



# Mid-term Evaluation of the Partnership between the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and UNEP





# United Nations Environment Programme

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة · 联合国环境规划署

PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT · PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE

ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

## Management Response to the Mid-term Evaluation Report

The report provides significant insights for advancing the partnership in UNEP. It highlights a number of challenges to programme implementation but, I am pleased to note, that the evaluation confirms that most activities have now been firmly anchored into national planning processes and the basic conditions exist for the successful accomplishment of the objectives of the programme. It also offers a number of recommendations to improve programme implementation. The report further recommends that lessons learned from the implementation of the activities in this programme be carefully documented and utilized in the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan.

We have studied the report carefully and prepared implementation plans for all the recommendations made by the evaluation. The following response addresses the recommendations to Senior Management and represents our proposal on how to move forward in enhancing the quality of the Partnership.

The evaluation highlights the need for engaging with UNDP to review and shape the way in which the UNEP-UNDP MoU can be better implemented-with particular attention to the future of the UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) collaboration. We agree with this recommendation and are consulting with UNDP at the sub-programme level. For example, the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination has had discussions with UNDP GEF Coordination on collaboration between the two agencies within the context of the UNEP-UNDP MoU. These discussions have involved national capacity building activities such as collaboration on “National Capacity Self Assessments” and the partnership with the GEF Small Grants Programme. Likewise, the Division for Policy Implementation has been in regular contact with UNDP at the country level and with the UNDP focal point in Nairobi to facilitate a more effective implementation of joint projects.

While these consultations are useful, we recognize the need to formalize the UNEP-UNDP relationship by ensuring that the remaining implementation modalities laid out in the MoU are, indeed, in place by latest end of year 2006. This will include preparing a joint biennial action plan to be reviewed by the Executive Heads biennially. This plan will serve as the basis for collaboration. Further, UNEP will identify focal points, at headquarters and at the regional level, to coordinate cooperation in each area identified for collaboration. Finally UNEP will identify an overall focal point to be responsible for the oversight of implementation of the MoU.

We welcome the recommendation to ensure that the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan takes account of the lessons learnt from operational country level capacity building programme implementation. In this regard, the Division for Policy Development and Law will compile the lessons from the three sub-projects and organise a workshop for relevant internal staff to share and discuss experiences and the way forward when implementing the Bali Strategic Plan.

The report stresses the importance of addressing significant administrative obstacles internal to UNEP as well as between UNEP and UNDP by taking into account the recently conducted Dalberg study on administrative procedures in UNEP and the UK funded study on harmonising UNEP and UNDP procedures. We are in complete agreement with this recommendation and will review the studies carefully and implement the relevant recommendations.

The report recommends that UNEP reviews staffing for the capacity building programme component and assesses the need to strengthen or increase administrative or technical resources. This recommendation is especially relevant for the Poverty and Environment Programme component. Consequently, the Division for Policy Development and Law will present a proposal on this issue to the Executive Director by August 2006. The proposal will address both the staffing situation in headquarters and in the field.

The report underlines the need to strengthen coordination between different divisions that provide assistance to PRSPs or related national planning processes – both in terms of regional coordination as well as in terms of consistency of recommended methodological approaches. While communication between the various divisions has improved we acknowledge the need to address these issues in a more formalised way. All divisions will be requested to present proposals on coordination modalities with different divisions and their work at the country level to the Executive Management by August 2006.



Shafqat Kakakhel  
Deputy Executive Director & Officer in Charge

**Mid-term Evaluation of  
the Partnership between the Belgian  
Directorate General for Development Cooperation  
and UNEP**

**April 2006**

**John Horberry  
Catrina Perch**

**Evaluation and Oversight Unit**

**Disclaimer:** This report has been reproduced without formal editing

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	4
<b>1 Introduction</b>	6
1.1 Background	6
1.2 Scope	6
1.3 Approach	6
<b>2 Key Findings</b>	8
2.1 <i>The Partnership between UNEP and the Government of Belgium</i>	8
2.1.1 Background and Objectives	8
2.1.2 Strategic Vision and Direction	8
2.1.3 Predictability and Coherence of Funding	10
2.1.4 Administration	11
2.1.5 Recommendations	11
2.2 <i>The Achievements of the Programme Components</i>	12
2.2.1 Programme Components	12
2.2.2 Desk Study Approach	12
2.2.3 Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment	13
2.2.3.1 Introduction	13
2.2.3.2 Outputs	13
2.2.3.3 Conclusions	14
2.2.4 Global Programme of Action	16
2.2.4.1 Introduction	16
2.2.4.2 Outputs	16
2.2.4.3 Conclusions	17
2.2.4.4 Nairobi River Basin Programme (NRBP)	18
2.2.5 Capacity building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities	20
2.2.5.1 Introduction	20
2.2.5.2 Outputs	20
2.2.5.3 Issues and Key Findings	21
2.3 <i>Partner Collaboration</i>	26
2.3.1 Key Objectives	26
2.3.2 UNEP-UNDP Collaboration on Poverty and Environment	26
2.3.3 Other UN Agencies and Donors	27
2.3.4 National Authorities	28
2.3.5 Recommendations	28
2.4 <i>Broader Findings</i>	29
<b>Annexes</b>	
A Findings	31
B Terms of Reference	102
C List of Persons Interviewed	113

## List of acronyms

AEO	African Environment Outlook
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
BSP	The Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building
DEC	UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions
DED	Deputy Executive Director
DEPI	UNEP's Division of Environmental Policy Implementation
DEWA	UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment
DGDC	Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation
DGEF	UNEP's Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination
DPDL	UNEP's Division of Policy Development and Law
DTIE	UNEP's Division for Technology, Industry and Economics
ETB	Economics and Trade Branch
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEO	Global Environmental Outlook
GPA	Global Programme of Action
ICARM	Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management
IEA	Integrated Environmental Assessment
IED	International Environmental Governance
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MGP	Micro Grants Programme
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCCC	National Convention Coordinating Committee
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessments
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NPA	National Programme of Action
NRBP	Nairobi River Basin Programme
PADELIA	Partnership for Development of Environmental Law and Institutions in Africa
PADH	Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats
PEI	Poverty Environment Initiative
PCMU	Programme Coordination Management Unit
PCB	Production and Consumption Branch
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
ROA	UNEP's Regional Office for Africa
SAP	Strategic Action Plan for Wastewater
SGP	Small Grants Programme
UNCBD	UN Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	UN Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

## Preface

This mid-term evaluation of the Partnership between the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGDC) and UNEP was conducted between December 2005 and February 2006. The Belgian Partnership started in mid 2004 with a planned four year duration and consequently the principal goal of the evaluation has been to provide the Belgian DGDC and UNEP with an evaluation of results achieved so far and to make recommendations about how the implementation of the Partnership could be improved over the remaining two years or so.

The Partnership consists of three programme components:

- Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment – within the Division for Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA)
- Implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for protection of the marine environment from land based activities and the Nairobi River Basin Phase III – within the Division for Policy Implementation (DEPI) and Regional Office for Africa (ROA)
- Capacity building for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities – within the Division for Policy Development and Law (DPDL) and the Division for GEF Coordination (DEGF)

After consultation with the Belgian DGDC, it was decided to conduct a brief desk study of the first two components based on a review of available documents and interviews with project managers. In the case of the third component, a more in-depth evaluation was undertaken based on field visits to the four countries in which the component is being implemented – Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Mozambique. In the course of these field visits, the evaluation team organised consultation meetings with a range of stakeholders as well as interviews with focal points, partners and collaborating institutions.

The report presents the synthesised findings and recommendations of the evaluation in the main text organised according to the principal questions of interest to UNEP and the Belgian DGDC, as set out in the Terms of Reference:

- Does the Partnership provide a framework for policy dialogue between the donor and UNEP and a means of long-term coherent support for the UNEP programme of work?
- To what extent have the programme components of the Partnership achieved their intended outcomes and results at this mid-term stage?
- How effectively has UNEP collaborated with partners in the implementation of the Partnership?

It also became apparent during the evaluation that some of the key findings arising from the Belgian Partnership have wider implications for UNEP beyond the context of this or other partnerships with donors. Accordingly, a brief section is included offering a set of conclusions that are of wider relevance to UNEP's management.

The detailed reporting of the current status of the programme components and, in particular, the results of the field work are presented in the Annex. The implementation of the intended outputs and results is presented according to the original logframes included in the submissions to the Belgian government before the Partnership was approved. In addition, the components are evaluated in terms of project design, administrative issues, implementation and coordination.



## **1 Introduction**

### ***1.1 Background***

1 In 2003, the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGDC) agreed a Partnership with UNEP with a duration of four years and a total value of USD 12.1 million. The Partnership became effective in mid 2004. The UNEP Evaluation Unit launched a mid-term evaluation of this Partnership in November 2005. This is the final report of the evaluation into which comments received from the involved divisions and other stakeholders have been integrated.

### ***1.2 Scope***

2 The Belgian Partnership has three programme components:

- Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment – within the Division for Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA) (referred to below as the assessment component)
- Implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for protection of the marine environment from land based activities and the Nairobi River Basin Phase III – within the Division for Policy Implementation (DEPI) and Regional Office for Africa (ROA) (referred to below as the water component)
- Capacity building for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities – within the Division for Policy Development and Law (DPDL) and the Division for GEF Coordination (DEGF) (referred to below as the Capacity Building component<sup>1</sup>)

3 Each of these programme components is composed of a set of sub-projects or project activities. These sub-projects are in some cases also supported by funds from other donors. They are, of course, only a part of the overall programme of work of the respective Divisions.

### ***1.3 Approach***

4 This evaluation has two elements. The first is to address two strategic questions concerning the Partnership as a whole:

- Does the Partnership provide a framework for policy dialogue between the donor and UNEP and a means of long-term coherent support for the UNEP programme of work?
- How effectively has UNEP collaborated with partners in the implementation of the Partnership?

5 The second is to evaluate the progress made towards achieving the stated results and outputs of the programme components. This element has been undertaken in part by a brief desk study of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the programme component is referred to as the Capacity Building component, its focus is on integrating poverty-environment linkages into national planning processes using a multi-year operational capacity building approach with country ownership. This is not typical of the very wide range of capacity building activities undertaken by UNEP throughout its programmes of work,

assessment and water components, and a significantly more in-depth evaluation of the Capacity Building component including field visits to UNEP HQ and the four countries in which the component is being implemented.

6 In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the greater proportion of effort has been focused on the Capacity Building component – reflecting the priority attached by the Belgian DGDC to the theme of mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national planning processes and the focus on delivering operational capacity building at the country level.

7 This evaluation has been conducted by an independent consultant (team leader) and a staff member from the Evaluation and Oversight Unit in UNEP.

## **2 Key Findings**

### ***2.1 The Partnership between UNEP and the Government of Belgium***

#### **2.1.1 Background and Objectives**

8 Prior to 2004, the Government of Belgium had provided financial support to a number of separate UNEP projects and programmes without any particular strategic coherence or dialogue with UNEP about goals or synergy. By that time a number of other bilateral donors (such as Norway) had created partnership agreements with UNEP which had two principal goals – to identify a strategic framework for the programmes funded and to provide UNEP with greater certainty about the financial resources available over a multi-year period for its priority programmes. The decision was then taken by the Belgian DGDC to create a Partnership with UNEP which should embody priority themes from among the diverse range of programmes previously supported by Belgium.

9 Belgium and UNEP agreed that the support should concentrate on three priority themes: scientific assessment, water and poverty and environment. Belgium would provide financial support of just over USD 10 million (later increased by USD 1.8 million) to agreed projects within those themes over a 4 year period. UNEP then submitted proposals for the three specific programme components which make up the current Partnership.

10 Under the agreement, UNEP receives annual instalments on submission of a progress report and an annual financial report. The Belgian DGDC and UNEP also review progress in the context of their annual consultation meeting.

11 We understand from the Belgian DGDC that they have a number of strategic objectives including:

- To achieve more effectiveness and sustainability through establishing a focus on priority themes over a multi-year period
- To support UNEP's increased focus on providing operational capacity building at the country level
- To encourage UNEP to collaborate better with UNDP and with other donors
- To combine with the support already provided by the government of Norway to strengthen UNEP's work on poverty and environment

12 We also understand that the Partnership provides potential benefits to UNEP including:

- Funding for UNEP's core priority areas
- Increased dialogue with the DGDC
- Greater predictability of funding for specific programme components
- More flexibility in management and implementation within agreed programme frameworks
- Simplified administration and reporting
- Potential complementarity between Partnership Agreements from different donors

#### **2.1.2 Strategic Vision and Direction**

13 The Partnership agreement is the result of discussions between the Belgian DGDC and UNEP clearly represents a concentration on three priority themes – a considerable shift from the previous pattern of support for a number of separate programmes and projects. The Belgian DGDC was evidently satisfied that this choice of themes met its requirements – and has since reinforced the particular priority it places

on the poverty and environment theme. It was clearly a strategic decision for Belgium to add its funding to the Norwegian funding for the poverty and environment work – ensuring that these combined funds were channelled into a challenging and innovative programme compared to UNEP’s typical country based activities.

14 The consultations between the Belgian DGDC and UNEP in May 2004 and 2005 have demonstrated a consistency with this strategic focus. These consultations have also revealed a wider strategic priority of encouraging greater cooperation between multilateral organisations involved in environment programmes at the country level and supporting UNEP’s greater involvement in operational capacity building at the country level.

15 Belgium also has required UNEP to focus on countries which are existing partner countries for its development cooperation programme – and as a result UNEP agreed to add Rwanda and Tanzania to the countries participating in the Capacity Building programme component. It is evident that this decision was made without consultation with the countries concerned.

16 The Belgian partnership consists of a formal agreement indicating the amount to be contributed to UNEP and reporting requirements and three programme component documents. The partnership differs from other partnerships in that logframes were used in developing the programmes. Accordingly, the three documents outline needs, and expected results and outputs in a clear manner. However, evidence suggests that in the implementation of the programmes the logframes and especially the indicators for achievement of outputs have been used to a limited extent.

17 The content of the Partnership seems to be in line with the priorities of UNEP’s Programme of Work and there is no evidence that during implementation the programme components have diverted significantly from these priorities although changes from the original agreed activities and outputs have taken place particularly for the Capacity Building programme component.

18 Belgium has developed a strategic note for UNEP<sup>2</sup> but apart from the focus on the three strategic areas (assessment, water, poverty and environment) there is no document in the Partnership which describes DGDC’s strategic focus for the Partnership. This is unlike some other agreements that UNEP has with, for example, the Netherlands<sup>3</sup> and Norway<sup>4</sup>. The latter has recently signed a framework agreement with UNEP which supports three programme areas (assessment, capacity building and technology, industry and economics for sustainable development). As with the Belgian Partnership, implementation will be focused on three programme components. However, article 3 of the framework agreement describes the criteria that UNEP shall adhere to when selecting activities - for example MDG 7, contributing to capacity development through the Bali Strategic Plan, ensuring that gender considerations are fully taken into account, promoting a rights based approach to development etc. Generally most of the partnerships seem to be developed on the basis of dialogue around the thematic priorities of the donors and some broader explicit or implicit selection criteria.

19 It is not evident that Belgium expected synergies between the three programme components. It was also the case that Belgium did not influence greatly the choice of individual sub-projects within the programme components – these were proposed by UNEP from their existing portfolio of projects within the identified themes (some being activities already supported by Belgian funds) and time constraints prevented much dialogue about these sub-projects.

---

<sup>2</sup> PNUE-DGDC: Note strategique PNUE, 2004

<sup>3</sup> Policy Framework Paper for the DGIS- UNEP Partnership Program: UNEP’s Contribution to Sustainable Development and Global Poverty Reduction, 2002

<sup>4</sup> Framework Agreement on Programme Cooperation in the Field of Development Co-operation between the Government of Norway and UNEP 2006-2007.

20 In the case of the DEWA and GPA components, Belgium presumably had confidence that these were housed within well established, coherent and effectively managed programmes. It is apparent that Belgium did not require UNEP to demonstrate that there was any strong synergy between the sub-projects within each programme component. However, in the case of the Capacity Building programme component (on poverty and environment), Belgium evidently assumed that there was synergy – in fact they regard the three sub-projects as one integrated whole.

21 It is evident that the importance attached by Belgium to UNEP taking a stronger role in capacity building at the country level and working in partnership with other multilateral agencies such as UNDP is consistent with UNEP's recently adopted Bali Strategic Plan.

22 Overall, the Partnership does undoubtedly represent an increase in strategic vision compared with the previous situation. At the same time, we believe there are lessons to be learned for future Partnerships:

- The Belgian DGDC did not formalise their strategic vision or goals as part of the Partnership agreement. Doing so would make it easier to focus the work within the Partnership on achieving those goals
- The Belgian DGDC and UNEP did not have a substantive dialogue about the programme components and in particular the synergies between the sub-projects or their contribution to an overall coherent programme of work. Doing so in future would prompt discussions about the potential impact of these sub-projects and also on how synergies can best be achieved.
- There are concerns about how thinly spread the Partnership budget is and whether this reduces the potential for strategic impact – especially with a focus on multi-year operational capacity building at the country level.

### **2.1.3 Predictability and Coherence of Funding**

23 The Partnership undoubtedly provides more certainty and predictability to UNEP for the Divisions who host the selected programme components - as it comprises support over a four year period. It was also pointed out that this type of financial support enables Divisions to implement activities that reinforce their strategic objectives of their programmes of work – to an extent they would not otherwise be able to do. This is undoubtedly an advantage to UNEP compared to alternative means of obtaining resources.

24 However, the evidence from the country level is that this predictability is less clear to the national focal points for the Capacity Building programme. In many cases, they are operating within workplans agreed for a period of a year or less and are not fully aware of the full scale or duration of the funding of their specific sub-projects.

25 It is also clear that channelling the funds through one Trust Fund has considerable practical advantages for UNEP and increases the ease with which the disbursements can be tracked.

26 On the basis of the field work, it is our view that a consequence of spreading the funds over three programme components for a four year period – and in particular within the Capacity Building component over three sub-projects in four countries – is that the funds are thinly spread. As a result, it appears that the transaction costs of each sub-project of the Capacity Building programme are high. This may also be the case for the other programme components to a lesser extent.

27 One implication of spreading the resources over a large range of sub-projects within the three programme components is that it is harder to assess the overall impact of the partnership – in terms of whether the resources provided are making a real difference to UNEP's intended results by enabling Divisions to focus effort on key outputs or plugging gaps in existing resource mobilisation.

#### **2.1.4 Administration**

28 The annual consultation meetings between the Belgian DGDC and UNEP provide a predictable channel for discussion and feedback. However, since May 2005 Belgium has had no representation with responsibility for UNEP in Nairobi. This responsibility is located in Uganda. It is reasonable to assume that this makes it harder to maintain a close dialogue with UNEP on progress.

29 It is evident that reporting by UNEP to Belgium on the three programme components has not been effective to date. There have been progress reports for each of the three programme components in mid 2005. For the Assessment (DEWA) and Marine (GPA) components, the progress reports had a logical structure but did not provide a reasonable account of the status of planned activities and outputs. The progress report for the Capacity Building component failed to provide a structure that reflected adequately either the original sub-project logframes or the actual workplans planned at the country level for the sub-projects. As a result, the report failed to provide a satisfactory account of the status of the programme component as a whole or at the level of the sub-projects.

30 It should be noted that the Belgian DGDC sees the Capacity Building programme component as an integrated whole, while it is managed in UNEP as three separate sub-projects. It can reasonably be assumed therefore that the Belgian DGDC would expect there to be more integration of the process of managing and reporting back.

31 It was clear from the field visits that the Belgian embassies in three of the four countries were not fully aware of the Capacity Building programme component in their country and the representatives were keen to be kept informed – either by the Belgian development cooperation administration or by the local focal points supported by the UNEP project management.

#### **2.1.5 Recommendations**

UNEP should, through the Programme Coordination and Management Unit (PCMU), communicate more routinely with the Belgian DGDC about the amendments to programme design and how the programme component resources are allocated.

The UNEP Programme Coordination and Management Unit (PCMU) should build on previous improvements and encourage Divisions to adopt a well structured and consistent framework for progress reports that take account of the current status of the country level sub-projects – indicating workplans, timelines and targets. This may require some increased PCMU capacity.

UNEP should, through PCMU, clarify with the Belgian DGDC how it can best ensure that the Belgian embassies in participating countries are informed of the progress of activities in their countries.

## 2.2 *The Achievements of the Programme Components*

### 2.2.1 Programme Components

32 The Partnership comprises three programme components:

- Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment
- Implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for protection of the marine environment from land based activities and the Nairobi River Basin Phase III
- Capacity building for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities

33 In the following sections, we present our summary findings on the achievement of the intended results and outputs of these components.

