



Module 4

Group exercise No.1: Learning from the implementation of PIM in selected countries

Purpose

The objective of this exercise is to learn from the critical analysis of the PIM experience in two countries of the region. In principle, the two selected countries are Egypt and Turkey. However should any participant be willing to present the case of his/her country, arrangements could be made to accommodate this possibility. For this analysis the participants are expected to use the guidance of the Modules 1, 2 and 3 presented earlier during the course.

This should be an important learning experience since the two countries selected have completely different approaches to PIM and there is much to be learned from each one.

Methodology

The participants will be divided in four groups. Groups 1 and 2 will analyze the country case of Egypt. Groups 3 and 4 will deal with Turkey.

Every group will select a “rapporteur” to present the results of the analysis of the group

For each country a background paper has been selected from some of the existing references and provided as reference to the participants. Participants may want to consult Internet to obtain more information about the PIM Programme in any of the two countries but bear in mind that time is limited.

Time allocated

The time allocated for the analysis/reading of the country case study is ½ hour and for the preparation of the “Lessons learnt” is also ½ hour.

After this is completed, each “rapporteur” will have 10 minutes to present the analysis of the group and 5 minutes for questions and comments.

Reminder questions for the “Lesson learnt” of the country case studies

Participants of the course will find below some of the questions that may be helpful to undertake the requested analysis. However, the rapporteurs may want to include other questions or issues that are not included but are relevant for the specific country in consideration.

I. Phase 1. Preparatory

1. Was there a real need for PIM or was the programme induced by foreign donors and agencies?
2. Was the PIM programme supported at the political level? Is PIM a priority of the Government?
3. Was the need for PIM assessed or was the programme initiated without an evaluation of the existing difficulties of managing irrigation systems?
4. In your view, which were the main motivations to undertake the programme?
5. Was the PIM programme allocated the necessary financial and human resources?



II. Phase 2. Strategic planning

1. Did the PIM programme involve the most important stakeholders?
2. Was there any conflict among the stakeholders?
3. Was there a specific information programme to inform the stakeholders about the PIM programme?
4. Was there a Special Commission or similar institutional arrangement to supervise the programme?
5. Was the programme properly planned with specific targets to be reached?
6. Did government agencies reduce their staff because of the PIM programme?
7. Have the responsibilities of the Government agencies changed after PIM or continued to be the same essentially?
8. Was training provided to the staff of the government agency responsible for the Implementation of PIM?

III. Phase 3. Preparing for the implementation. Resolution of key issues

1. How will O&M maintenance be financed? Will it be sustainable?
2. How will rehabilitation works be financed? Will it be sustainable?
3. What services will be transferred?
4. If not all traditional services (operation, maintenance and administration) are transferred will the WUAs will be sustainable?
5. What types of farmers organizations were selected for transfer. Were they sustainable?
6. Are the different types of WUAs supported by proper legislation?
7. Do WUAs use technical staff for the technical activities?