courriel à m.karim@utoronto.ca. Si vous avez des questions ou commentaires, je peux vous mettre en contact avec mon superviseur d’études, Professor Micheal Bunce.

Once again, I would like to thank you for your participation. All the information you provided will be kept confidential and safe on my password protected computer. If any time later on you wish to withdraw from my research project, please feel free to contact me before September 2009 via email at m.karim@utoronto.ca. If you have any questions or comments, upon request I would be happy to put you in contact with the Supervisor of Studies, Professor Micheal Bunce.
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