**Table 1: Current Status of Disbursement**

	<b>Total Budget 2004-2007</b>	<b>Budget to Date</b>	<b>Disbursement to Date</b>
<b>Strengthening integrated environmental and water assessment</b>	\$4,000k	\$2,000k	\$1,615k 81%
<b>GPA for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities (not including NRBP III)</b>	\$2,100k	\$1,100k	\$541k 49%
<b>Capacity Building including additional funds for stakeholder involvement</b>	\$5,200k	\$2,500k	\$722k 29%

Source: UNEP January 2006

### 2.2.2 Desk Study Approach

34 The evaluation of the assessment and water programme components took the form of a brief desk study. The principal task undertaken was to review the relevant documents in order to determine the current status of implementation of activities and achievement of outputs. As both components include several sub-projects each of which entail a wide range of outputs, this was a challenge. The component progress reports have not been structured to achieve that objective.

35 Given the wide range of activities and outputs within these programme components, there was very limited scope for evaluating their effectiveness with the resources available. It was possible from a small number of interviews with the relevant staff to address some very general questions about the potential results of these activities and to gain an impression of the overall achievements.

36 However, it is important to note that the sub-projects funded by the Belgian Partnership within these components are only several among a larger number within the relevant programme of work and it is hard to attempt an evaluation without looking at the programme as a whole – which is beyond the scope of this exercise.

37 It is also the case that the majority of the outputs of these components are of a normative nature: publications, workshops, training materials, methodological tools and pilot studies. Their intended area of influence is global or regional but the specific activities are relatively small. It is inherently challenging to gain a reliable estimate of the actual results of such activities and would, if undertaken systematically, require an extensive investigation. These desk studies have not attempted such an effort but have raised the issue of how the managers can focus on tracking results as the components proceed.

## 2.2.3 Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment

### 2.2.3.1 Introduction

38 This programme component with a budget of USD 4,920,000 over four years consists of 4 sub-elements:

- Increasing the involvement of the scientific community in the development of the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) (1,275,000 USD)
- Preparation of the Africa Environment Outlook (790,000 USD)
- Supporting Integrated Environmental Assessment of Cities in Latin America and the Caribbean (695,000 USD)
- Assessing vulnerability of water resources to environmental change in African, Latin American and Asian countries including trans-boundary freshwater treaties and agreements at regional scale (1,180,000 USD)

39 An overall project document and log-frame exists for this programme component. It is managed by the Division for Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA) but different sections (GEO-Section, Ecosystems Section, Regional Coordination, Capacity Building and Partnership Section) within the Division are responsible for different sub-elements.

40 The shared focus among the four sub-elements is the preparation of the fourth Global Environment Outlook report (GEO-4) by 2007, which is UNEP's international environmental assessment. Specific activities have been identified that provide inputs to this process.

41 One progress report covering the period January 2004- March 2005 exists but it does not fully account for the status of planned activities and outputs as outlined in the original log-frame.

### 2.2.3.2 Outputs

42 While it has been feasible to review a good number of documents, it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to undertake robust analysis of the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the programme. In the following table we summarise the main outputs, current status and key issues for the programme. In the annex we provide detailed tables showing the status of activities and outputs.

**Table 2 Status of Programme Component – Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment**

	<b>Key Outputs</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Issues</b>
<b>Strengthening Science base of GEO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 10 Global and regional science workshops</li> <li>▪ GEO-4 published</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 5 regional and 3 global consultation or workshops</li> <li>▪ Zero draft of GEO-4 developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strong water element difficult to reflect in all sub-elements</li> <li>▪ Realignment of certain activities linked to</li> </ul>



			<p>regional needs and the Bali Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More than 200 scientists participating as authors in GEO-4, more will participate in the Peer review and regional consultations processes.</li> <li>▪ Challenge to ensure findings are considered by policy makers</li> </ul>
<b>Africa Environment Outlook (AEO)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report of indicators</li> <li>▪ Lake Victoria Environment Outlook</li> <li>▪ Second Africa Environment Outlook</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Indicators on MDGs and NEPAD developed</li> <li>▪ Lake Victoria Outlook report being published</li> <li>▪ Draft of AEO-2 being reviewed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ecological footprint and HDI not used</li> <li>▪ Working with national Governments slow</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment in LAC cities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 9 GEO Cities reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agreements with five municipalities and further 3 being negotiated</li> <li>▪ Two drafts available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Original target of 9 reduced to 8</li> <li>▪ Expansion of capacity building activities to other regions not funded with Belgian money but taking place in Africa.</li> <li>▪ Early signs of immediate impact (2 cities using methodology without financial support from UNEP)</li> <li>▪ Slow release of funds from UNEP HQ to region a problem.</li> </ul>
<b>Vulnerability of surface and ground water in Africa, Latin America and Asia – transboundary freshwater agreements and treaties.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water vulnerability report for Africa, Latin America and Caribbean, Asia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project on Assessment of pollution Status and Vulnerability of Water Supply Aquifers in Africa completed</li> <li>▪ 5 publications completed(Africa)</li> <li>▪ 4 on-going (Africa, Asia, LAC)</li> <li>▪ 2 workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Challenge of making publications relevant to policy makers</li> <li>▪ Impact will be difficult to measure</li> <li>▪ Focus so far primarily on Africa</li> </ul>

### 2.2.3.3 Conclusions

43 The DEWA Programme is an amalgamation of projects that were originally developed independently. Synergies among the different sub-element are therefore not explicitly built into the design of this programme. However, the programme benefits from being located in one Division and it would seem that the different sub-elements are succeeding in feeding into the overall GEO process and product in line with the work of the Division. Some inconsistencies do however exist, for example it was mentioned that the strong focus on water from the Belgian side has been difficult to integrate into all sub-elements and has caused certain overlaps with the sub-element on water. Nevertheless, it would seem that good use has been made of existing networks on coastal management and vulnerability in drafting chapters on water in the AEO and GEO-4.

44 Alignment of certain activities has been necessary. This is in part due to the fact that the programme was designed before the GEO-4 content was known. For example the activity of water related environmental consequences on food production towards 2030 is being reconsidered in light of other relevant on-going activities and new emerging issues.

45 Overall the progress of the programme seem healthy : the involvement of scientists in the GEO process has increased to 200 scientists; a zero draft of the GEO-4 exists; the AEO 2 will be launched in May 2006; 5 cities are either in the process or will embark on the assessment process using the GEO cities methodology; groundwater vulnerability assessment of 11 cities have been undertaken and vulnerability assessments of surface water have been undertaken for 6 regions (North, West, South East, Central and Islands) in Africa and more are underway for Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean.

46 The project document does not provide timelines or set targets. Consequently, it is hard to evaluate whether the programme is on track. Furthermore, the established indicators were not used in the last progress reports. A large number of activities have been carried out but due to the normative nature of the work it is difficult to measure the impact of the programme at this stage of the implementation. Subsequently, a common challenge to all sub-projects is to make products and processes relevant to policy makers.

47 DEWA works both through a host of Collaborating Centres and regional networks. In addition DEWA has strong presence in the regions with out-posted officers in UNEP's six regional offices. This approach has proven efficient in terms of delivery of outputs.

48 After a slow start up it would seem that the implementation rate has recently picked up. In April 2005 DEWA had used about 50% of the funds provided to them against the current implementation rate of 81%. While DEWA mentioned administrative issues such as only making funds available in the middle of the calendar year as a cause for the initial delay in implementation the evaluators were informed that the Divisions were encouraged, through a memo from the DED in March 2004, to proceed with the planning and implementation of the programmes. They were furthermore informed that funds could be advanced against the pledge made by Belgium.

## 2.2.4 Global Programme of Action

### 2.2.4.1 Introduction

49 The Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the Protection of Marine Environment from Land-based Activities is a long-standing and comprehensive programme supported by a number of different donors. It comprises several programme elements including:

- National Programmes of Action (NPA)
- Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats (PADH)
- Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM)
- Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater (SAP)

50 The Government of Belgium has provided financial support since 2000. It has been included as a major programme component of the Partnership with funding support amounting to USD 2,000,000 over the period 2004-2007. The programme is managed by the GPA coordination office in The Hague, which is part of DEPI.

51 The GPA as a whole is designed to be a source of conceptual and practical guidance to be drawn upon by national and/or regional authorities for devising and implementing sustained action to prevent, reduce, control and/or eliminate marine degradation from land-based activities. The GPA aims at preventing the degradation of the marine environment from land-based activities by facilitating the duty of governments to preserve and protect the marine environment.

### 2.2.4.2 Outputs

52 The project document for the GPA programme component of the Belgian Partnership has a detailed logframe for each sub-project. There was a progress report submitted to the Government of Belgium in mid 2005 which covered the period from 2000-2003 (prior the period covered by this evaluation) and the period from 2004 until March 2005. However the information in this report for this latter period is highly summarised and does not provide a clear account of the results so far.

53 In November 2005, the GPA coordination office prepared narrative progress reports on the sub-projects. These are very useful in explaining the context, rationale and process followed within each component but they also do not provide an account of the achievement of the planned activities and outputs consistent with the logframe.

54 Accordingly, the main focus of this desk review has been to liaise with the GPA coordination office to summarise the status of planned activities and outputs. In addition, we have conducted interviews with GPA coordination office staff members to identify the key challenges and issues facing the programme component.

55 The GPA is complex and involves numerous activities and outputs within the four different sub-projects – many of which have a global or regional scope. While it has been feasible to review a good number of documents, it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to undertake a robust analysis of the relevance, efficiency or effectiveness of the full range of outputs. In the following table, we summarise the main outputs, current status and key issues for the programme. In the annex, we provide detailed tables showing the current implementation status of activities and outputs.

**Table 3 Status of Programme Component: Global Programme of Action**

	<b>Key Outputs</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Issues</b>
<b>NPA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NPA in Bangladesh</li> <li>▪ Completion of NPAs through GEF regional projects</li> <li>▪ Networks for information and training</li> <li>▪ International conference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ready to submit to government</li> <li>▪ See table in annex – more progress in CPPS than GCLME</li> <li>▪ Web-based network launched</li> <li>▪ H2O Conference held</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integration of NPAs with macro-processes</li> <li>▪ Challenges of mobilising resources to ensure sustainability</li> <li>▪ Challenge of engaging regional partners to launch NPA efforts</li> <li>▪ Focus on delivering implementation and compliance</li> </ul>
<b>PADH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity building in selected countries</li> <li>▪ Adoption of sector principles</li> <li>▪ Implementation of 2 pilot projects</li> <li>▪ Pilot project in Bangladesh</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional studies have led to development of work programmes</li> <li>▪ Principles adopted by various international bodies – leading to national applications</li> <li>▪ Several pilot projects initiated</li> <li>▪ Completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional focus helps to identify opportunities to influence policy and to provide capacity building</li> <li>▪ Challenge of ensuring principles are adopted at ground level</li> <li>▪ Challenge of ensuring coherent policy and demonstration impacts of pilot projects</li> </ul>
<b>ICARM</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agreed principles</li> <li>▪ Dissemination through papers and conferences</li> <li>▪ Regional network</li> <li>▪ Demonstration of ICARM implementation</li> <li>▪ Framework to assess outcomes and impacts of ICARM efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Main effort: Guiding Principles for post-Tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction</li> <li>▪ Tsunami principles endorsed by 14 countries affected by the Tsunami</li> <li>▪ Action plan for their adoption agreed</li> <li>▪ Network established</li> <li>▪ Casebook under preparation</li> <li>▪ ICARM Progress Marker being prepared</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Challenge of ensuring Guiding Principles have an impact on the ground</li> <li>▪ Challenge of using knowledge based outputs to influence practice</li> </ul>
<b>SAP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ WET target roadmap</li> <li>▪ Regional portfolio of candidate pilot projects</li> <li>▪ 2 pilot projects selected in N Africa</li> <li>▪ Projects prepared for funding</li> <li>▪ Training and capacity building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roadmap has been discussed</li> <li>▪ Efforts continue to identify pilot projects in Morocco and Algeria</li> <li>▪ 10 training course have been delivered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to complement the efforts of other donors to identify and prepare projects for financing</li> <li>▪ Need to articulate a comparative advantage for UNEP</li> </ul>

### 2.2.4.3 Conclusions

56 Recognising the limitations of this desk study of what is a very wide ranging and complex programme, our conclusions are mainly confined to overall questions about the likely value and success of the programme.

57 The GPA is a well established and managed programme with an overall strategy and coherence. From the information available, it seems there has been satisfactory achievement of the planned activities and outputs supported by the Belgian funds. It has not been possible to assess this in detail as no workplans are available indicating when the activities were scheduled – other than the distribution of the budget per activity over the 4 years included in the original programme submission document. Clearly there are some activities which are more challenging, such as mobilising the regional initiatives for the NPAs or preparing water and sanitation projects for financing and it is possible these activities may not be as far advanced as intended at this point. We would expect these and other activities to be addressed in the next progress report.

58 It is a predominately normative programme component. The bulk of the activities consist of knowledge based outputs, efforts to establish networks, partnerships and other mechanisms for dissemination, pilot projects and training activities.

59 The scope is very large in terms of issues and regions – so the range of relatively small scale activities are trying to influence, mobilise and enable both at the policy and practice levels. There is a regional focus evident and numerous partnerships, formal and informal with other institutions. There is recognition of the need to leverage resources from other sources to ensure priority actions can be taken.

60 It is inherently difficult to assess the impacts of such activities on improved policy, on better environmental management on the ground or on awareness of the options for solving problems. In this case, the resources have not been available to attempt such an evaluation of impacts systematically. It is possible to some extent to look for evidence of strategies to maximise the impacts and awareness in reviewing progress of the need to track the range of contributions that the activities can make towards achieving the intended results.

61 In conducting a desk review of this programme, it is clear that the intent of the Belgian supported component is to influence policy, disseminate better knowledge and tools and to make a contribution to capacity building. The evidence is that the programme is well coordinated and administered. The managers of the programme are clearly alert to the issues of achieving impact (as is clear from their progress reports). For example, they are looking for means to build on more sustainable policy processes; they are trying to mobilise funds from other sources; they are endeavouring to get tools into the hands of practitioners. It would be desirable to see more clear evidence of the strategies chosen to ensure that the activities do achieve the maximum results.

#### **2.2.4.4 Nairobi River Basin Programme (NRBP)**

62 Within the overall GPA programme component of the Belgian UNEP Partnership is the NRBP – Phase III. The project submission to the Belgium government requested USD 2,000,000 for five sub-components. However, the Belgian government has agreed to fund selected sub-components amounting to USD 644,000.

63 The NRBP started in 1999. Phase I was a situational assessment. Phase II was a pilot activity focusing on a tributary of the Nairobi River system. The Belgian government undertook a study of the achievements and lessons learned before agreeing to provide further support. They funded a bridging phase to enable UNEP to develop Phase III jointly with UN-HABITAT and UNDP, in partnership with the Government of Kenya and Nairobi City Council. This bridging phase resulted in an agreed framework for collaboration between UNEP, UN-HABITAT and UNDP, alignment with the Kenyan government sector policy, extensive stakeholder consultation and the design of a project proposal with a logframe.

64 The project submission contained five components:

- i) Environmental management and urban planning system

- ii) Rehabilitation of Nairobi Dam
- iii) Water quantity and quality protocols
- iv) Service delivery, environmental conservation and sustainable use of resources
- v) Public awareness and participation

65 The Belgian government has agreed to fund components i) and iv), plus a part of iii). The implementation arrangements require MOUs between UNEP and both UN-HABITAT and UNDP covering their joint roles in managing the project. UNEP, through the Regional Office for Africa, is also engaging IUCN, the University of Nairobi and Kenyan government bodies via MOUs for the activities for which it is directly responsible

66 The current status is that after extensive delays the first activities are now underway – for example, IUCN has nearly completed an initial study to prepare a framework for the development of an Integrated Environmental Management and Urban Plan. Most activities are now scheduled to start in the first half of 2006. The table in annex A provides a detailed report on the status.

67 The funding had been agreed in January 2005, but as it was partial, time was taken up in adjusting the project plan to fit within reduced resources. The workplan was also then packaged up into a cluster of activities for each UN Partner to take responsibility for. However, the administrative procedures involved in agreeing MOUs between UNEP and UN-HABITAT and UNDP also contributed to delays.

68 The main issues that have become apparent to date are:

- The decision by the Belgian government to provide partial funding required some revision of the project design and implementation arrangements
- There have been extensive bureaucratic barriers to agreeing MOUs between UNEP and UNDP and UN-HABITAT
- There have been delays in getting staff resources allocated to the project in both UNDP and UN-HABITAT
- The implementation arrangements are complex and have consumed a good deal of effort
- UNEP faces a challenge to make up for the absence of funding in certain components – and has been investing a good deal of effort in bringing the private sector on board.

69 The main conclusions are that:

- The review of Phases I and II and the bridging phase were an essential pre-requisite to agreeing a country owned project
- This phase also enabled the framework for the collaboration between the UN agencies to be worked out
- However, the nature of the project is itself very challenging technically but it would seem that most of the effort has so far been devoted to quite ambitious and complex institutional arrangements
- It is important to consider whether the reduced resources are sufficient to launch a project of this nature successfully

## **2.2.5 Capacity building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities.**

### **2.2.5.1 Introduction**

70 The third component of the Belgian Partnership was evaluated in greater depth – in response to the priority attached to it by the Belgian government. In addition to a detailed review of the available documents, the evaluation included in-depth interviews with the project managers and other relevant UNEP staff at Headquarters. This was followed by a two week field trip to the four participating countries. In each country, a consultation meeting was held to which focal points, responsible officials, sub-project managers and other stakeholders were invited, - including representatives from UNDP and the Belgian embassies. In addition, detailed interviews were held with focal points and their colleagues in the host agencies. The project managers from UNEP HQ attended these field visits in two of the four countries.

### **2.2.5.2 Outputs**

71 This programme component with a budget of USD 4,000,000 over four years provides support to four countries: Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Mozambique. It is made up of three sub-projects:

- Integration and mainstreaming of key environmental issue into PRSPs
- Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of the Rio MEAs
- Capacity building for the development of institutions and legislation implementing Rio MEAs with specific consideration to poverty alleviation

72 In addition, there is a budget of USD 1,200,000 for strengthening stakeholders' participation in integration and mainstreaming of environment into PRSPs.

73 There is no overall project document for the Capacity Building programme component. Each sub-project prepared its own document at the outset with a logframe. They are managed by separate divisions or branches within UNEP and each has a strong link with a larger UNEP programme – respectively the joint UNEP-UNDP poverty and environment programme, the NEPAD Environment Initiative and PADELIA.

74 The three sub-projects do share a focus on capacity building for poverty-environment processes at the country level. They are also among the most significant examples of UNEP providing sustained operational capacity building at the country level.

75 The start-up of this programme component has been prolonged. It is more than a year and a half since the programme component began and the sub-projects have only recently become operational at the country level. Accordingly disbursement has been very slow up to date.

76 The original project design of each sub-project was of a generic or regional nature without the focus on the specific needs of the countries concerned. In fact, there appears to have been little consultation with the countries before the programme component started – although in the case of sub-project 1, there had been some consultation with the original candidate countries before the Belgian

funding was committed<sup>5</sup>. Not surprisingly, the process of launching the sub-projects at the country level has required a sustained process of consultation and tailoring to the needs of the countries in order to obtain a reasonable level of country ownership. This has taken considerable time and effort on the part of the UNEP project managers and it is only within the last few months that sub-project agreements or MOUs have been put in place, workplans agreed and funds have begun to flow.

77 In this process, it has not only been necessary to make implementation arrangements with national authorities, in some cases dealing with changes in focal points, but also to establish partnerships and working agreements with other agencies, in particular with UNDP country offices.

78 A major consequence of this extended period of launching the sub-projects at the country level is that the current activities and planned outputs agreed with the countries not only differ from country to country but are significantly different from those in the programme component submission to Belgium. It is also the case that the intended results can be reasonably assumed to have evolved significantly from the original ones but are not explicitly redefined.

79 The main focus of this evaluation has been to:

- Collect and collate information on the current workplans for the sub-projects in the four countries: identifying the intended outputs and activities
- Establish the current level of achievement of these activities and outputs
- Identify important issues with a view to assessing any risks to achieving the intended results and highlighting lessons learned based on the programme component to date
- Identify concerns and suggestions on the part of the relevant national authorities and other country level stakeholders that can help improve the implementation of the sub-projects

80 In Annex A, we present the detailed results of the evaluation by sub-project and by country. The current status of the sub-projects is hard to summarise overall. There are now workplans for all sub-projects in all countries – although in some cases these workplans are only agreed for the next few months or the year. In most cases therefore, there is limited evidence of outputs achieved as the sub-projects have only just started. It is not clear in some cases what intended results can be inferred from the revised focus and planned activities of the sub-projects and it is premature to try to assess the achievement of results. In the next section, we discuss the overall findings in terms of issues identified and risks to the achievement of the intended results. However, overall it is a considerable achievement on the part of the UNEP staff to have successfully adapted the original sub-project design to the country needs and to have achieved a good level of country ownership.

### **2.2.5.3 Issues and Key Findings**

81 Project Design

- The original project design was “top-down” and predominately focused on knowledge based or regional activities.
- There was inadequate prior consultation with the participating countries and as a result the period of gaining country ownership and preparing to launch the sub-projects at the country level was prolonged and time consuming.

---

<sup>5</sup> The project preparation phase had started in 2003 before the Belgian funds were added to the Norwegian support. Two additional countries, Tanzania and Rwanda, were added to the original five at the request of Belgium.



- The country level sub-projects were significantly adapted from the original design – which was partly a response to country needs and partly a change in focus that may not have been fully defined in terms of intended results.
- There is no overall up-to-date document that provides the logical structure for future monitoring or evaluation of the Belgium Partnership programme component nor are there similar project documents for the sub-projects (although the poverty-environment sub-project operates within a project document which covers more countries than the Belgian component).
- There were no intended synergies between the three sub-projects which had a different “home” at UNEP and a different institutional context.
- At the country level, there is a high level of appreciation for the sub-projects combined with a desire to link capacity building support to direct implementation processes.
- In some countries, there was concern about the balance between capacity building and achieving tangible impacts “on the ground”.

## 82 Administration

- The three sub-projects are managed by different UNEP branches and there is little evidence of measures taken to encourage synergies between the sub-projects at the administrative level (such as financial arrangements, timing of workplans, reporting requirements etc.).
- Each sub-project has a different focal point at the country level – although in several cases they belong to the same institution – and no mechanisms are yet established to facilitate coordination between them.
- A UNEP Task Force for the Capacity Building programme was established in June 2004 in response to concerns raised by Belgium about the lack of coordination between the Divisions in the implementation of the Programme. The Task Force was composed of Directors of DPDL, DEPI, DEC, DGEF and DRC/ROA and chaired by the DED . Terms of Reference and a joint implementation plan for sub-project 1 (Integration and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs) and sub-project 3 (Capacity building for the development of national legislation implementing Rio MEAs) were also developed. The meetings however were not sustained. It has been suggested that placing the task force at the Director level did not lead to effective follow up by the project managers.
- A number of administrative and procedural obstacles within UNEP have been identified and are acknowledged by UNEP officials – such as the ceiling on the value of MOUs, arrangements for travel approval and differences between UNEP and UNDP procedures.

## 83 Delivery

- The period of country consultation and agreeing the sub-projects has been very prolonged – in part this was due to the need to adapt the sub-projects to the specific country needs and in part due to the challenges faced by the relevant UNEP branches in preparing operational style country level activities.

- The evidence shows that the agreed workplans are for limited periods of time – consequently, the countries and UNEP need to invest considerable effort in preparing a sequence of workplans and in some cases the focal points are unclear about the overall scale, duration and intended results of the sub-projects.
- It is clear that these sub-projects make significant demands on the responsible officials both in UNEP and at the country level – much more so than the type of country focused capacity building activities typical of other UNEP programmes. This has been acknowledged by UNEP (especially in sub-project 1) and has been reflected in project design through the provision for full-time project managers in many cases. Many focal points however have stated that there is a high burden of project administration.
- The evidence suggests that the countries need robust technical support from UNEP – to operationalise what are quite complex activities in many cases and looking forward to ensure that the intended project results are clear and achievable. There are many good examples of such technical support from UNEP. The countries indicated that they hoped UNEP would continue to provide the level of support needed – especially now the projects are fully underway – either in the form of more frequent visits or allocation of funds for technical advisors.
- Each of the three sub-projects has held regional workshops to which they have invited the focal points and other stakeholders in order to share information and experiences. These workshops have helped to ensure that there is a common understanding about the focus and key elements of each sub-project. It is clear that the focal points have appreciated these events and found them very useful.
- It was clear that there have been and will continue to be high “transaction costs” for what are quite small projects at the country level – between USD 250,000-300,000 (of Belgian funds) per sub-project per country over the 4 year project lifetime<sup>6</sup>. The prolonged period of preparation, the administrative complexity, the use of a sequence of MOUs for each project all contribute to the high ratio of management to content.

#### 84 Coordination

- The evidence is that there has been limited formal coordination between the managers of the sub-projects at UNEP. An inter-divisional Task Force was convened in mid-2004 but has not been sustained – this was set up partly in response to concerns from the Government of Belgium that the three sub-projects should be more closely linked. However, it is evident that the managers recognise the benefits of closer coordination about country specific activities.
- At the country level, there are no formal mechanisms for coordination between the sub-projects. However the focal points often work closely together in the same institutions and are very conscious of the separate management by UNEP. In some cases, they have suggested potential mechanisms for coordination.
- There are some examples of good coordination with other UNEP programmes, such as PADELIA and the NEPAD Environment Initiative, as well as with the UNDP PEI and the

---

<sup>6</sup> The country projects within sub-project 1 combines Belgian funds with Norwegian funds as well as funds from UNDP or other donors in some cases – consequently they are often much larger.

GEF Small Grants Programme. There is also evidence of current efforts to ensure that separate initiatives within UNEP focused on integrating environmental issues into PRSPs are complementary and well coordinated – for example there are pilot initiatives by DTIE ETB and PCB.

#### 85 Risks

- There are some cases where the UNEP managers and country focal points may not have a clear focus on the overall intended results of all the three sub-projects following the period of preparation and adaptation to country needs.
- The high administrative burden and transaction costs of relatively small projects may reduce their effectiveness.
- The focal points may find it hard to operate effectively without a clear understanding of the scale, duration and overall direction of the UNEP support over the project lifetime.
- UNEP's capacity to manage these types of operational country level programmes may become over-stretched as they progress into the implementation phase.
- To sustain the benefits of these sub-projects, it will be necessary mobilise substantial resources from donors.

#### 2.2.4.3 Recommendations

UNEP project managers, with input from PCMU, should prepare revised multi-year project logframes and workplans that clearly identify the intended sub-project results over the duration of the sub-projects and provide a clear structure for reporting and monitoring – overall and at the individual country level.

UNEP senior management should take account of the conclusions of the current Danish study on administrative procedures and the UK study on harmonising procedures between UNEP and UNDP to see how improvements can be made to the administration of multi-year country level programmes.

UNEP project managers of the Capacity Building programme should meet periodically to review opportunities for better coordination between the three sub-projects taking account of the specific country level findings set out in Annex A possibly using available mechanisms such as the NCCCs and should repeat the success of the regional workshops and country-to-country exchange of experience.

UNEP branches should ensure that country focal points have a clear understanding of the scale, duration and elements of the sub-projects over the lifetime of the support – including the opportunity to adapt the budget allocation to changing needs.

UNEP senior management should review its staffing for the Capacity Building programme component and assess the need to strengthen or increase its administrative or technical resources

to meet the challenge of multi-year operational projects at country level.

UNEP senior management should consider staffing options in cases within the Capacity Building component where UNDP country offices lack spare staff resources to collaborate on managing UNEP country level programmes.

### **Sub-project level**

#### **Sub-project 1**

UNEP senior management should consider how to ensure it has the permanent technical and administrative staff resources necessary for managing sustained country level sub-projects rather than relying on project staff.

UNEP senior management should strengthen coordination between different divisions on providing assistance to countries related to PRSPs or related national planning processes – both in terms of regional coordination as well as consistency of recommended methodological approaches.

UNEP project managers should update the country focal points about the intended future role of the international partners.

#### **Sub-project 2**

UNEP task manager should ensure effective coordination between the NCSA and NCCC in each country.

UNEP should target more support to NCCC team building and developing consensus on the benefits of synergistic implementation of MEAs.

UNEP task manager should assist countries to refine NCCC workplans in the area of achieving synergistic MEA implementation.

UNEP task manager should follow through on plans to assist countries in drawing lessons from MGP projects.

#### **Sub-project 3**

The UNEP task manager should prepare a revised logframe as soon as possible.

The UNEP task manager should clarify the duration and scope of the sub-projects with the focal points.

## **2.3 Partner Collaboration**

### **2.3.1 Key Objectives**

86 The Belgian DGDC has placed a high priority on the issue of collaboration between UNEP and other donor and country level agencies – principally in the implementation of the Capacity Building programme component. It has therefore been an important theme of this evaluation to address this issue in the context of the Belgian Partnership<sup>7</sup>.

### **2.3.2 UNEP-UNDP Collaboration on Poverty and Environment**

87 The UNEP poverty environment programme was established with funding from the Government of Norway and initially operated independently. Once the Belgian Capacity Building programme component started, UNEP began to launch the process of trying to prepare country level sub-projects. It rapidly became apparent that there was a significant risk of duplication in particular with the UNDP PEI which was already active in several of the countries. This led to a discussion about integrating the UNEP and UNDP programmes. Eventually, UNEP and UNDP agreed to collaborate fully on launching poverty environment sub-projects at the country level in a selected group of African countries. This collaboration includes joint preparation of project documents, pooling of resources and jointly supported staffing in some cases.

88 As a result of previous high-level discussions, UNEP and UNDP had already agreed an MOU setting out a broad strategy for collaboration for country focused operations. This MOU provided an agreed framework for the specific PEI collaboration. In fact, the joint PEI programme has become a key example of implementation of the MOU. In this context, UNDP has appointed the Nairobi-based Director of the UNDP Drylands Development Centre as a focal point for UNEP-UNDP cooperation, including the MOU implementation<sup>8</sup>.

89 With respect to the sub-project 1 of the Capacity Building programme component, the evidence is that the UNEP and UNDP PEI team are working together effectively. There is close personal communication between the staff in New York and Nairobi. UNEP, UNDP PEI and UNDP country offices have collaborated at an operational level in two of the four countries supported by Belgium. In the other two which are not UNDP PEI countries, the evidence suggests that UNEP has tried to engage the UNDP country offices so far without success.

90 It is clear that this has worked best where UNEP and UNDP PEI have teamed up at the outset and have secured the cooperation of the UNDP country office. A good example of this is Rwanda

91 It has also been suggested that the collaboration needs to be founded on complementary roles and that for this to work best UNEP needs to focus clearly on how its expertise can represent a comparative advantage over other agencies – for example in areas of environmental assessment related to poverty-

---

<sup>7</sup> UNEP's overall programmes of work involve very many partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of agencies – including UNDP. There are of course many instances of collaboration within the assessment (DEWA) and water (GPA) programme components – however we were only able to undertake a desk study of these components.

<sup>8</sup> There are numerous other examples of UNEP collaboration with UNDP – notably within DEWA's regional programmes, including support to PRSP preparation and revision based on analysis and capacity building resulting from the integrated environmental assessment approach.

environment linkages or economic valuation of the contribution of environment and natural resources to growth<sup>9</sup>.

92 The evidence also indicates that there have been significant procedural problems that have made it hard for the two agencies to collaborate efficiently in putting country level programmes into operation. This seems to be widely acknowledged and a UK funded consultancy is about to be launched which will address this problem.

93 There are other examples of collaboration within the Belgian funded Capacity Building programme component. For example, within sub-project 2, UNEP has entered into an agreement (MOU) with UNDP in two of the four countries for the UNDP country office to administer the MGP (through their GEF SGP). Also, the UNDP and UNEP are sharing responsibilities between countries to manage the NCSAs which are closely related to sub-project 2.

94 A new and significant dimension to the collaboration between UNEP and UNDP in the context of country level capacity building is the UNEP Bali Strategic Plan – focused on UNEP delivering extensive capacity building at the country level. The Plan documents make reference to the UNEP–UNDP MOU and the experience gained so far in the joint poverty and environment work. It has been stressed that it will be important to ensure that putting the Plan into operation recognises the challenges of preparing and implementing operational country level capacity building and takes account of how this has worked in the case of the UNEP-UNDP collaboration – especially the need to work in partnership with the UNDP country offices.

95 It is worth noting that UNDP is developing a significant focus in its strategic level work on MDG based national planning processes. To support this, it is establishing what is called the Integrated Package of Services for MDGs – a programme of support to countries. Within this, UNDP is placing high priority on mainstreaming environment and the UNDP PEI, in an expanded form, will be the main platform for achieving this. In effect, mainstreaming environment into national development is likely to become UNDP's main focus in its environment programme. Therefore, in the future, the UNDP part of the joint UNEP-UNDP poverty environment programme will be undergoing significant expansion and adaptation. This will have important implications for UNEP's part of the collaboration.

### **2.3.3 Other UN Agencies and Donors**

96 UNEP has had limited occasion to collaborate directly with UN agencies and other donor agencies in the context of the Belgian Capacity Building programme component.

97 In the case of one of the PEI programmes to which UNEP has contributed under sub-project 1 (Tanzania), there is funding from other bilaterals. In the case of the two countries where, UNEP is implementing sub-project 1 without the involvement of UNDP, there have been or currently are related activities supported by other donors. There is perhaps little evidence of UNEP having consulted with other bilaterals in launching these sub-projects.

98 It is evident that the UNEP poverty environment team are in regular contact with the Nairobi representatives of interested donors, in particular the UK and Norway.

99 In the case of the Nairobi River Basin Programme which is included in the water (GPA) programme component, UNEP is jointly managing the project with UN-HABITAT. The evidence is that

---

<sup>9</sup> The key UNEP assessment approach is the Integrated Environmental Assessment (IEA) developed by DEWA.

in this case, there are also difficulties arising from different procedures and processes concerning MOUs which has caused some delays.

100 In the context of the assessment programme component, UNEP has collaborated with UN-HABITAT through a strategy document on “Urban Environment” to streamline the GEO Cities assessment work with the work of Localizing Agenda 21 (LA21) in selected Latin American Cities. The strategy is currently implemented in six countries in the region: Brazil, Peru, Cuba, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Columbia. The strategy builds on experiences developed in both agencies in the fields of urban environmental planning and management. The strategy seems to be working reasonably well although the two regional offices (UNEP, HABITAT) still, in some cases, need to clarify their respective mandates.

#### **2.3.4 National Authorities**

101 The Capacity Building programme component has involved launching the three sub-projects at the country level. This has been a challenging and prolonged process as the countries had not been consulted in advance and perceived the programme design to be very top-down. However, UNEP has engaged effectively with the national authorities, sometimes building on relationships through existing programmes such as PADELIA or NEPAD. The evidence would suggest that now there is in almost all cases a high level of ownership by the relevant national authorities. There is also a healthy willingness by the national focal points to make suggestions about how UNEP can manage the sub-projects more effectively and how the country needs can be better met.

102 It is generally acknowledged that UNEP has experienced a learning process in launching these sub-projects. Although UNEP has experience of a host of other activities at the country level, launching multi-year operational capacity building programmes is not something attempted very often in the past. There has been a need to adopt a project management approach that is more country focused than is typical of UNEP activities and which requires more direct communication and interaction with the national focal points and their host institutions.

#### **2.3.5 Recommendations**

UNEP senior management should engage with UNDP to review and shape the way in which the UNEP-UNDP MOU can be better implemented – with particular attention to the future of the UNDP PEI collaboration

UNEP senior management should ensure that the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan takes account of the lessons learned about operational country level capacity building programmes through the Capacity Building programme component

## 2.4 *Broader Findings*

103 The focus on this evaluation on the strategic goals of the Belgian Partnership and on the achievements to date of a significant UNEP initiative to address mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national planning processes in partnership with UNDP have raised a number of issues that are outside the original scope of the evaluation. Nevertheless we believe it is worth noting these briefly for consideration by UNEP management.

104 **Country based capacity building.** It is clear that UNEP is placing increased emphasis in its overall programme on country level capacity building. In the past, UNEP has delivered a host of different technical capacity building support to governments, and has played a key role in very significant technical assistance programmes such as the GEF. However, it has had relatively little experience of sustained, operational country owned programmes of capacity building – integrated into development planning and delivery processes. The adoption of the Bali Strategic Plan has created a new priority for this type of operation. The experience gained within the poverty environment programme funded by Belgium and Norway can offer significant lessons about what is required<sup>10</sup>.

105 **Methodological consistency.** It was evident that UNEP's potential contribution to mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into country led planning processes is in part its special expertise in environmental assessment. In particular, countries need to apply tools that can help them identify and quantify the contribution of environment to poverty alleviation and growth. However, it is clear that different Divisions of UNEP have developed or adopted particular methodologies or analytical tools that can be used in this context. In some cases, different methodologies with a similar purpose are being promoted by different UNEP Divisions in the same country.

106 **Country level development coordination.** There is a consensus that UNEP, like any other UN agency, needs to approach country level operational capacity building by cooperating with or working through the local UNDP country office which is responsible for coordinating the country level development assistance from the UN system. It is also evident that in many countries, there are donor harmonisation processes in place which often create mechanisms for all donor institutions to coordinate their activities focused on a particular sector such as the environment – usually with one or two donor taking the lead role.

107 **UNDP-UNEP MOU implementation.** The joint UNEP UNDP poverty environment programme is evidently the most concrete example of collaboration within the framework of the UNEP-UNDP MOU. However, it is not evident that the commitment expressed in the MOU actually brought the poverty environment collaboration into effect or that the MOU shapes how the collaboration works in practice. It does not seem clear how UNEP intends to implement the MOU in practice or what place the poverty-environment programme has within any such strategy. In particular, UNEP may need to engage with UNDP and other partners in joint programming of capacity building at the country level – to ensure that intended activities are embedded within agreed processes for support.

108 **UNEP establishment and resources for capacity building.** The experience gained through in the Belgian funded Capacity Building programme component suggests that successful preparation and management of operational capacity building at the country level requires a substantial input of both administrative and technical resources from UNEP more than is usually available for more normative UNEP activities. If UNEP is to scale up its support to this type of capacity building, there is no doubt that it will need to put in place the staffing and resources needed for the task – preferably building up teams

---

<sup>10</sup> There is of course relevant experience of capacity building accumulated over many years in other Divisions, such as DEWA and DGEF, which would also be helpful in this context.



composed of permanent rather than temporary project staff. UNEP will also need to look to other partners for the resources necessary to sustain such projects successfully.

109 **Challenge of MDG based development planning.** Given the close collaboration between UNEP and UNDP on the poverty environment programme, UNEP will need to work closely with UNDP on planning future activities. UNDP is giving priority over the coming years to providing integrated support to MDG based national planning processes and the UNDP PEI will be the key mechanism for mainstreaming environment into this endeavour. This will undoubtedly imply a significant scaling up and re-engineering of the UNDP PEI. UNEP will need to make some important decisions about how to continue the partnership with UNDP as these changes takes place and what this implies for UNEP's overall strategy for increased support of operational country based capacity building focused on mainstreaming environment into national planning processes.

## **Annexes:**

### **Annex A Findings**

- 1. Strengthening the Scientific Base and Regional Capacity for Integrated Environmental and Water Assessment**
- 2. Global Programme for Action Partnership Programme and Nairobi River Basin Programme III**
- 3. Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalisation of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reduction Programmes and Related Activities**

### **Annex B Terms of Reference**

### **Annex C List of Persons Interviewed**

## **Annex A Findings**

### **1 Strengthening the Scientific Base and Regional Capacity for Integrated Environmental and Water Assessment**

#### ***1.1 Programme Structure***

110 The programme submission to the Government of Belgium consisted of four sub-elements under the overall title of: Strengthening the Scientific Base and Regional Capacity for Integrated Environmental and Water Assessment. The total budget of this programme is USD 4,920,000 of which the Belgium authorities have provided USD 4,000,000. Additional funding was secured from the Netherlands, Norway, Luxembourg, and UNESCO.

111 The shared focus among the four sub-elements is the preparation of the fourth Global Environment Outlook report (GEO-4) by 2007, which is UNEP's flag-ship global environmental assessment. Specific activities have been identified that provide inputs to this process.

112 At the time of this evaluation, there has been one progress report – covering the period up to March 2005. The desk review of this programme is limited to providing an up-date of progress of activities and outputs against actual achievements.

#### ***1.2 Outputs, Evidence and Issues***

##### **1.2.1 Strengthening the Science Base of GEO**

113 Recognizing the complexity of environmental change and its impacts on human vulnerability at global, regional and national level this sub-element seeks to strengthen the scientific base through more active participation of the scientific community in workshops, strategic research, preparation of inputs and review as well as the development and use of indicators and indices in UNEP's monitoring and assessment activities.

114 In line with the above stated goal DEWA has for the GEO-4 embarked on a intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder consultative process to strengthen the scientific base. Presently, five regional and three global consultations have taken place with Belgium funding and more than 200 scientists and technical experts are participating as Coordinating Lead or Lead Authors in the preparation of GEO-4. In addition, a great number of scientists will be Contributing Authors and participate in the extensive Peer Review process. Contributing authors play a strategic, but less prominent role by providing very specific inputs to the drafts while the Peer Review process is a critical step in ensuring the scientific credibility of the findings as well as the legitimacy of the process.

115 The funding provided by the Belgian authorities has thus enabled DEWA to apply a “bottom-up” approach in conceptualising and further developing the GEO process as well as certain chapters which would otherwise not have been possible within the funding available. This has for example been the case with the chapter on Scenarios which has incorporated a regional capacity building component and consequently builds on regional perspectives.

116 This process has, however, resulted in realignment of some activities related to strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment to focus on capacity building, particularly to strengthen regional inputs and covers the following:

- Developing regional capacity for scenario development and modelling, and to ensure that regional perspectives and scenarios are an integral part of the Outlook (Chapter 9) in GEO-4;
- Developing a new capacity building module on Interlinkages as covered in Chapter 7, which will be part of the regional and national level GEO/IEA capacity building programme;
- Financing participation of four (4) GEO fellows from developing and transition countries;
- Capacity building to strengthen the scientific and knowledge base of assessment activities in the West Asia region;

117 The strong focus on water from the Belgian side has been a challenge to integrate into all sub-elements and has caused certain overlaps with the sub-element on water. Nevertheless, it would seem that good use have been made of existing networks on coastal management and vulnerability in drafting chapters on water in the AEO and GEO-4. There is no evidence that the realignment has caused any delays or diverted from the overall programmatic scope on the contrary it would seem that good use of adaptive management has been made. This has in part been necessary due to the fact that the programme was conceptualised prior to decisions being made on the content of the GEO-4.

118 Presently a zero draft of the GEO-4 is available, which is being revised into Draft 1 and prepared for peer review and Regional Consultations to be carried out between April and July 2006. Work on indicators, the remaining scientific workshops, and study of emerging issues will be carried out in 2006-2007.

<b>Needs:                      To broaden participation of the scientific community in the UNEP assessment process at regional and global levels, thereby, strengthening UNEP's scientific base for assessment and monitoring of the environment and environmental change</b>						
Results:	Objective verified indicators:	Outputs:	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
Greater involvement of the scientific community in UNEP's assessment process  Enhanced understanding of global environmental change and interactions at global, regional and national level	Participation of the scientific community increased between 2004-2007  Incorporation of new scientific findings in GEO related materials in the next 4 years  New scientific approaches and concepts and research findings incorporated in GEO 2007	10 Global and regional science workshops	Organise 10 global and regional science workshops to:  Advise on the process for greater involvement of the scientific community in UNEP's assessment work  Provide scientific input to the assessment of the environment and global env. change	<u>Multi stakeholder Regional Consultations</u> Belgian counterpart funding was used to support (5) meetings in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, North America and West Asia. (Sept-Oct 2004) <b>Completed</b>  <u>Global consultation on GEO.</u> 96 gov and 50 stakeholder groups representing intergovernmental org, non-governmental org, and the scientific community participated in the consultation. (Feb 2005). In following up govts were requested to nominate scientific experts to participate in GEO-4 processes(200 received -13 currently participating in GEO-4-remaining will be involved in the Peer Review scheduled for April – June 2006 and in Regional Consultations May-June 2006). <b>On-going</b>  <u>Global Workshop</u> The first Global and Regional Scenario Development workshop for GEO-4, Chapter 9, Bangkok, Thailand, 12-15 September 2005. <b>Completed</b>  <u>Global Workshop</u> To increase participation by scientists dealing with atmospheric issues.(Dec. 2005). <b>Completed</b>  <u>Regional inputs to GEO-4:</u>	Progress report (March 2005) Reports of Regional GEO Ad Hoc Expert consultations   Statement by the global Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder consultation on the scope and process of the fourth GEO presented to GC.(UNEP/GC.23/CRP.5 22 Feb 2005)  Progress report (March 2005)  Report of the first Global and Regional Scenario Development workshop for GEO-4 Chapter 9.  Report of the GEO-4 Chapter 2 Lead Authors Meeting, 25-26 September 2005, York, UK.	Main recommendations pointed to increasing focus on policy issues and action, and developing a communications strategy so that the findings will better reach a wide variety of end users. Results of the regional consultations fed into the Global Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder Consultation on the GEO-4 and the outline of GEO-4.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To LAC for Chapter 8 (Challenges and Opportunities) and Chapter 10 of GEO-4 (). They have also been used for a GEO-4 Regional Consultation in January 2006 in Trinidad, in order to review the section of the LAC Regional Perspectives as well as to organize a meeting of the Regional Scenario Group.</li> <li>To Asia and the Pacific for sub-regional inputs to GEO-4 for Chapters 2, 6, 8 and 9 and sub-regional datasets.</li> </ul> <p><b>On-going</b></p> <p><u>Pilot GEO Fellowship programme</u> Introduced in 2005 a total of 37 Fellows (51% female and 49% male). The objective of the pilot programme is to bring young scientists into a global assessment process, thereby giving them experience of assessing global environmental change and policy analysis so that they can then go on to work at regional or global level in the future. Belgian partnership funds were used to support the participation of four GEO Fellows from Uganda, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and Ukraine.</p> <p><b>On-going</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOU with Fundación México-Estados Unidos para la Ciencia and the University of Chile</li> <li>MOU with the Cropper Foundation, the Institute of Marine Affairs and the University of the West Indies Trinidad Campus</li> </ul> <p>MOU with The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI).</p>	
		Review candidate environmental sustainability indicators and indexes	<p>This activity will be carried out in 2006-2007</p> <p><b>Not yet initiated</b></p>		

		<p>Review the status of scientific research in water and other key areas on global environmental change</p>	<p><u>Global Workshop to Increase Participation by Scientists</u> dealing with atmospheric issues was held in September 2005, to draft inputs to Chapter 2 of GEO-4. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>Water related activities were executed in conjunction with Element (d) (see description of water publications in table on water). Vulnerability of surface and ground water, and the results have fed into Chapter 4 of GEO-4 on water and AEO. <b>On-going</b></p>	<p>GEO-4 (Chapter 2 Atmosphere-Lead Authors' Meeting 25-26 September 2005, York).</p>	
		<p>Assess emerging environmental issues identified through GEO process such as the interlinkages between excess nitrogen loading aquatic ecosystems and human health</p>	<p><u>Contribution to MA survey report "Marine and Coastal Eco-systems and Human Well-Being"</u>. In both reports, issues related to excess nitrogen loading aquatic ecosystems and human health have been addressed. <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>Coordination and contributions to Chapter 5 of the World Water Dev. Report 2: "Coastal and Freshwater Ecosystems"</u>, (to be published in 2006.) <b>On-going</b></p> <p><u>Chapter on biophysical interlinkages</u>, This chapter in GEO-4 includes water degradation and biodiversity loss in freshwater systems, their impacts on ecosystem services and consequences for human well-being, including health. <b>On-going</b></p>	<p>MOU with UNU/Institute for Advanced Studies</p>	
		<p>Commission desk studies on selected emerging issues such as assessment of water related environmental consequences of food</p>	<p>UNEP is reassessing which emerging issue to focus on during the 2006-2007 biennium in the light of recent developments such as the International Assessment of Agricultural Science &amp; Technology for Development (FAO, UNEP, UNDP, UNESCO, World</p>		

		<p>production towards 2030 Prepare workshop and technical reports draft inputs to GEO-4.</p>		<p>Bank, WHO and GEF), the Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture (IWMI) and other studies. <b><i>Not yet initiated</i></b></p> <p><u>Capacity building for Integrated Environmental Assessment (IEA).</u> MoUs signed with a number of institutions to develop regional capacity for scenario development and modelling, and ensure that regional perspectives and scenarios are an integral part of the Outlook in GEO -4. In addition an MOU has been signed in November 2005 with the United Nations University/Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU/IAS) as part of the development of a new capacity building module on interlinkages related to Chapter 7 of GEO-4. UNU/IAS will develop a stand-alone capacity building module which will be part of the GEO/IEA capacity building programme. <b><i>On-going</i></b></p> <p><u>Specific capacity building activities in West Asia</u> to strengthen the scientific base of assessment at national and regional levels. They comprise the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a capacity building strategy for West Asia</li> <li>• Development of the West Asia Global Environment Outlook Data Portal: Phase I under an agreement with Environmental Research and Wildlife Development Agency (ERWDA), UAE</li> <li>• Support the development of a State of Environment (Outlook) report for Syria</li> <li>• Support the preparation of the state of the Marine Environment report (SOMER) for the Regional</li> </ul>	<p>MoUs have been signed with the following institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African Futures Institute</li> <li>• Arabian Gulf University (AGU)</li> <li>• University of West Indies</li> <li>• University of Denver</li> <li>• Stockholm Environment Institute</li> <li>• The Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency</li> <li>• UNU/Institute for Advanced Studies</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Asia Capacity Building Strategy</li> <li>• Priority Environmental Indicators in West Asia</li> <li>• Latest design of the West Asia Data Portal</li> <li>• MoU with ERWDA.</li> <li>• MOU with the Ministry of Land Administration and Environment, Syria</li> <li>• MOU with ROPME</li> <li>• Covers of the CDs.</li> <li>• West Asia Information Note</li> </ul>	<p>There has been some realignment of activities related to strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment to focus on capacity building in order to strengthen regional inputs, particularly in the Outlook Chapter of GEO-4. These developments are also closely linked to implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building at national and regional levels. The realignment covers the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Developing regional capacity for scenario development and modelling, and to ensure that regional perspectives and scenarios are an integral part of the Outlook Chapter in GEO-4;</li> <li>b) Developing a new capacity building module on Interlinkages which will be part of the regional and national level GEO/IEA capacity building programme;</li> <li>c) Capacity building to strengthen the scientific and knowledge base of assessment activities in the West Asia region.</li> </ol>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



				<p>Organisation for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) Sea area (i.e. Bahrain, I.R. Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Knowledge base CDs have been produced for Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, UAE, Yemen.</li> <li>• A regional workshop on Policy Analysis for Integrated Environmental Assessment (IEA) in West Asia from 18-20 December 2005</li> </ul> <p><i>completed</i></p>		
		GEO-4 published by 2007		<p><u>GEO-4</u> Preliminary draft (Draft 0) of the 10 chapters has been prepared, and was reviewed and revised at the Second Production and Authors Meeting which took place in Nairobi from 6-10 March 2006. This will result in the first draft (Draft 1) which will be submitted 14 April for Peer Review and Regional Consultations during April to June 2006.</p> <p>Belgian funds have been used to support development of draft global or regional inputs to GEO-4 for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2 on Air;</li> <li>• Chapter 3 on Water which has drawn from the vulnerability of ground and surface water work funded under Element (d) of the partnership;</li> <li>• Chapter 6 regional inputs to Asia and the Pacific;</li> <li>• Chapter 8 regional inputs for Latin America and the Caribbean;</li> <li>• Regional inputs to the Outlook Chapter 9;</li> <li>• Chapter 10 regional inputs for Latin America and the Caribbean;</li> </ul>	Interviews with staff	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Related capacity building including in West Asia and for Chapters 7, 9 and 10 on Interlinkages (see above and Comments section).</li></ul> <p><i>On-going</i></p>		
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

## 1.2.2 Preparation of the African Environment Outlook

119 The Africa Environment Outlook (AEO) report seeks to provide a comprehensive and integrated analysis of Africa's environment. It contains a detailed assessment of the current state of the environment in the region. Additionally, the preparation process is based on wide consultation and participation between UNEP and various partners in the Africa region. It reflects a variety of regional and sub-regional perspectives and priorities. The AEO process involves six collaborating centres (CCs) producing sub-regional environment assessment and policy retrospective reports for Central Africa, Eastern Africa, Northern Africa, Southern Africa, Western Africa and the Western Indian Ocean Islands.

120 The integrated environmental assessment methodology used in the AEO process seeks to answer four questions that are key to effective decision making:

- What is happening to the environment?
- Why is it happening?
- What can we do and what are we doing about it?
- What will happen if we do not act now?

121 The original logframe includes an indicator on the review of trends of environment and emerging issues in Africa by 2007. A consolidated draft of the AEO-2 is currently being reviewed and will be launched in May 2006. More than 100 scientists have been engaged in the AEO-2 process in different fora including consultative meetings. Within the capacity building initiative of the AEO-2 process, seventeen (17) countries and four (4) sub-regions are preparing national and sub-regional environment outlook reports using the IEA methodology, four (4) of which have been published. Additionally the Lake Victoria Basin -ecosystem report is in the process of being finalised.

122 Considerable efforts have also gone into developing a set of indicators based on the NEPAD and MDGs and using the Driving Force Pressure-State Impact –Response (DPSIR) framework for analysis. These indicators are intended to help governments in producing national reports and highlighting key issues. A reduced set of core indicators for the AEO has furthermore been developed. In carrying out this work. Some data gaps have also been identified based on the AEO-2/NEPAD themes-issues-indicator matrix. It is expected that within the Africa Environment Information Network, this process will be further strengthened to facilitate better reporting at the regional level

123 Based on the above it would seem that there is healthy progress with respect to this sub-element.

<p>Needs: To identify and develop an appropriate set of indicators or index which can be used to evaluate and measure a particular environmental issue and contribute to a scientifically credible basis for decision making.</p> <p>To keep under review the state and trends of the environment in Africa as well as emerging environmental issues in order to provide a strong foundation for a regional approach to addressing environmental challenges in Africa.</p>								
Objective verified indicators	Results	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Objective verified indicators	Activities:	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
<p>Key environmental indicators such as those relating to water and the MDGs and indexes such as Ecological footprint reviewed</p> <p>Appropriate set of indicators and/or indexes identified and developed by 2007 to measure environmental issues</p> <p>State and trends of the environment in Africa</p>	<p>Improved information available for policy formulation processes and development of effective national, regional global agendas to respond to current and emerging environmental challenges.</p> <p>Tested and evaluated Indicators or sets of indicators to measure particular environmental issues and provide scientifically credible basis for decision making.</p>	<p>Emerging Environmental issues identified periodically(AEO2 developed by external institutions in dev. countries)</p>	<p>Assessment report of indicators and indexes such as land air and water based Human Environment Index and the ecological footprint</p>	<p>Assessment report of indicators and indexes published by 2007</p>	<p>Track the implementation of the MDGs in Africa and review the implementation of the goals adopted by the world summit on Sustainable development.</p>	<p><u>Working groups on Data, Policy and Scenarios established</u> Policy and scenario working groups established. <b>completed</b></p> <p>A comprehensive data and indicator matrix designed by the data working group to guide the collection of data and information by the contributors to the AEO-2. <b>completed</b></p> <p>A set of about sixty (60) core regional environmental indicators have been developed for the AEO-2 process. <b>completed</b></p> <p><u>Workshop Cairo 2004.</u> Consensus on the structure of chapter 4(scenario)and chapter 6 policy recommendations of the AEO 2 report established</p>	<p>Matrix/Interviews /Progress report March 2005</p> <p>Progress report 2005</p>	<p>Data collection for AEO2 is streamlined and focused and gov. support the initiative. Countries involved also use indicator matrix to identify and collect data for national environmental assessment and reporting.</p> <p>The matrix has been useful in guiding AEIN countries and the AEO collaborating centres in identifying the priority indicators for environmental assessment and reporting as well as streamlining the indicators in the region, based on agreed upon regional developmental targets such as NEPAD, MDG, PRSPs, etc.</p>

<p>reviewed and emerging env issues identified by 2007</p>						<p><b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>Compiling of National Data Sets</u> Data collection and verification by members of the AEO Data Working Group (AEO-DWG) made up of a member from each of the 6 AEO sub-regions in its final stages and is due to completion in March 2006 ( AEO-2 data compendium and the AEO-2 Indicator booklet).</p> <p><b>On-going</b></p> <p><u>Joint UNEP/UNSD Workshop on Environmental statistics for ECOWAS</u> (March 2005)</p> <p><b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>AEO Meta Database</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AEO-Environmental Information System toolkit has been developed in three (3) languages (English, French and Arabic).</li> <li>• Fifty-two (52) participants from twenty-five (25) English and French speaking countries have participated in</li> </ul>	<p>Progress Report 2005</p> <p><a href="http://gridnairobi.unep.org/ao_prototype/index.asp">http://gridnairobi.unep.org/ao_prototype/index.asp</a></p> <p>Progress Report March 2005/workshop report</p> <p>The GEO Africa Data Portal prototype (the web</p>	<p>Enhanced cooperation between UNEP/DEWA and UN statistics Division in the collection of environmental statistics.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

						<p>capacity building training workshops on data and information management.</p> <p><u>Guidelines for Integrated Environmental Policy Analysis in the AEO process</u> <i>completed</i></p> <p><u>Regional Consultative Meeting, Nairobi Kenya (April 2004 )</u> <i>Completed</i></p> <p><u>Training workshop in integrated environmental assessment and reporting (IEAR)</u> Workshops were held for all the Africa sub-regions and have been attended by a total of 120 participants (30 women 90 men) from different parts of Africa. <i>completed</i></p> <p><u>Lake Victoria Basin - ecosystem report- Eastern Africa</u> (currently being published) <i>On-going</i></p>	<p>interface of the AEO-EIS toolkit</p> <p>Guidelines/ Progress report march 2005</p> <p>Meeting Report</p> <p>Draft</p> <p>Publication</p>	<p>Refined structure of AEO2 and implementation of the NEPAD Env. initiative and MDGs. Process praised by AMCEN and endorsed by ministers during 10<sup>th</sup> session Libya 2004. Increased commitment and interest from the academic institutions and individual experts Improved draft contents to AEO2 The objective of the meeting was to identify the relevant key issues for the thematic areas of AEO-2, and where possible suggest some indicators that could be used in analyzing these issues. The meeting was also to finalize the structure of the report 17 countries and 4 sub-regions undertaking the national and sub-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			Outlook	inputs for AEO report prepared by 2005	Outlook report	<p><u>“Africa Environment Outlook Past, Present and Future: Towards AEO-2” (Booklet)</u> <b>completed</b></p> <p><u>“Africa Environment Tracking issues and Development (booklet)</u> <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>Technical meeting of experts on Freshwater (2004).</u> of the theme and also constituted a task force to prepare a draft write up for review by various experts in the region. <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>Technical meeting of experts on Coastal/Marine (2004)</u> <b>Completed</b> <u>AEO-2</u> Consolidated draft has been finalized and peer reviewed by 110 experts in Africa. The draft was further reviewed by AMCEN Inter Agency Technical Committee in October 2005. The report is undergoing editing and design and will be launched at the 11<sup>th</sup> session of AMCEN, in Congo Brazzaville (May 2006). <b>On-going</b></p>	Publication	<p>regional environment outlook reporting using IEAR methodologies</p> <p>This booklet which was produced in 2004 describes the process of preparing the AEO-2 and its current status, its objectives and structure and complementary products. It is not entirely clear who the target audience for this publication is but it is presumed that it is decision makers. It is supposed to provide information on progress of the AEO-2 report and act as a catalyst for enhanced commitment to integrated environmental assessment and reporting at different levels in Africa.</p> <p>The booklets seeks to keep policy makers informed in order to enable them to strategize at the regional and national and local levels.</p>
--	--	--	---------	----------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 1.2.3 GEO for Cities in Latin America and the Caribbean

124 This project, which is the second phase of the GEO cities project aims at promoting better understanding of the dynamics of cities and their environments, providing local governments, scientists, policy makers and the public in general in the region with reliable and up to date information about cities.

125 The objectives of the project are to:

- Recognize the links between environment conditions and human activities, especially those related to urban development;
- Contribute to build local technical capacities that will permit integrated assessments to be made on the state of the urban environment;
- Guide consensus building on the most critical environmental problems in each city by encouraging all sectors of society to engage in dialogue and participate in the decision making process;
- Make it possible to formulate and implement urban strategies and plans that will help cities improve urban environmental management;
- Encourage the creation of institutional networks in the city.

126 Overall the work on GEO Cities seems to be progressing well. The activities carried out are in line with the original log-frame.

127 The result stated in the log-frame which expands the capacity building activities to other regions including Africa does not seem to be consciously followed through with Belgian funding. However, the methodology is being duplicated in Africa with funds from the Environment Fund. DEWA Africa is implementing the initiative in three cities (Nairobi, Lusaka, and Dakar) and a cities manual is being developed. DEWA is also planning to use the GEO Cities Methodology for urban assessment in the Asia-Pacific Region.

128 The main indicator of increased number of cities which are using the GEO Methodology is on track. Agreements have been reached with six municipalities and two are currently being negotiated and a request have been received from the Municipality of Cancun, Mexico. In addition, approximately 70 people have been trained to date and it is expected that by March 2006 an additional 100 people will have been trained.

129 According to UNEP officials, immediate impact is already visible in that cities such as Sao Paulo and Santo Andre in Brazil are taking the initiative to use the GEO cities methodology without any financial assistance from UNEP.

130 Furthermore, the increasing visibility of the GEO Cities project and its methodology is reflected in the increasing number of invitations that UNEP receive to take part in events concerning urban environmental assessment and management. The project was represented at the National Seminar: "Peruvian Experience in Planning and Urban-Environmental Management" in Lima, Peru (20-23 October 2004); the XIII General Assembly of Ministers and Housing and Urban Authorities of LAC/ IX Iberoamerican Forum of Ministers and Authorities of Housing and Urban Authorities in San Jose, Costa Rica (25-28 October 2004); the Forum "Ciudad de Mexico: Ocaso o Sustentabilidad" in Mexico City, Mexico (29 October 2004); the Forum "Support for the reduction of urban poverty in Mexico" in Mexico City, Mexico (9 February 2005); the 2005 Global Meeting of the Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) and Localizing Agenda 21 Programme (LA21) in Havana, Cuba (26 June - 1 July 2005); the Fourth Seminar and the Urban Environmental Fair of the Network of the Authorities for the Urban-Environmental Management in the Cities of Latin America and the Caribbean in Panama City, Panama



(2 – 3 August 2005); the “Regional Consultation - Water in Human Settlements in Latin American and Caribbean” in preparation for the 4th World Water Forum, in Mexico City, Mexico (8-9 November 2005), and the UN-HABITAT JAM which consisted in a global internet-based event (1 – 3 December 2005).

131 Other indicators such as “GEO LAC reports largely undertaken by municipal stakeholders and UNEP plays advisory role” is more difficult to measure as no target has been set and it is unclear what the baseline was. However, the above mentioned cases of two cities in Brazil which are starting urban environmental assessments using the GEO Cities Methodology with UNEP only providing technical inputs, is a good illustration of the popularity and perceived utility of the tool by municipalities in the region. Further, from the explanations given from DEWA it would seem that the process taking place is largely undertaken by municipal stakeholders such as representatives of municipalities or by technical institutions (e.g. universities, NGOs). UNEP trains the team and other key stakeholders in the city on how to use the GEO Cities Methodology. UNEP also accompanies them throughout the assessment until they produce a final output in form of a report. UNEP in almost all cases takes the role of the main facilitator in the initial capacity building workshop and stays in close contact with the members of the core team through regular telephone and email communications, monitoring their progress. When necessary, UNEP or a person from of the GEO Cities expert network visits the cities to provide additional support needed. UNEP reviews, and revise when necessary, all technical documents produced during an assessment process. Advisory service on editing, designing, and printing processes as well as launching of a report is also available to the core team through UNEP.

Objective verified indicators	Results:	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
Overall Needs: To build the capacity of regional, national and municipal organisations to undertake environmental assessments that will underpin decision-making at different levels.							
Increased N of cities using GEO methodology in env. assessment process	Strengthened IEA and reporting capacities in 9 cities in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru and in other regions including Africa	-LAC GEO cities reports are largely undertaken by municipal stakeholders and UNEP plays a advisory role	9 Geo cities reports published by 2007	Dev. and print 1000 copies of the GEO Cities Andes strategy/outreach booklet;	<u>Draft outreach booklet developed by the University of Pacific with help of UNEP/HABITAT</u> <b>Completed</b>	Draft Outreach booklet  Strategy	Strategy agreed upon in 2004 is currently implemented in six countries in the region : Brazil, Peru, Cuba, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Columbia. The agreement does not correspond exclusively to the Belgium Partnership, but the Andean Sub-Region, where much of the funds from Belgium have been targeted as this is the area where the strategy is implemented most effectively.  The strategy builds on experiences developed in both agencies in the fields of urban environmental planning and management and is supporting municipalities and cities in preparing urban-environment assessments based on the UNEP GEO Cities Programme.
				Organise in collaboration with the technical and political partners, 9 capacity building and orientation workshops to train at least 450 people in GEO Cities	<u>Urban Environmental Strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP/HABITAT)</u> <b>Completed</b>		



Objective verified indicators	Results:	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
				<p>Launch and distribute the nine (9) Geo Cities reports</p>	<p>Loja (Ecuador) Final draft of GEO Loja report being prepared (expected to be published in August 2006)</p> <p>Chiclayo (Peru) – first draft delivered UNEP sent comments. Review workshop (March 2006)</p> <p>For cities where agreements are being negotiated it is expected that reports will be published in second half of 2007.</p> <p><b><i>On-going</i></b></p>		

#### **1.2.4 Vulnerability of surface and ground water in Africa, Latin America and Asia, including regional assessments of transboundary freshwater agreements and treaties. (Budget 1.180.00 USD).**

132 At the time of this evaluation the water unit has completed six activities: One project, three publications; and two workshops In addition, two drafts are available and further two publications are on-going. Updating the Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database is foreseen for 2006-2007.

133 Overall the water unit seem to address the identified need of assessing vulnerability of key water resources in Africa, Latin American countries and Asia to environmental change. Although focus so far has been predominately on Africa. Out of eleven outputs that the water unit has either completed or are in the process of completing seven are publications. The constant challenge that the unit faces in the production of these publications are how to make them relevant to policy makers. The unit has forged links with African Ministerial Council on Water (AMCOW) in order to address this issue.

134 The project on Assessment of Pollution status and Vulnerability of Water Supply Aquifers of African cities was successful in determining the status and vulnerability of groundwater suppliers in cities of eleven countries and enhancing scientific capacities. However, it was noted that the impact of influencing policy at both national and regional and local level is still largely of local significance.

135 The publications have been widely distributed and efforts have been made to involve the AMCOW in the processes of developing these publications. For example the publication on “Hydropolitical Vulnerability and Resilience along International Waters” includes a foreword by the president of AMCOW. The Water unit intends to make this a standard for relevant publications.

136 Additionally the water unit provided support to the African Environment Outlook-2 (AEO-2) process by contributing and editing sections on Freshwater and Costal and Marine waters. These sections feed into chapter 2 of the AEO report on the state of the environment and opportunities for development. The chapter on Freshwater succeeds in providing a brief synthesis of the state of water resources and challenges to water resource management in Africa. By structuring the chapter around the shared water vision framework and road map an attempt has been made to provide policy relevant analysis and recommendations. The chapter reiterates all the key issues in water management and provides a positive outlook. However, it is less clear how the chapter provides guidance for monitoring the MDGs and NEPAD priorities as no baseline has been established.

Objective verified indicators:	Results:	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Objective verified indicators	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
Needs: To assess the vulnerability of key water resources in Africa, Latin American countries and Asia to environmental change, examine data trends and interrelated factors and up date existing information								
To review, update and analyze transboundary freshwater treaties and agreements at a regional scale covering Africa, Latin America and Asian countries								
<p>Reports from assessment of vulnerability of key water resources in Africa-AMCOW - data trends, causative factors and information available in hard copies and in electronic version between 2004-2007 to scientific community and decision makers;</p> <p>- report on vulnerability assessment in Africa, LAC, Asia which includes review the treaties and agreements at transboundary scale.</p>	<p>Information and data on vulnerability of Water resources available to the AMCOW and governments in Africa for policy making</p> <p>Review, up-date and analysis of transboundary freshwater treaties and agreements at regional scale covering Africa, Lac and</p>	<p>Comprehensive report on vulnerability of water resources is made widely relevant to decision makers in Africa, LAC and Asia by 2007</p>	<p>Water vulnerability assessment report for Africa, LAC and Asia publication 2006</p>	<p>Water vulnerability Assessment report (Africa, LAC, Asia) published by 2006</p>	<p>Assess the vul. of water resources in Africa, LAC, Asia.</p>	<p><u>Assessment of vul of water resources to environmental change in Africa.</u> <b>Completed for Africa</b></p> <p><u>Assessment of vulnerability of water resources to environmental change in Asia..</u> <b>On-going.</b> <i>(publication is estimated to be ready in July 2006.)</i></p> <p><u>Assessment of vulnerability of water resources to environmental change in Africa phase II-preparatory.</u> <b>On-going</b></p> <p><u>Africa's Lakes: An Atlas of Environmental Change</u> <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>Assessment of the "Hydropolitical Vulnerability and</u></p>	<p>"Facing the Facts"</p> <p>Draft</p> <p>Draft</p> <p>Draft</p>	<p>Publication has been distributed to AMCOW, the Pan African Start Secretariat, the UN Environmental Management Group, universities.</p> <p>Timely publication launched at the 11<sup>th</sup> World lakes Conference in Nairobi on November 1<sup>st</sup> 2005. The Atlas received huge media attention with approximately 40 press articles issued.</p> <p>Describes the quality of legal pacts governing access to lakes in Africa and highlights several possible flashpoint of political instability This publication</p>

Objective verified indicators:	Results:	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Objective verified indicators	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
					<p>Organise workshop related to the assessment</p> <p>Draft review edit and produce the assessment report on the vul. Of water resources in Africa, LAC and Asia.</p>	<p><u>Resilience along International Water: Africa</u> <i>Draft available. Publication due in January 2006</i></p> <p><i>The Latin America series is on going.</i></p> <p><u>Support to Regional consultation on coordination mechanism for water Assessment and Policy in Africa.</u> Meeting <i>Completed June 2005</i></p> <p><u>Assessment of pollution status and vulnerability of water supply aquifers.</u> <i>Completed</i></p> <p><u>Workshop organised in Western Cape 28-30 November 2005</u> <i>Completed</i></p> <p><u>Input to African Environment Outlook II</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freshwater <i>completed</i></li> <li>• Coastal and Marine Waters</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluation October 2005</p> <p>Policy statement</p> <p>Draft</p>	<p>includes a foreword by the President of the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) which indicates some relevance to the policy processes related to water documents are provided.</p> <p>Workshop concluded with a message to decision makers which calls for a cooperative programme with the focus on sustainable utilization of groundwater in Africa.</p>

Objective verified indicators:	Results:	Objective verified indicators	Outputs:	Objective verified indicators	Activities	Achievements	Evidence	Comments
						<p><i>completed</i></p> <p><u>Updating Transboundary freshwater Dispute database (TFDD)</u></p> <p><i>No up-date has taken place. Expected to be followed up in 2006-2007.</i></p>	Draft	



## **2 Global Programme for Action Partnership Programme and Nairobi River Basin Programme - Phase III**

### ***2.1 Programme Structure and Management***

137 This programme component includes:

- i) the Belgian contribution to a larger integrated programme – the Global Programme of Action Partnership Programme: Protection of the marine environment from land-based activities
- ii) the Nairobi River Basin Programme Phase III

138 The GPA Programme is a well established programme (set up in 1995) supported by a number of donors. The Belgian contribution is USD 2,000,000 over four years. Within the GPA there are several related components. It is managed by the GPA coordination office in The Hague, which is part of DEPI. The Belgian government had provided considerable financial support to the GPA prior to the establishment of the Partnership with UNEP.

139 This evaluation has conducted a brief desk study of this programme component with the intent of providing a broad overview of progress to date and any issues that may be relevant to the achievement of the intended results.

140 The main element to this desk study has been to assess the achievement of planned outputs and to follow up with a number of telephone interviews with GPA officials. The original project document submitted to the Belgians provides a detailed logframe for each component. A progress report was submitted by UNEP to the Belgian government covering the period January 2004 to March 2005. This report provides a brief summary of progress on specific activities in the project document planned to take place in 2004. This follows a similar progress report submitted at the same time on the period 2000-2003. Although this does not cover the period of this evaluation, it is a useful source of background information.

141 In addition, in November 2005 the GPA coordination office prepared narrative style progress updates for most of the individual components covering the period 2001-2005. There is a good deal of useful information in these reports but they are not designed to show progress against the planned activities and outputs in the project document for the time period covered by the Partnership or to give any structured assessment of the achievement of results. Therefore the principal focus of the evaluation has been to establish, with the help of GPA staff, the current status of the programme components – especially the achievement of planned activities and outputs.

142 The Nairobi River Basin Programme Phase III is also included in this programme component. After Phases I and II, the Belgian DGDC supported a major review of the lessons learned and provided funds for a bridging phase to enable UNEP and its partner agencies (UN-HABITAT and UNDP) to prepare Phase III. The Belgian DGDC has approved funds of USD 644,000 for Phase III.

143 This project was covered in the GPA progress report. In addition, there was an appraisal of the bridging phase conducted by the Belgian DGDC in May 2004.

## **2.2 *Outputs, Evidence and Issues***

### **2.2.1 The GPA**

144 The Belgian support to the GPA is composed of the following components

- The National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land Based Activities (NPA)
- Physical Alterations and Destructions of Habitats (PADH)
- Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM)
- Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater (SAP)

### **2.2.2 NPA**

145 The table below presents the current status of this component in terms of achievement of planned outputs and activities – indicating the available documentary evidence. The NPA is essentially the umbrella for the GPA programme as a whole – a flexible framework for national policy and priority actions aimed at protecting the marine environment from land-based pollution. Overall, the objective has been to support the process of developing NPAs in more than 70 countries through technical support, such as the NPA Handbook, seed money and facilitation.

146 Earlier Belgian funding supported NPAs in nearly 20 countries – partly through a regional effort, for example in the Pacific and Caribbean. Under the Partnership funding, the target is to launch another 20 – with a focus on West Africa and the CPPS (South Eastern Pacific) region.

147 UNEP’s financial support is modest and can be seen as seed money to enable a country to launch a policy review process and to ensure that protecting the marine is integrated into national level policy processes such as PRSPs. The aim is to generate political momentum, create public awareness and engage stakeholders. Additionally, the aim is to identify pilot projects and leverage funds from other sources.

148 The focus on a regional approach is the result of lessons learned in the earlier stages of the GPA. Working through regional mechanisms, such as regional seas programmes or regional GEF programmes, should enable UNEP’s funds to achieve greater impacts compared to working to launch NPAs in individual countries.

149 Another lesson from earlier experience is that the NPA should focus on longer term domestic resource mobilisation and financing for implementation to ensure that there is a basis for the process to be sustained.

150 According to the GPA officials, the achievements of outputs and issues to date can be summarised as follows:

- The status of the individual NPAs is presented in the table below
- There have been some challenges to overcome in engaging other partners at the regional level which has involved a prolonged effort by UNEP. The CPPS initiative is further advanced than the GGCLME region
- There has been an increased focus on current macro-level processes such as PRSPs and UNDAF
- There has been a strong emphasis on stakeholder engagement, public awareness and partnerships with the private sector
- There has been some success in leveraging funds from other donors

- The GPA coordination office has updated its NPA Handbook to take account of lessons learned and will pilot it in 2006
- The GPA provides feedback to the countries to ensure that the NPAs focus on implementation and enforcement responsibilities and next steps

151 The GPA coordination office have identified some achievement of results in terms of better integration into national policy processes, higher levels of political commitment, increased stakeholder participation, better regional capacity to address these issues, launching of pilot projects and leveraging of funds in certain cases. There is no evidence available to address the extent of these results systematically.

**GPA - NPAs funded by Belgium 2004-2007 – Status: December 2005**

Country	Summary Status	Core Team	Identification priorities	Stakeholder consultations	Identification of activities, design of work plan	Adoption by relevant national authorities
<b>Bangladesh</b>	Revised NPA ready for submission to Government	X	X	X	X	
<b>CPPS:</b>						
<b>Chile</b>	MOU signed; implementation of pilot project ongoing	X	X		X	
<b>Colombia</b>	MOU to be signed shortly	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Ecuador</b>	MOU to be signed shortly	X	X		X	
<b>Panama</b>	MOU signed; implementation of pilot project ongoing	X	X		X	
<b>Peru</b>	MOU signed; implementation of pilot project ongoing	X	X		X	
<b>GCLME:</b>						
<b>Benin</b>	First national workshop held					
<b>Ghana</b>	First national workshop held					
<b>Nigeria</b>	Draft available; to be finalised shortly	X	X	X	X	
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	First national workshop held					
<b>Togo</b>	First national workshop held					

Prepared by UNEP GPA Coordination Office December 2005

<b>GPA Component 1: NPAs</b>		
<b>Outputs &amp; Activities</b>	<b>Reporting Statement</b>	
<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p>1.1 A politically supported NPA in Bangladesh.</p> <p>1.2 Up to twenty drafted/pilot NPAs, as a part of GEF projects in the CPPS and West Africa (GCLME) regions, incorporating innovative technical and financial arrangements.</p> <p>1.3 Enhanced networks for the exchange of information and training on at the regional level.</p> <p>1.4 An international conference representing a major milestone in a WSSD Type II partnership that directly addresses the objectives of the GPA.</p>	<p>1.1. Revised NPA ready for submission to Government</p> <p>1.2. Status per country as described in attached table on status</p> <p>1.3. Web-based Network of Practitioners launched in Cairns, 2004. Available at <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/forum/php/bin/login/login.php">http://www.gpa.unep.org/forum/php/bin/login/login.php</a></p> <p>1.4. H2O conference held in Cairns, 11-14 May 2004</p>	<p>1.1 GPA NPA Update Nov 2005, page 2</p> <p>1.2 Attached table on status; GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); GPA NPA Update Nov 2005, page 3</p> <p>1.3 GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25);</p> <p>1.4 GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); H2O Communiqué</p>
<p><b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</b></p> <p>1.1 Endorsement of NPA by the Government of Bangladesh.</p> <p>1.2 Progress towards improved capacity by the respective governments to adopt and implement targeted interventions within the pilot NPAs.</p> <p>1.3 Assessments indicate that measurable process towards protection of the marine environment within the NPA framework has been achieved.</p> <p>1.4 Wide participation in and contribution to the H2O Partnership Conference on NPAs.</p>	<p>1.1. Preparation in process, expected to take place early 2006</p> <p>1.2. See attached table on status</p> <p>1.3. Assessments to be initiated, review among others at the GPA Intergovernmental Review Meeting, October 2006, Beijing, China</p> <p>1.4. H2O conference held in Cairns, 11-14 May 2004</p>	<p>1.1 GPA NPA Update Nov 2005, page 2</p> <p>1.2 Attached table No. 1; GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); GPA NPA Update Nov 2005, page 3</p> <p>1.3 N/a</p> <p>1.4 GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); H2O Communiqué</p>
<p><b>Activities:</b></p> <p>1.1 Designate a Core Team in each of the participating countries.</p> <p>1.2 Identify, from existing documentation, priority land-based sources and activities of marine pollution and feasible options for management intervention, taking into account, <i>inter alia</i>, suggested methods, and approaches and targets identified by the GPA (respectively in its Chapters II and V of the GPA).</p> <p>1.3 Consultations with all stakeholders in the process, at national and/or local levels as means of deciding on measures and partnerships to address priority concerns, identify activities and key stakeholders, costing, responsibilities, etc.</p> <p>1.4 Identify, agree and draft realistic concrete actions, targets and measures, along with costed plans for interventions with corresponding institutional responsibilities and timetables, as means of setting a clear path for implementation of the GPA.</p> <p>1.5 Design programme of interventions, including highly feasible and visible demonstration projects and pre-investment studies, addressing problems of both national and regional priority.</p> <p>1.6 Promote an ecosystem approach by integrating national activities with those of other countries in the respective regions and encouraging compliance with Regional Programmes of Action, if applicable.</p> <p>1.7 Facilitate partnerships between national governments and regional organisations in the private sector and civil society.</p> <p>1.8 Facilitate adoption of NPA by relevant national authorities</p> <p>1.9 Support to governments to participate in the H2O Partnership Conference in 2004.</p>	<p>1.1– 1.8: This is part of the NPA development process (see attached table on status)</p> <p>1.9 H2O Global Partnership Conference held in Cairns, 11-14 May 2004</p>	<p>1.1 – 1.8: Attached table on status; GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); GPA NPA Update Nov 2005, page 3</p> <p>1.9: GPA Progress report March 2005, section 2 (page 25); H2O Communiqué</p>

### 2.2.3 PADH

152 The table below summarises the current status of the PADH component. The PADH encompasses the core theme of protection of marine and coastal resources from human induced development activities that alter or destroy habitats. This is of course a global issue of huge significance.

153 The PADH component has the following key objectives:

- Capacity building within governments to address PADH issues
- Provide tools for sector focused environmental management of developments: tourism, aquaculture, mining., ports and harbours
- Encourage better practice through pilot projects

154 The programme aims to achieve these objectives through global level focus on better tools, regional focus on legal frameworks and needs for policy development and national emphasis on policy influence and local level demonstration projects.

155 The component has a strong regional focus: South Asia, Eastern Africa and the Wider Caribbean. Legal reviews were conducted (in the period prior to the Belgian Partnership) which have provided the stimulus for workshops aimed at mobilising political support and stakeholder involvement. They have led to a focus on regional needs for policy and implementation reforms and the opportunities for partnerships with other organisations. It would be desirable to see more explicit focus on how the Belgian support is leading to prioritised and focused actions arising from this earlier effort (much of it also funded by Belgium) and what specific results this will bring about in terms of improved government capacity. We do note however that this is the main aim of the NPA process and its emphasis on linking with national planning processes. .

156 The preparation of sector focused guidelines clearly reveals an assumption that development control processes can be strengthened to reduce damage or alternation to habitats and that part of the problem lies in the absence of good technical assessment tools. Clearly this strategy requires not simply good tools but a means to put them into practice in a way that will make a difference on the ground. Most of the evidence about the dissemination of these guidelines relates to their adoption or endorsement by other international organisations. The implication is that this will lead to their being implemented by development planning authorities or practitioners. There does not seem to be an explicit strategy for getting the tools into practice based on a clear analysis of what are the most effective means of achieving this result. However, there is some focus on this within the NPA pilot projects.

157 The pilot project activities are aimed at testing innovative technologies, demonstrating alternative resource management practices and developing mechanisms for public sector partnerships with civil society organisations or the private sector. The GPA is on track in terms of achieving the intended outputs (3 pilot projects) of the Belgian Partnership. There has not been any opportunity within this evaluation to determine whether the overall programme of pilot projects will achieve the intended results. However it is clear that the GPA Coordination Office is alert to the need for some tracking of their impacts and it would be desirable to see this followed through on a systematic basis.

158 The GPA recognises that its potential to achieve impacts depends on leveraging its efforts through partnerships of many varieties. Therefore it is not surprising that much of the evidence of achievement of this component related to activities removed from the ground level – except of course the pilot projects. There is a challenge inevitably in ensuring that there is a clear connection between these activities and the intended results.

## Component 2: Physical Alterations and Destruction of Habitats (PADH)

### Outputs:

1. The planning, legislative and regulatory capacity strengthening through the facilitation of multi-stakeholder/partnership fora in selected countries
2. Key principles (on aquaculture, ports and harbour, tourism and mining) adopted by the economic sectors in selected countries
3. Thematic information sheets and delivery of technical support to institutes for promoting policy change and Media campaign.
4. Two pilot projects for pre-feasibility studies/execution within specific economic sectors as based on current regional priorities
5. Pilot project on mangroves in Bangladesh. Records of baseline condition and maps produced on mangroves through the use of remote sensing and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

1. PADH programme was launched through regional brainstorming meetings in South Asia, Eastern Africa and Wider Caribbean and resulted in a changed focus of the PADH programme. They were followed by a second round of regional meetings in 2003-2004, which led to the development of concrete regional (e.g. protocol/national) programme of work to address land-based sources of marine pollution and the initiation of pilot studies.
2. In many countries, the key principles have contributed in the debate for policy change. The Ports and Harbour principles have been endorsed by IAPH, IADC, CEDA and PIANC. In light of the guiding principles, PIANC has established a Working Group to address dredging around coral reefs. UNIDO has endorsed the tourism principles, and a collaborative programme has been developed to apply the principles in tourism planning in several African countries (Tanzania, Seychelles, Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia and Senegal, Cameroon, Mozambique, Ghana) through the GEF supported Africa Coastal Tourism project.
3. Information sheets have been produced for Aquaculture, Tourism, Mining, Ports and Harbours, and Mangroves, respectively.
4. Several pilot projects have been initiated to address priority problems identified in the NPA, aiming to improve management of coastal resources and ensure protection/sustenance of the critical habitats.
5. Completed

1. Reports South Asia - A Comparative Review of Coastal Legislation in South Asia; A Regional Framework for Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution due to Land-based Activities in South Asia; The Economic Valuation of Alternative Uses of Mangrove Forests in Sri Lanka; Reports East Africa - Review of National Legislations and Institutions Relevant to Tourism, Mangroves, Port, Land Reclamation and Damming of Rivers in Selected Countries along the Western Indian Ocean; Reports Latin America & Caribbean - Review of Coastal Legislations related to Coastal Zone Management in the English and Spanish Speaking Caribbean and Latin American Countries; Utility of User Fee as Financial Instruments for the Management of Marine Parks and Marine Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region.
2. Key principle documents for the various sectors are available on request (doc. list no. 16), showing the endorsement of the respective professional associations involved. The Key principles for Aquaculture are presently open for discussion in the sector, see [www.enaca.org/shrimp](http://www.enaca.org/shrimp)
3. Draft sheets are available on request.
4. GPA PADH Update Nov 2005,

		<p>section on Pilot projects</p> <p>5. GPA PADH Update Nov 2005, section on Pilot projects; Project documents available on request (doc. list no. 18)</p>
<p><b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</b></p> <p>1.1 Updated version of regional annexes in the Guidelines on PADH.</p> <p>1.2 Incorporation of PADH issues into initiatives on national legislation.</p> <p>1.3 Demand driven priority projects and programmes formulated and agreed upon.</p> <p>1.4 Increased public awareness of the implications of PADH, and national and international media find project results of interest and accept for publication.</p> <p>1.5 Pilot projects demonstrating better practices in the main economic sectors.</p> <p>1.6 GIS maps illustrating the status of mangroves produced.</p> <p>1.7 Key principles adopted</p>	<p>1.1 Key Principles have been discussed in regional meetings, annotated guidelines have been developed. Further updating of the Guidelines with regional annexes is in process.</p> <p>1.1 The Tourism principles led to expansion and/or replication of regional eco-certification (e.g. Green Globe, Blue Flag) in the wider Caribbean. In reference to the Aquaculture principles, Sri Lanka announced a moratorium on expansion of shrimp farming.</p> <p>1.2 The second round of regional meetings in 2003-2004 led to the development of concrete regional (e.g. protocol/national) programme of work to address land-based sources of marine pollution and the initiation of pilot studies.</p> <p>1.3 The key principles are used as course material in the IADC-CEDA environmental aspects of dredging seminar, which are organised in cooperation with UNESCO-IHE Delft. Several articles refer to the principles in professional journals.</p> <p>1.4 Several pilot projects have been initiated to address priority problems identified in the NPA, aiming to improve management of coastal resources and ensure protection/sustenance of the critical habitats.</p> <p>1.5 The development of GIS maps has been applied in East Africa.</p> <p>1.6 The Ports and Harbour principles have been endorsed by IAPH, IADC, CEDA and PIANC. In light of the guiding principles, PIANC has established a Working Group to address dredging around coral reefs. UNIDO has endorsed the tourism principles, and a collaborative programme has been developed to apply the principles in tourism planning in several African countries (Tanzania, Seychelles, Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia and Senegal, Cameroon, Mozambique, Ghana) through the GEF supported Africa Coastal Tourism project.</p>	<p>1.1 Key principle documents for the various sectors are available on request (doc. list no. 16)</p> <p>1.2 N/A</p> <p>1.3 GPA PADH Update Nov 2005, section on Pilot projects</p> <p>1.4 World Port Development, June 2003; Ports and Harbour, vol. 48, no.7, 2003, Port Technology International, Spring 2005</p> <p>1.5 GPA PADH Update Nov 2005, section on Pilot projects</p> <p>1.6 Overview of Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats in the Eastern African Region using Geographical Information System (GIS); Shoreline Change in the Western Indian Ocean Region: An Overview</p> <p>1.7 Key principle documents for the various sectors are available on request (doc. list no. 16), showing the endorsement of the respective professional associations involved. The Key principles for Aquaculture are presently open for discussion in the sector, see <a href="http://www.enaca.org/shrimp">www.enaca.org/shrimp</a></p>
<p><b>Activities:</b></p> <p>1.1 <u>Awareness raising and outreach</u> through further development on the guidelines, checklists and key principles based on feedbacks and ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogues through regional meetings.</p> <p>1.2 Dissemination of the sectoral key principles (four main sectors: <u>tourism</u>,</p>	<p>1.1 The study reports, key principles, meeting reports have been distributed in hard copies and digital forms (CDs) through various regional consultative meetings and international fora.</p>	<p>1.1 GPA PADH Update Nov 2005</p> <p>1.2 World Port Development, June 2003; Ports and Harbour, vol.</p>



<p>aquaculture, mining and ports and harbour) and checklists in the priority regions.</p> <p>1.3 <u>Promote legal reforms and policy development</u> based on the works carried out during earlier phases to develop programmes to enhance the legislative framework and regulatory capabilities of local, national and regional authorities.</p> <p>1.4 Selection and development of 2-3 pilot projects within specific economic sectors of regional significance for pre-investment studies and action that demonstrates alternative practices in close coordination with the developments of NPAs.</p> <p>1.5 In Bangladesh develop pilot project for restoration and management of mangroves, draft “Codes of better management practices” within the shrimp aquaculture and identify, and prioritise areas for assessment.</p>	<p>1.2 Private sector agencies (e.g., CEDA and IADC) and other intergovernmental bodies such as PIANC and NACA, are posting GPA principles in their websites. Several articles refer to the principles in professional journals.</p> <p>1.3 Following the first set of regional meetings, several studies were undertaken as listed below. The review/study process raised awareness and created interest among key actors for addressing various policy issues, including the development of NPAs.</p> <p>1.4 Several pilot projects have been initiated to address priority problems identified in the NPA, aiming to improve management of coastal resources and ensure protection, ongoing.</p> <p>1.5 Completed</p>	<p>48, no.7, 2003, Port Technology International, Spring 2005</p> <p>1.3 See outputs mentioned above, reports available on request;</p> <p>1.4 GPA PADH Update Nov 2005, section on Pilot projects</p> <p>1.5 GPA PADH Update Nov 2005, section on Pilot projects; Project documents available on request (doc. list no. 18)</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 2.2.4 ICARM

159 This component is mainly focused on developing guiding principles, their dissemination, network building and a framework for assessing the impacts of Integrated Coastal Zone Management and ICARM activities.

160 The evidence suggests that most of the effort has been focused on developing the guiding principles into a tool for application in the post Tsunami reconstruction efforts. The UN Oceans in its meeting of January 2005 entrusted UNEP/GPA coordination office with the responsibility to lead the Task Force on Post-Tsunami Response, including developing key principles to guide the Coastal Zone Rehabilitation and Management in the Tsunami Affected Region.

161 In pursuance to this decision UNEP/GPA coordination office drafted the principles and discussed them through holding of a meeting in February 2005 in Cairo. The participants to the meeting included senior government officials from the tsunami-affected countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Kenya, Seychelles, Tanzania and Yemen) and representatives of international organizations and institutions (DEFRA/UK, DFID/UK, FAO, UNESCO, World Bank, Islamic Development Bank, League of Arab States, IUCN, WWF and UNEP). The participants adopted 12 Guiding Principles for environmentally sound coastal rehabilitation and reconstruction

162 As a follow-up to the Cairo meeting, the GPA coordinating office mobilized resources to support national-level dialogues for wide dissemination of the 12 guiding principles and to develop consensus to ensure their incorporation in the national reconstruction plan. National dialogues have successfully been organised in several countries (Sri Lanka, Thailand and Seychelles), while government in (Yemen, India, Maldives, Kenya and Indonesia) have made necessary preparations for holding such dialogues. There is some preliminary evidence of their application at the national level.

163 There is some evidence of broader dissemination through a variety of conferences and publications. There are parallel efforts supported by the Belgian funding to launch ICARM pilot projects and to develop a case book with lessons learned.

164 There is an activity aimed at developing and testing an ICARM progress marker – a guidance document for measuring progress on ICARM implementation. The evidence is that this is on track.

165 This element of the programme component therefore combines the focus on applying a guidance tool to the post Tsunami context with a range of other knowledge based activities. There is little evidence at this point on which to base any judgement of impact. But it will be desirable to have a clear view of how these activities can have an impact. In the case of the Tsunami context, it is likely that these can be tracked in terms of on the ground activities. In the case of the other activities, it is hoped that there is sound strategy for ensuring that such publications and knowledge based outputs will lead to specific benefits.

<b>Component 3: Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM)</b>		
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Agreed ICARM concept and Guiding Principles.</li> <li>1.2 Conference and discussions papers, proceedings and river basin management plans reflecting ICARM concept.</li> <li>1.3 An established regional network to exchange experiences among ICARM cases</li> <li>1.4 Demonstrations of ICARM implementation</li> <li>1.5 A framework to assess outcomes and impacts of ICZM/ICARM efforts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 The 12 Guiding Principles for Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM) have been finalized and published.</li> <li>1.2 ICARM sessions and papers on Conferences</li> <li>1.3 The FreshCo partnership and the Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management Expert Group is actively analysing lessons learned from practical experience and preparing for guidance documents</li> <li>1.4 Several ICARM pilot projects are supported and an ICARM Casebook is being prepared – including a global overview of 20-25 freshwater-coast case studies and lessons learned</li> <li>1.5 Report ICARM Progress Marker – guidance document for measuring progress on implementing integrated management + demonstration of applying the Progress Marker in a series of test cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, Section 2, page 25, 2.1.3; <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org">www.gpa.unep.org</a></li> <li>1.2 WWF-3, March '03, Kyoto; Southeast Asia Water Forum, Nov '03, Chang Mai; Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, etc., Jan. '05, Paris; WWF-4, March '06</li> <li>1.3 FreshCo partnership established at WSSD, Sept '02. GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.3</li> <li>1.4 Pilot projects: Incomati (RSA/Moz), Attanagalu Oya (Sri Lanka), Bang Pakong (Thailand). ICARM Casebook will be published: in April 2006;</li> <li>1.5 Report ICARM Progress Marker will be published in April 2006. GPA Progress Report 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.3</li> </ul>
<p><b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 ICARM concept and Guiding Principles agreed by international ICARM expert group</li> <li>1.2 GPA Network extended to the freshwater community.</li> <li>1.3 Case studies and lessons learned.</li> <li>1.4 Recommendations for improvements in ICZM/ICARM project/programme design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 The 12 Guiding Principles for Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM) have been finalized and published.</li> <li>1.2 Under the FreshCo Partnership an ICARM expert group has been established and a series of regional ICARM workshops has been organised</li> <li>1.3 The ICARM Casebook will be published</li> <li>1.4 The ICARM Progress Marker will be published and applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, Section 2, page 25, 2.1.3; <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org">www.gpa.unep.org</a></li> <li>1.2 <a href="http://www.ucc-water.org/Freshco/">http://www.ucc-water.org/Freshco/</a></li> <li>1.3 ICARM Casebook to be published in April 2006; GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.3</li> <li>1.4 ICARM Progress Marker to be published in April 2006</li> </ul>
<p><b>Activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Further development of the concept of ICARM and associated Guiding Principles for ICARM implementation, finalisation and publication.</li> <li>1.2 Targeted outreach to relevant GPA stakeholders on the need and benefits to integrated watershed and coastal management.</li> <li>1.3 Preparation of key papers and presentations, in close cooperation with specialists and stakeholders from the freshwater/coast and ocean community; promoting the concept of ICARM in major freshwater and coastal/marine events.</li> <li>1.4 Organise ICARM regional workshops in GPA Regions including Partner Countries for Belgium Development Cooperation in an effort to establish a regional network for exchange of ICARM experiences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 In line with these Guiding Principles an ICARM Casebook and Progress Marker are being developed.</li> <li>1.2 Completed the Annotated Guiding Principles for post-Tsunami Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, adopted in Cairo on the 17<sup>th</sup> of February 2005 during the UNEP Tsunami Disaster Task Force meeting.</li> <li>1.3 The Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management Expert Group is actively preparing the ICARM Casebook – including a global overview of 20-25 freshwater-coast case studies and lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, Section 2, page 25, 2.1.3; <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org">www.gpa.unep.org</a></li> <li>1.2 GPA Progress Report March 2005, Section 2, page 26, 2.1.3; Report: “After the Tsunami – Rapid Environmental Assessment”, published on 22 February 2005; <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/tsunami/index.html">http://www.gpa.unep.org/tsunami/index.html</a></li> </ul>

<p>1.5 Support to pilot projects in basin-coast cases in accordance with ICARM Guiding Principles.</p> <p>1.6 Test, in cooperation with World Bank and the Dutch Coastal Zone Management Centre (RIKZ), a framework to assess the outcomes and impacts of ICZM/ICARM efforts in the three priority regions and draft recommendations for improvement in project/programme design.</p>	<p>1.4 Joint South and South East Asia workshop on Land-Ocean Interaction in the Coastal Zone, 16-19 October 2005, Negombo, Sri Lanka – assessment of 15 river-coast systems, identification of conflicts of interest and testing of progress marker; co-organising the LOICZ African Catchment-coast Workshop, JFeb'04 – and 4 more regional ICARM workshops .</p> <p>1.5 Pilot projects has been initiated/supported for the Incomati (RSA/Moz), Attanagalu Oya (Sri Lanka), Bang Pakong (Thailand) and Oder (Polans/Ger).</p> <p>1.6 The framework to assess ICZM efforts has not been developed in cooperation with WB. Instead, the ICARM Progress marker is being developed (see 1.1)</p>	<p>1.3 Report to be published in April 2006; GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.3</p> <p>1.4 Interim report available 29 Nov 2005</p> <p>1.5 Short pilot project reports available</p> <p>1.6 Report to be published in April 2006</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 2.2.5 SAP - Wastewater

166 The principal objectives of this component are to

- Develop a road map for proceeding with regional and/or national WET targets
- A regionally focused portfolio of candidate pilot projects
- Training and capacity building

167 It is evident that the WET road map has been discussed at the Cairns conference and is being further developed, including discussions with MEDPOL. It is not clear at this point how to assess the intended results of this activity or how it can be taken to the next stage of implementation. Following Cairns, a WET-WASH programme has been launched in partnership with WSSCC (water supply and sanitation collaborative council) which demonstrates the linkages between sanitation at the household level and environmental quality.

168 The efforts to identify pilot projects in Algeria and Morocco are on track and are continuing. The effort to prepare a regional portfolio is being pursued via MEDPOL. Here the intended results are reasonably clear cut. It will be appropriate at a later stage to determine how effective these efforts have been in terms of securing finance.

169 The training component appears to be on track with delivery of more than 10 training courses achieved up to date. It will be desirable to focus on the potential impact of this type of training and ensure that delivery is targeted in the most effective way.

170 There is perhaps a wider issue of how the GPA can make a contribution to the goal of improved wastewater treatment and improved sanitation based on comparative advantage – especially in the context of the major efforts undertaken by donors and financing institutions to address the huge financing requirements. In this context, it is noted that GPA is coordinating with the EU Water Initiative in one of the pilot project countries.

171 The GPA has also been successful in raising the issue of sanitation being linked to wastewater and thus environmental issues at a broader level through its contribution to the CSD and Secretary General's report, through disseminating the normative key principles, guidelines and financing studies.

<b>Component 4: Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater (SAP-Wastewater)</b>		
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>1.1 Roadmap on how to proceed with respect to regional and/or national WET targets.</p> <p>1.2 Regional portfolio on candidate pilot projects and 2 Pilot projects selected (Morocco and Algiers) demonstrating innovative approaches, such as financial arrangements, institutional set-up and appropriate technology.</p> <p>1.3 Project proposals and arrangements for project funding.</p> <p>1.4 Documentation and training and capacity building programmes.</p>	<p>1.1 Roadmap has been discussed at the Hilltops-2-Oceans (H2O) Conference in Cairns (2004)</p> <p>1.2 For Morocco, the process is being initiated January 2006, jointly with EU Water Initiative. For Algeria, UNEP/GPA attended and contributed, from 19-21 September 2005 in Algiers, to the UNESCO/IRC initiated meeting on the re-use of municipal wastewater. Here a series on possible pilot projects was being discussed.</p> <p>1.3 For Algeria, one project proposal has been developed, which is now under consideration for finalisation of the text, planning, budgets and next steps to take.</p> <p>1.4 More than 10 training courses have been delivered in various languages. A total of 300 participants have been trained from Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kenya, Kiribati, the Maldives, Mozambique, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Turkey and Tuvalu.</p>	<p>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 1, page 14, no.4; Cairns Communiqué: <a href="http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-INF17.doc">http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-INF17.doc</a> , WET-WASH Partnership document: <a href="http://www.wsscc.org/dataweb.cfm?edit_id=524&amp;CFID=687443&amp;CFTOKEN=33873148">http://www.wsscc.org/dataweb.cfm?edit_id=524&amp;CFID=687443&amp;CFTOKEN=33873148</a></p> <p>1.2 Morocco: Meeting documents for 26 January 2006 are being prepared. Meeting report Algiers by UNESCO/IRC, available on request.</p> <p>1.3 Algerian project proposal available on request.</p> <p>1.4 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.4; Training Manual on Municipal Wastewater Management in Coastal Cities (2004); <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/">http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/</a></p>
<p><b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</b></p> <p>1.1 Regional consensus on the way forward in addressing WET.</p> <p>1.2 Enhanced local/national government capacity to develop and implement adequate municipal wastewater management as being advocated in the UNP/WHO/Habitat/WSSCC Strategic Action Plan and the Guidelines on Municipal Wastewater Management.</p> <p>1.3 Multi-stakeholder partnerships established and /or current ones strengthened on the selected pilot projects.</p> <p>1.4 Adaptation of the train-sea-coast training module to the needs of the region</p>	<p>1.1 At the Cairns conference it was agreed developing WET remains the responsibility of Governments; also the WET-WASH partnership has been launched.</p> <p>1.2 More than 10 training courses have been delivered in various languages, bringing the total number of experts trained to 300 from 23 countries. The training manual has been distributed to 1500 experts worldwide.</p> <p>1.3 Multi-stakeholder partnerships established in East-Africa; In Algiers a project proposal has been developed jointly with stakeholders.</p> <p>1.4 Coordinated over 10 training courses, training more than 230 managers from 15 different countries in English, Portuguese, Turkish and Spanish language, working closely with local governments, academic institutions and NGO's. The training manual is translated in Turkish.</p>	<p>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 1, page 14, no.4; Cairns Communiqué: <a href="http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-INF17.doc">http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-INF17.doc</a> , WET-WASH Partnership document: <a href="http://www.wsscc.org/dataweb.cfm?edit_id=524&amp;CFID=687443&amp;CFTOKEN=33873148">http://www.wsscc.org/dataweb.cfm?edit_id=524&amp;CFID=687443&amp;CFTOKEN=33873148</a></p> <p>1.2 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.4; Training Manual on Municipal Wastewater Management in Coastal Cities (2004); <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/">http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/</a></p> <p>1.3 Project initiatives in Dar es Salam and Zanzibar / Pemba are in initial phase being set up by the partnerships established, reports available on request; Algerian proposal awaits comments for kick off, proposal available on request.</p> <p>1.4 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.4; Training</p>

		<p>Manual on Municipal Wastewater Management in Coastal Cities (2004); <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/">http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/</a></p>
<p><b>Activities:</b></p> <p>1.1 Consultations with the MEDPOL region on municipal wastewater management and WET, focussing on how to achieve the WSSD agreed target on Water &amp; Sanitation</p> <p>1.2 To identify and enhance 2 replicable pilot projects within the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP)/MEDPOL/North Africa region (Morocco and Algeria) and contribute to the development of a regional portfolio of priority pilot projects</p> <p>1.3 Draft a detailed outline of fundable, long-term project proposals for selected pilot project to be submitted to financing institutions</p> <p>1.4 Regional adaptation and delivery of TSC module on municipal wastewater management</p>	<p>1.1 Results of the consultation of MED on WET/wastewater have been incorporated in the WET reports. MEDPOL has recognised wastewater is priority one issue, which will be addressed in the MEDPOL – Phase 4 / MAP programme of work.</p> <p>1.2 For Morocco, the process is being initiated January 2006, jointly with EU Water Initiative. In Algiers a consultative meeting has been held 19-21 September 2005. Here a series on possible pilot projects was being discussed, resulting in an interesting port-folio of candidate pilot projects for Algeria with respect to the re-use of municipal wastewater.</p> <p>1.3 From June – November 2005, MEDPOL/MAP has developed a framework for long-term sustainable financing. This is now ready for adding up with appropriate funding mechanisms. In Algeria, a project proposal has been developed.</p> <p>1.4 Coordinated over 10 training courses, training more than 230 managers from 15 different countries in English, Portuguese, Turkish and Spanish language, working closely with local governments, academic institutions and NGO's.</p>	<p>1.1 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 1, page 14, no.4; MEDPOL-Phase 4/MAP document is available on request.</p> <p>1.2 Morocco: Meeting documents for 26 January 2006 are being prepared; Meeting report Algiers by UNESCO/IRC, available on request.</p> <p>1.3 The financing framework will soon become available from MEDPOL/MAP. Project proposal Algiers available on request.</p> <p>1.4 GPA Progress Report March 2005, section 2, page 26, 2.1.4; Training Manual on Municipal Wastewater Management in Coastal Cities (2004); <a href="http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/">http://www.gpa.unep.org/training/</a></p>

## 2.2.6 NRBP

172 The NRBP started in 1999. Phase I was a situational assessment. Phase II was a pilot activity focusing on a tributary of the Nairobi River system. The Belgian government undertook a study of the achievements and lessons learned before agreeing to provide further support.

173 They funded a bridging phase to enable UNEP to develop Phase III jointly with UN-HABITAT and UNDP, in partnership with the Government of Kenya and Nairobi City Council. This bridging phase resulted in an agreed framework for collaboration between UNEP, UN-HABITAT and UNDP, alignment with the Kenyan government sector policy, extensive stakeholder consultation and the design of a project proposal with a logframe.

174 The project submission contained five components:

- i) Environmental management and urban planning system
- ii) Rehabilitation of Nairobi Dam
- iii) Water quantity and quality protocols
- iv) Service delivery, environmental conservation and sustainable use of resources
- v) Public awareness and participation

175 The Belgian government has agreed to fund components i) and iv), plus a part of iii). The implementation arrangements require MOUs between UNEP and both UN-HABITAT and UNDP covering their joint roles in managing the project. UNEP, through the Regional Office for Africa, is also engaging IUCN, the University of Nairobi and Kenyan government bodies via MOUs for the activities for which it is directly responsible

176 The current status is that after extensive delays the first activities are now underway – for example, IUCN has nearly completed an initial study to prepare a framework for the development of an Integrated Environmental Management and Urban Plan. Most activities are now scheduled to start in the first half of 2006. The following table in the annex provides a detailed report on the status.



Needs:	Results	Outputs	OVI	Achievements
<b>To rehabilitate, restore and manage the Nairobi River ecosystem in order to provide improved livelihoods, especially for the poor, enhanced biodiversity, and a sustainable supply of water for domestic and industrial, recreational and emergency uses.</b>	1. Nairobi River Basin environmental management and urban planning systems developed and accepted	1.1 Situation analysis of the Nairobi River Basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline survey and environmental audit report produced within the first quarter of Year One</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles divided between UNEP, UNDP and UN-Habitat. Initial reports came in as at 21<sup>st</sup> December, 2005. Second reporting during 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2006.</li> <li>Reports already in analyse operational gaps, provides baselines information, digitised base maps, delineated area of operation for the entire programme.</li> </ul>
		1.2 Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EMIS strategy produced and operational by end of Year One</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UN-Habitat focal agency. Information from Output 1.1. to feed into the framework of this output. Substantive reporting end of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter in 2006.</li> </ul>
		1.3 Integrated Environmental Management and Urban Plan (EMUP) <sup>11</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An integrated EMUP formulated and approved by end of Year Two<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNEP is focal agency. Information from Output 1.1. to feed into the framework of this output. Substantive reporting end of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter in 2006.</li> </ul>
		1.4 Capacity building programme to implement management plan for lead government agencies and stakeholders <sup>13</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy document produced by end of Year Two</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UN-Habitat focal agency. Information from Output 1.1. to feed into the framework of this output. Substantive reporting end of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter in 2006.</li> </ul>
		1.5 Integrated Environmental Management and Urban Plan Piloted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific components of action plans implemented during Years Three and Four</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comes at the tail-end of the NRBP. Initial trial will be done during the last two years of the NRBP.</li> </ul>
	2. Nairobi Dam rehabilitated and restored	1 Survey, demarcate and reclaim designated Nairobi Dam area and adjacent riparian land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey carried out by first six months</li> <li>Land illegally acquired reclaimed</li> <li>Perimeter fence erected at the Dam and riparian land</li> <li>EIA completed by end of Year One</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey complete and report available.</li> <li>Land re-possession on-going.</li> <li>Implementation Plan completed</li> <li>EIA to commence once issue of land resolved.</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> The Integrated Environmental Management and Urban Plan will include guidelines for the following plans: Solid Waste Management, Liquid Waste Management, Land Use Management, Catchment Management, enforcement of Riparian Way Leaves, infrastructure and urban services, and human settlements.

<sup>12</sup> In the development of the EMUP, a participatory methodology involving key stakeholders will be applied.

<sup>13</sup> Lead agencies and stakeholders have been segregated in this context to reflect the difference between those agencies that have a regulatory function and the affected stakeholders.

Needs:	Results	Outputs	OVIs	Achievements
		2 Consolidate existing socio-economic studies and previous engineering designs for the Nairobi Dam catchment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catchment studies complete by end of first six months</li> <li>• Restoration plan drawn by end of Year One</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catchment studies on-going, and integrated with UNDP and UN-Habitat components. Final report expected during 2006.</li> <li>• Restoration Plan/Engineering designs completed</li> </ul>
		3 Demonstration programme on waste management around Nairobi Dam.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community coordination framework established within the first six months</li> <li>• Visible reduction in amount of solid waste within 18 months</li> <li>• Centralised garbage disposal points</li> <li>• No. of awareness raising and recycling activities</li> <li>• Training programme on waste implemented by end of first year</li> <li>• No. of people participating in waste management activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A demonstration model on waste management (Community Cooker) design complete;</li> <li>• Community mobilisation for Laini Saba village done successfully.</li> <li>• Installation of the waste management project commences January 2006.</li> <li>• Training programme yet to be designed.</li> <li>• Adjacent villages to be sensitised during 2006 to replicate the waste management intervention demonstrated in Laini Saba.</li> </ul>
		4 Restoration of Nairobi Dam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of restoration plan (drain and dredge) by end of Year Three</li> <li>• Plan for management (post-restoration) of for Nairobi Dam drawn by end of Year Two</li> <li>• Level of pollution flow into Nairobi Dam reduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bill of Quantities against restoration plan complete</li> <li>• Restoration contractors identified</li> <li>• Post-restoration plan to be developed</li> <li>• Monitoring protocol to ascertain reduced pollution levels of the Dam integrated in the larger Pollution Monitoring Protocol to be developed by the University of Nairobi.</li> </ul>
		3.1 Water quantity and quality assessment and monitoring protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quantity and quality assessment and monitoring protocol developed within 12 months</li> <li>• Map of hotspots prepared within 12 months</li> <li>• Updated map of point and non-point sources available within 12 months</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A monitoring gaps analysis and identification of competent laboratories complete</li> <li>• A framework for the Pollution Monitoring Protocol developed</li> <li>• Updated maps of hotspots, point and non-point sources being developed</li> </ul>
3. Water quantity and quality measuring protocol developed and tested		3.2 Water quantity and quality monitoring and assessment network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networks established within the first six months</li> <li>• New and appropriate monitoring technologies introduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laboratories assessment report ready;</li> <li>• Labs consulting on collaborative framework to share sampling results</li> <li>• Consultation outcome will form basis for establishing assessment network.</li> </ul>

Needs:	Results	Outputs	OVis	Achievements
		3.3 Water quantity and quality monitoring and assessment database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A gaps analysis on water quality monitoring</li> <li>• Database centre established by end of six months</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Template of web-based database has been developed by Nairobi University</li> <li>• Information already in public domain being uploaded onto the database.</li> </ul>
		3.4 Training programme for data managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cadre of data managers trained during the programme implementation period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data managers yet to be identified through the laboratory network</li> </ul>
		3.5 Test monitoring protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test monitoring of Nairobi rivers and pollution sources from Year Three</li> <li>• Training programme completed and applied by Year Three</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring Protocol to be tested once ready during Year 3.</li> <li>• The Laboratory Network to conduct training programme, whose curriculum is under discussion.</li> </ul>
	4. Service delivery, environmental conservation and sustainable utilisation of resources enhanced	4.1 Action plan for provision of basic urban services <sup>14</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in on-going processes from Year One</li> <li>• Action plan produced by end of Year Two</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP and Stakeholders have agreed on Work Plan for 2006 to design Action Plans</li> <li>• Experience of 2006 will inform subsequent years in terms of Action Planning.</li> </ul>
		4.2 Community action plans for environmental conservation <sup>15</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community-based environmental conservation action plans produced by end of Year Three</li> <li>• Increased conservation/rehabilitation activities within the catchment</li> <li>• Evidence of increased riverine biodiversity within community action plan areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP has designed an intervention Plan with the Forest Department for catchment activities.</li> <li>• Catchment rehabilitation and increased conservation activities to be evidenced during 2006.</li> <li>• Increased river biodiversity is long-term, but some evidence expected during Year 3 of implementation.</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup> The strategy will incorporate water provision services, waste management (solid and liquid), improved access roads

<sup>15</sup> Community action plans for environmental conservation will be derived from Environmental Management and Urban Plan (Result 1)

Needs:	Results	Outputs	OVI	Achievements
		4.3 Environmental management system for commerce and industry <sup>16</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased adoption of appropriate cleaner production technology</li> <li>Cost-effective environmental management models developed by end of Year One</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP has designed an intervention plan with Kenya Cleaner Production Centre for 2006 to pilot cost-effective environmental management models in selected manufacturing plants.</li> </ul>
		4.4 Environmentally friendly enterprises within the catchment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variety of successful environmentally friendly enterprises</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP in conjunction with the Forest Department and Eco-Tourism Society of Kenya have identified bee-keeping and other utilisation of non-timber forest products to be promoted as micro-enterprises in the catchment. The process starts in earnest in 2006.</li> </ul>
	5. Public awareness and participation in environmental issues affecting Nairobi River Basin enhanced	5.1 Information and communication strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information and communication strategy developed and implemented</li> <li>Number of events organised by NRBP to promote public awareness about environmental issues</li> <li>Increased public participation in organised environmental activities</li> <li>Tool kit produced by end of project period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This component has not received any funding – hence it has not been developed</li> <li>Information dissemination and communication is central to stimulating public interest and attention for universal participation in the nrbp process.</li> <li>Efforts to mobilise resources to jump-start this process will continue. During 2006.</li> </ul>
		5.2 Environmental education programme (formal, non-formal and informal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental education and information materials produced during Phase II refined by end of Year One</li> <li>Handbooks and teachers' guides on urban rivers utilised in a pilot project from Year Two</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efforts continue to be made to access resource to facilitate this sub-component.</li> </ul>

<sup>16</sup> Environmental management models produced for commerce and industry will feed into the Environmental Management and Urban Plan (Result 1)

Needs:	Results	Outputs	OVIs	Achievements
		5.3 Maintained NRBP website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Website up-to-date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Nairobi River Basin Programme website has been re-designed and will be up to date by January 2006.</li> </ul>

## **2.3 Conclusions**

### **2.3.1 GPA**

178 The GPA is a well established and well managed programme within UNEP's DEPI. The contribution by Belgium of USD 2 million for the period 2004-2007 is only part of the overall effort. Belgium provided financial support prior to 2004 and the establishment of the Belgian Partnership represented no significant change in the GPA programme - more a different mechanism of providing the funds from the Belgians.

179 However, it introduced a logframe based structure to the component and therefore to subsequent monitoring and evaluation. It has consequently been the main focus of this desk study to assess the implementation status of the Belgian support to the GPA using this logframe structure. It is worth noting that the recent progress updates were not structured in this way.

180 The GPA programme and the elements supported by Belgian funds are focused on a major global environmental issue. The specific activities within the programme as a whole are inherently normative and thinly spread – knowledge based activities, efforts to influence policy, training, pilot projects, networks and partnerships are the main type of activities. A finite amount of resources and effort are spread over a number of sub-programmes and numerous individual activities – many of which are targeted at a large number of countries.

181 It is not the aim of this evaluation to evaluate the design of the GPA as a whole or to try to assess its overall effectiveness and impacts. Belgium and UNEP evidently support its overall strategy and coherence. It has been our aim to provide an up to date assessment of its implementation to UNEP and the Belgian government. Broadly we can say that the implementation status is healthy in terms of the intended activities and the component appears to be well managed. It will be desirable for future progress reports to indicate the implementation status in this way and to determine if any activities are not on track in terms of the intended timetable (not indicated in the project document).

182 It has not been feasible to evaluate rigorously the effectiveness and impact of the wide range of activities and outputs within the Belgian supported components. There are simply too many activities and outputs spread over such a wide target area.

183 It is also inherently difficult to determine the true impact of mainly normative (and small) activities. We have therefore looked for evidence of strategies to maximise the achievement of impacts or means of tracking impacts of activities already implemented. It is certainly the case that the recent progress updates reveal a concern for impacts and they provide considerable evidence of how activities have had specific impacts – without perhaps very precise definition of what the intended results are. It is not so evident however that there are strategies built in to the shaping and implementation of the activities that are designed to ensure impacts are maximised.

184 It is evident that regional approaches are used to leverage implementation efforts and resources – often through partnerships with other institutions. It is also evident that there is an appreciation of the need to work with other donors who may have more resources to apply to longer term programmes initiated through pilot activities.

185 We would therefore conclude that managers are aware of the challenge of getting results from producing guidelines, creating networks, delivering training programmes and supporting small scale pilot projects. There may need to be more emphasis on the specific strategies for maximising the results focus of these kind of activities – how are guidelines going to be applied on the ground; how will training participants apply the knowledge and so on. It must be emphasised however that these concerns are equally valid for any normative style programme targeted at a global programme.

### 2.3.2 NRBP

186 There have been significant delays in launching the NRBP Phase III. However it has now started up.

187 It seems evident that the extended process of project preparation and agreeing a set of institutional arrangements for the project has been necessary to ensure a sound project design, ownership by the Kenyan government and Nairobi City Council and clarity about how the different UN agencies will take responsibility for the respective components.

188 It is also clear that there have been several issues which have led to delays in getting the project started.

189 First, the Belgian DGDC did not agree to provide all the funding requested. UNEP and its partners have had to adjust the project design and implementation plans accordingly. Second, there have been considerable bureaucratic difficulties arising out of the need to establish MOUs between UNEP and UN-HABITAT and UNDP. These have proved hard to resolve. Third, there have been problems due to the lack of responsible staff in place in the UN partner organisations once the procedural problems had been overcome.

190 There is no doubt that it has taken a considerable amount of effort by UNEP to resolve these problems, and to ensure that implementation can now get fully underway. It is worth noting that this type of project does present significant institutional and technical challenges and there is some concern whether there are sufficient resources to achieve the intended results. It is also desirable to monitor closely how effectively the partnership between UNEP, UN-HABITAT and UNDP works in the context of working closely and productively with the Nairobi City Council and Kenyan government bodies.

### **3 Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalisation of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reduction Programmes and Related Activities**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

191 The programme submission for this component to the Government of Belgium consisted of three sub-projects under the overall title of: *Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalisation of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reduction Programmes and Related Activities*. The original budget for the years 2004-2007 totalled USD 4,420,000 of which Belgium's contribution was USD 4,000,000. In addition, Belgium contributed USD 1,200,000 for strengthening stakeholders' participation in integration and mainstreaming of environment into PRSPs. The three sub-projects are described below.

192 Although these three sub-projects are grouped together in the programme submission, it should be noted that they have separate institutional histories and are managed by different teams within UNEP. There is no overall document or logframe for the Programme. The Programme covers four countries: Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Mozambique.

193 At this time, there has been one progress report – covering the period up to March 2005. This report does attempt to give a summarised account of the progress of the programme component overall, but does not provide an account of the progress of the sub-projects in the four countries against their intended activities and outputs.

194 The logframes for the sub-projects broadly focused on generic or regional activities and outputs but did not explicitly foresee that the sub-projects would be customised to fit the specific circumstances in each of the countries. Therefore, it is hard in practice to use the sub-project logframes to provide a structure for evaluating their progress at the country level. It is also the case that each of the three sub-projects have departed significantly from the original intended outputs and results – mainly as a result of adapting to the specific needs of the countries.

195 In the light of the above, and taking account of the prolonged period of preparing and agreeing on arrangements for launching the sub-projects at the country level, this evaluation has focused on the following:

- Capturing the current workplans for the three sub-projects in order to establish what are the current planned results, outputs and activities
- Collecting information on the achievement of the current planned outputs
- Consulting with relevant parties at UNEP and in the countries to identify issues relevant to the future achievement of the intended results

196 There are no logframes for the sub-projects at the national level. In most cases, the workplans at the country level have only just been agreed and launched. The workplans however do not cover the lifetime of the project and either have already been revised on a periodic basis or will be revised to cover the next period of activities.

197 Our approach therefore has been to focus the evaluation on establishing what is the current status of the sub-projects, observing of course how they may have changed from the original project design, and on trying to identify ways in which the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the project can be enhanced going forward.



## **3.2 Programme Structure and Management**

### **3.2.1 Sub-project 1. Integration and Mainstreaming of Key Environmental Issues into PRSPs**

198 The programme submission to the Government of Belgium for this sub-project totalled USD 1,440,000 of which the requested Belgian contribution was USD 1,340,000. The Belgian support was added to existing support from the Government of Norway which started in 2002. During UNEP's negotiations with the Norwegian government Belgium became involved and an integrated programme was developed – formalised in a programme document in 2004. During this period prior to 2004, certain key elements of the programme had been designed.

199 Soon after the Belgian funding was approved in 2004, the initial efforts were made to introduce the programme at the country level. There are a total of seven countries, with Belgian funds targeted at the four mentioned above (of which two were added at the request of Belgium). The initial efforts soon revealed the need to consult with the country governments and with other donors active in this area and to adapt what was being offered to the needs of the country at the time.

200 At the same time, it became apparent that the UNEP programme was running in parallel with the UNDP Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI), funded by the UK and the EC. This initiative had launched a number of country programmes aimed at supporting the integration of poverty-environment linkages into PRSPs – including some of the countries which the UNEP programme intended to target. It was soon agreed, partly in response to donor concerns, that there was a strong case to integrate the two programmes and consequently UNEP and UNDP have collaborated closely since.

201 It is worth noting that UNEP and UNDP had been developing an MOU on collaboration for country focused work which was signed in 2005. This provided a policy framework within which the PEI collaboration can be seen and strengthened the specific case for integrating the two programmes.

202 It is not the aim of this evaluation to review the original project design which preceded Belgium support or the early outputs. However the current implementation of the sub-project (and the overall combined programme funded by Norway and Belgium) is strongly influenced by the early lessons learned and the need to change the implicit project design and activities to achieve good adaptation to the country level needs and effective collaboration with UNDP.

203 The original logframe for the sub-project embodies regional and knowledge sharing activities and outputs principally. The change in focus to developing country level activities tailored to the specific needs of each country – taking account of their current stage of revising or implementing PRSPs and the parallel activities of other donors – implies a significant revision is needed.

204 It is acknowledged by UNEP and other parties that the original design was too conceptual and supply driven. It has been a considerable challenge for the UNEP poverty-environment team to shift from this approach to one focused on preparing, agreeing and launching country based sets of activities and outputs aimed at supporting government efforts to integrate poverty environment linkages into the PRSP process. In two countries this has been achieved through close collaboration with UNDP.

205 The original project design also embodied MOUs with four international partners – IISD, WWF-MPO, CSC (Cambridge University) and UNU (SAfMA) – chosen because of their experience in poverty-environment issues. The intention had been that they provide technical support to the implementation of the sub-project – working with regional or national partners. However, they were selected and the MOUs were put in place before country needs were identified and the sub-project approach shifted to preparing country level activities – of a more operational character. The current

position is that these MOUs are being brought to a close or being revised to reflect the need to operate in a more demand led style. UNEP hopes that this will release funds originally allocated to these institutions for country level activities.

206 UNEP held a workshop in May 2005 for the focal points of the seven participating countries and the four institutions – one of the main aims being to try to identify how the particular services and expertise of the institutions might match the needs of the countries. As a result of this, there are a number of specific activities in the current workplans of the countries which will be delivered by the institutions.

207 The overall aim of the country level sub-project is consistent – to support the government's efforts to integrate poverty-environment linkages into the PRSP or its implementation. The particular set of activities being supported vary from country to country in line with the particular needs of each country and the opportunities to collaborate with other parties such as UNDP.

### **3.2.2 Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs**

208 The programme submission for this sub-project requested a budget of USD 1,780,000 of which Belgium's contribution is USD 1,660,000. The sub-project is an integral part of GEF Capacity Building Programme of the NEPAD Environmental Initiative Action Plan and the GEF National Capacity Needs Self Assessments (NCSAs). The sub-project is managed by the UNEP Division of GEF Coordination.

209 The original aim of the sub-project was to strengthen the capacity of the governments to achieve synergistic implementation of the Rio MEAs (CBD, FCCC, and CCD) with the overall aim of poverty reduction.

210 The original logframe embodied a focus on a set of methodologies and tools to be adopted by the countries, training activities, a coordination mechanism at the country level and targeted inputs to strengthen implementation capacity.

211 In preparing to launch this sub-project at the national level, a consistent project design was adopted to be followed by each country. This originally had three components:

- The establishment of a National Convention Coordination Committee (NCCC) – foreseen in the original project design
- Methodologies and tools for mainstreaming the implementation of MEAs into PRSPs – subsequently dropped on the grounds that this was covered by sub-project 1<sup>17</sup>
- A Micro-Grants Programme (MGP) to demonstrate MEA-Poverty linkages implemented at the national and local level – not foreseen in the original project document and closely linked with the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP).

212 In each country, the sub-project has therefore focused on the establishment of an NCCC and launching a MGP. The sub-project has thus been applied at the national level in a consistent manner – with a significant element added to the original project design.

213 The NCCC mandate is intended to be twofold – i) to develop and implement a workplan aimed at achieving more synergistic implementation of the Rio MEAs with a focus on poverty alleviation, and ii) to oversee the implementation of the MGP.

---

<sup>17</sup> This decision was arrived at as a result of the initial country level consultations. The only activity retained is the workshop on MEA synergies best practice.

214 In most countries, there is coordination with the GEF SGP – whereby the MGP is implemented by the UNDP GEF SGP unit or is sharing the experience of the SGP in the country concerned.

215 In parallel with this sub-project, the GEF NCSAs are also being implemented. In one of the four countries, the NCSA has already been completed. In another, the process is in its final stages and in two, it is just getting underway.

216 To support the country level implementation, UNEP has provided a range of technical back-up support, including:

- a generic workplan for NCCCs
- a generic Operational Guideline for the MGP
- TORs for NCCC project managers
- a project website to provide relevant information to projects and promote sharing of information
- a manual on Integrated Reporting and Coordinated Response to the Rio Conventions

217 It has recently held two regional workshops (September 2004 and November 2005) on the NEPAD Environmental Initiative attended by sub-project focal points. This 2004 workshop focused on orientation and MEAs – promoting networking among the stakeholders. The 2005 workshop provided training on EIA and GIS tools for MEA implementation and on options for synergistic implementation. UNEP is planning more support on common tasks, issues and workshops.

### **3.2.3 Capacity Building for the Development of National Legislation Implementing Rio MEAs**

218 The programme submission for this sub-project requested a total budget of 1,200,000 USD of which the Belgian contribution was 1,000,000 USD. The sub-project is closely related to the UNEP PADELIA project and is managed by the DPDL Environmental Law Branch.

219 The original aim of the sub-project was to build capacity for strengthening the national legislation and institutions to implement the Rio MEAs with specific consideration of poverty alleviation. The logframe embodies a set of results including improved legislation and institutions, strengthened capacity of environmental lawyers and enhanced legal regimes for environmental management taking into account poverty alleviation.

220 The sub-project is incorporated into the administrative arrangements of the PADELIA project in two of the four countries.

221 The aim of the project has evolved over the period of preparing to launch it at the country level. The emphasis now is on reviewing the broad array of environmental legislation in order to increase its potential impact on poverty alleviation. The capacity building elements have been adapted to meet specific national needs – in some cases focused on making legislation and in others on improved implementation. However in country workplans, there are components addressing the legal aspects of implementing Rio MEAs.

222 The project manager intends to revise the overall sub-project logframe to reflect the changes that have been made in response to country needs. It also is planning to commission a concept paper on the linkages between environmental law and poverty alleviation as a guide to the country focal points.

223 UNEP held a regional workshop in November 2005 for the focal points to exchange experiences and discuss the overall aims of the sub-project and how they could be best tackled at the country level.

224 At this point, there has been a limited amount of implementation and workplans have been adopted for the initial tasks only.

### **3.3      *Outputs, Evidence and Issues***

#### **3.3.1    Tanzania**

225      The three sub-projects are now underway after long period of preparation. UNEP and UNDP are working jointly on integrating environment into the PRSP. The momentum behind the two MEA sub-projects appears to be limited – with no project managers appointed to date and the focal point having many other responsibilities.

226      **Sub-project 1.** The UNDP PEI launched a USD 2.18 million programme aimed at integrating poverty-environment linkages into the PRSP in Tanzania in 2003. So when UNEP started to initiate this sub-project at the national level, the UNDP programme was well established. The UNEP sub-project has therefore been fully integrated into the overall PEI programme, with UNEP funds supporting a number of specific activities included in the overall workplan taking account of the progress achieved to date. UNEP's financial support is relatively small compared to the programme as a whole. However, it is apparently not clear to the focal point what the overall scale and duration of the UNEP support will be. In part this is because UNEP is not yet clear what follow-on there may be after the current UNDP programme finishes at the end of 2006. It also appears that the process of agreeing and renewing MOUs between UNEP and UNDP seems to be quite onerous.

227      **Sub-project 2.** This sub-project is integrated into the NEPAD programme. There has been limited progress to date, in part due to the absence of a full-time project manager. The NCCC was established in June 2005 and has met two times but its workplan so far is limited to the administration of the MGP and there is a need for clarity about what its substantive work will try to achieve. The MGP is ready to start but has not solicited proposals yet. UNDP is providing some experience from the SGP.

228      **Sub-project 3.** Two consultancies have been launched – one a review of legislation for implementation of MEAs and the other preparation of guidelines and training modules on implementation of MEAs with a focus on poverty alleviation. The TORs are quite demanding and complex. So far there is no workplan agreed beyond the completion of these reports and it does not seem clear what the intended results of the sub-project are.

229      **Coordination.** All the sub-projects have been managed within the VPO (although the Division managing sub-project 1 has just been transferred to the President's Office following the recent elections). Sub-projects 2 and 3 have the same focal point – who is personally too busy to perform this role. At present, there appear to be limited steps being taken to coordinate the activities of the sub-projects; however suggestions have been made that the NCCC could assume the task of improving coordination. There is a clear need to ensure that the NCSA which is about to start is well coordinated with the activities of both sub-project 2 and 3.

<b>Tanzania</b>				
<b>Capacity Building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities</b>				
<b>Overall comments</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sub-projects started with top-down approach.</li> <li>Long period of adapting to national context and getting government buy-in and understanding</li> <li>Administrative delays concerning MOUs and funds</li> <li>All three sub-projects under VPO</li> <li>No full time project manager in place for sub-projects 2 &amp;3 – but agreement to appoint one for 2.</li> </ul>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNEP project managers should encourage NCCC coordination of sub-project 2 &amp; 3; it was stated that the focal point for sub-project 1 was keen to become a member</li> <li>UNEP project managers should encourage Steering Committee/NCCC to communicate regularly with Belgian Embassy</li> <li>UNEP project managers should consider options for better disbursement schedules</li> <li>UNEP project managers should clarify with focal points whether timeframe can be extended</li> </ul>				
<b>Sub-project 1: Integrating and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs (only activities funded by Belgian programme listed)</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	Workplan	Workplan was prepared for 2005; progress report and workplan for 2006 being finalised.	UNEP Status Report (Jan 06) and mission report (Nov 05)	Belgian funds integrated into overall UNDP-UNEP PEI programme (with workplan) – clear identification of specific sub-activities funded by UNEP. Managed by UNDP. Overall progress healthy. UNEP contribution relatively minor.  Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constraint of MOU timeframe/upper limit</li> <li>Lack of longer-term workplan matching duration of sub-project</li> </ul>
Knowledge base on poverty-environment linkages improved and disseminated	Research on ecosystem under stress by using integrated ecosystems assessment on special/critical areas/ecosystems	June-July 2005 workshop took place; follow-up workshop planned. Attendance at regional workshop in Sept 2005	Follow-up report of workshop	
Strengthened capacity to integrate environmental and livelihoods issues into PRS (MKUKUTA)	Training and capacity building for key sector and CSO staff on p-e issues	Training team selected. Modules being prepared. Training will be ongoing until March 2006.	Report on training activity	
Strengthened capacity in local government offices to integrate environment and	Piloting mainstreaming of p-e issues from MKUKUTA in OO&D in selected districts	TOT package to be reviewed to take account of the MKUUTA; training manual	Status report	

livelihood concerns into district plans and programmes	and TOT package for local officials to integrate p-e issues	developed; working tool for p-e issues to be piloted in three districts. Awaiting printing.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependence on local approval process by Steering Committee</li> <li>• Lack of guidance on accessing international partners' contributions</li> </ul>
<b>Sub-project 2: Capacity Building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Establish National Convention Coordinating Committee	<p>Agree sub-project with VPO</p> <p>Prepare TORs for NCCC</p> <p>Prepare 3 year workplan for NCCC</p>	<p>NCCC established</p> <p>TOR agreed; 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting Nov 05.</p> <p>Workplan drafted and discussed by NCCC</p>	Feb 05 mission report. TOR. Work programme. Progress report Nov 05. 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting report.	<p>Scope of TOR and workplan is mainly focused on MGP – absence of activities aimed at national level MEA implementation. NCSA (UNDP) project approved to start early 2006. Need for coordination.</p> <p>Intended that NCCC prepare issue paper annually.</p> <p>Low level of disbursement. VPO has recently agreed to appoint full time project manager.</p> <p>Need for linkages with work undertaken by sub-project 3.</p>
Establish Micro Grants Programme	<p>Workplan 05/07</p> <p>Prepare MGP Operational Manual</p>	<p>Operational manual prepared and approved by NCCC;</p> <p>ready to receive proposals</p>	Manual	<p>Challenge of feedback from local level projects to policy level – involvement of local government will provide link</p> <p>Proposers will need to understand complex criteria.</p> <p>UNDP SGP represented on NCCC and can provide</p>

				advice.  Funds to be granted by Dec 2006.
<b>Sub-project 3: Capacity Building for the development of national legislation implementing Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Reports on critical review of existing environmental laws and institutional arrangement	Legal analytical review for implementation of Rio MEAs and assessment of capacity building needs	Consultant appointed Sept 05. Draft report completed.	TORs. Consultant reports due	Current funding is for very short time period (six months) Lack of indication about longer-term objectives and relevant workplan.  Clear focus on MEA legislation and implementation measures  Consultant TORs ambitious and require coordination.  Unclear how UNEP study will fit into local timetable.  Apparent intent to contribute to mainstreaming into PRSP implementation.
	Training modules, guidelines, toolkits and booklets on implementation of MEAs focusing on poverty reduction	Consultant appointed Sept 05. Draft report completed.	TORs. Consultant reports due	
	Consulting stakeholders, publication and dissemination report	Early 2006		
	Formulation of a multi-sectoral task force to review the implementation	ToR established Meetings held	ToR Meeting minutes	



### 3.3.2 Uganda

230 Overall the programme component is well placed to go forward. There appears to be a high level of commitment from the focal points in NEMA and the Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), combined with a healthy scepticism about capacity building that is not focused on making real progress with implementation. There has been a high level of support from other donors over the past few years, especially relating to revision of the PEAPs. There is a clear need to ensure that UNEP's support builds on the previous achievements of other donors involved in related activities. The focal points are keen to ensure synergies between the sub-projects.

231 **Sub-project 1.** Over the past 5 years, there have been a number of activities supported by several international donors aimed at mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into the PEAP. These activities have influenced two revisions of the PEAP, the establishment of an Environment and Natural Resources Sector Working Group and preparation of a SWAP. UNEP's support to this process follows these efforts and should build on the achievements and lessons so far. Not surprisingly therefore the first activity in the workplan is to review previous initiatives and to recommend how this sub-project should address any gaps and entry points. The workplan as it currently stands embodies a range of elements consistent with the previous efforts. It does however differ from the clear focus of the sub-project in other countries on influencing the revision of a PRSP. In light of the review, there may be revisions to the workplan that will give it more specific objectives. An integrated ecosystem assessment is planned.

232 **Sub-project 2.** Effort so far has focused on the initial outputs of establishing the NCCG and preparing to launch the MGP. The NCCC held a workshop in October 2005 aimed at team-building among the members and training needs. The MGP is to be managed by the GEF SGP (UNDP) and initial sensitisation is underway in four districts. UNEP has completed the NCSA study and the TOR for the NCCG expresses the intent to use the results of this study to focus its workplan and help to define its intended results. The NCCG's scope includes the Rio MEAs and other international conventions.

233 **Sub-project 3.** The sub-project is fully integrated into the PADELIA project. In the course of project preparation, NEMA expressed a preference for implementation rather than more studies and to ensure that poverty alleviation was the priority. The focal point is keen to ensure that the workplan can accommodate future activities that are identified during the initial phase – activities that have a strong focus on implementation of more poverty focused environmental legislation. There is also a strong preference to making the outputs relevant to local communities.

234 **Coordination.** Two sub-projects are managed by NEMA and one by MWLE and the focal points appear to be well disposed to coordinate at a personal level. There also seems to be strong support for the NCCG playing a coordination role between the sub-projects. It was apparent that the focal points have given some thought to the relevance of the outputs of the sub-projects to each other and are consciously planning to achieve some synergies. They would welcome more support from UNEP to achieve greater coordination at a management level.

<b>Uganda</b>				
<b>Capacity Building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a sense of “study fatigue” at the country level</li> <li>• NEMA appear keen to ensure capacity building activities lead to implementation results</li> <li>• NEMA is concerned about scope for taking up recommendations from studies in workplan over project duration</li> <li>• There is scope for furthering role of NCCG in coordination of sub-projects</li> <li>• NEMA and others thought capacity building should be more focused at community level benefits</li> <li>• The funds available for MGP are limited</li> <li>• There is limited involvement of UNDP in sub-project 1</li> <li>• Significant management burden on focal points despite having junior assistants</li> <li>• NEMA is concerned that UNEP wanted to manage the three sub-projects separately.</li> </ul>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP project managers should address the duration and updating of workplans to give NEMA more confidence about resources available and scope for including issues arising from initial activities</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should identify means to achieve synergies between the 3 sub-projects</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should focus on how sub-projects can build on achievements of past activities and the work of the ENR SWG (eg by taking account of the sub-project 1 initial study)</li> <li>• UNEP should take account of NEMA scepticism about value of capacity building compared to implementation activities.</li> <li>• UNEP and NEMA project managers should continue to try to involve UNDP Country Office</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should ensure that results of NCSA are explicitly addressed through NCCG and coordinate with planned follow up project</li> </ul>				
<b>Sub-project 1: Integrating and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	Workplan and implementation arrangements	1 year workplan agreed and currently being updated. Steering Committee and Technical Committee established	Updated workplan Jan 06. UNEP Status report Jan 06	Several donors involved in similar activities over past few years; but limited consultation in developing workplan; lack of involvement by UNDP.  Belgian representative is member of both NSC and NTC.
Gaps linkages, synergies, entry points, and lessons learned identified in existing poverty reduction initiatives	Review of existing P-E initiatives – gaps, linkages, entry points	Report prepared and reviewed by NTC. To be disseminated in Jan 06.	Draft Report.	
	On basis of report, capacity	Actions included in draft	Draft revised workplan	

	building in mainstreaming for NPA; develop guidelines; mainstream into national M&E framework.	revised workplan.		3 focal points members of NSC and NTC
ENR Database	Establish database and develop indicators.	ENR statistics committee has been created. Concept note to be developed.		Focal point concerned about how issues and recommendations arising from studies can be incorporated and funded in current and future workplans.  Question about extent to which current workplan builds on recent activities focused on integrating environment into PEAPs and work of ENRSWG
CSO and NGO support	CSO meeting	Completed	Report.	
Coherent policy	Analysis and workshop on coherent policy development	Partner institution identified. Possible synergy with sub-project 3 report. To be completed 2006		
Integrated assessment capacity	Report on ecosystems services	Study underway.	Inception report	
	Training workshop to prepare for integrated ecosystem assessment	Planned for Feb 2006.	Draft concept note submitted to UNEP	
	Pilot integrated assessment	Planned after workshop. Possible input from SAFMA		
Local sensitisation	Pilot projects in 4 districts, awareness raising and LWGs	CSO workplans have been developed		
M&E framework	Develop M&E plan and baseline	Consultants have prepared draft report	Draft report	
<b>Sub-project 2: Capacity Building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of Rio MEAs – started June 2005</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Establish NCCG	Prepare TOR for NCCG  Prepare 3 year workplan  Prepare annual substantive paper	NCCG TOR prepared; project manager recruited. October 2005 workshop on team-building and training needs  Prepared country issues paper on EIA and GIS in implementing MEAs Database and library being developed. 3 focal points included in NCCG.	NCCG TOR. NEPAD MEA workplan. Workshop report  Draft annual issues paper	NCSA has been prepared under UNEP management and preparing follow up capacity building project. Unclear how results will be integrated into workplan of NCCG.  Workshop helped to prepare NCCG for project implementation and finalised workplan

		Prepared country issues paper on EIA and GIS		Not clear what the NCCG agenda for improved implementation at the national level will be.
Establish Micro Grants Programme	MGP operational guidelines; Institutional framework; Community initiative	Operational guidelines finalised. Field visits to districts to sensitise about MGP  Proposals ready for submission. Training for grantees is planned.	MOU with UNDP	MGP managed by GEF SGP (UNDP)  Aim to select proposals in same districts as sub-project 1 pilot activities.
<b>Sub-project 3: Capacity Building for the development of national legislation implementing Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Focus on MEAs and their contribution to poverty alleviation.	Preparation of a synergy, cost-benefit and social impact analysis of national environmental policies and laws	Consultancy to start soon – delayed due to bidding process. Possible merging with Sub-project 1 study on policy coherence.	Status report Dec 05. TOR.	Incorporated into UNEP PADELIA project. Adds poverty focus to current PADELIA project workplan. Other focal points are members of PADELIA steering committee.
	Development of an implementation mechanism	To follow		
	Pilot activities and capacity building	Planned. Funds required. Possible synergy with sub-project 2 MGP.		NEMA feel UNEP do not see sub-project and PADELIA as an integrated whole.
	Capacity Building and Training of environmental lawyers - focus on poverty alleviation.	Activities identified and to be implemented. Strong potential for synergies with sub-projects 1 & 2.		Strong motivation to coordinate with other sub-projects.

### 3.3.3 Rwanda

235 There is a very high level of commitment by REMA and the Minister to the UNEP programme, and there is a good sense of what they are trying to achieve. The collaboration between UNDP and UNEP in preparing sub-project 1 has clearly worked well with the two organisations teaming up from the outset. The progress so far on the MEA sub-projects suggests that there is a focus on good results suited to their current needs – for example the initial priority for the legal component is on the urgent needs to develop legislation to implement their new organic law.

236 **Sub-project 1.** UNEP and the UNDP PEI have worked in partnership to prepare and launch a comprehensive sub-project with the clear focus (in Phase I) on influencing the revision of the PRSP over the coming year. The project will be implemented by REMA with assistance from the UNDP country office and UNEP. The preparation of the project has focused on a clear entry point and a new and highly committed local environment agency. Both UNEP and UNDP have committed a significant effort to getting the project launched and targeted at the PRSP revision process. UNEP and UNDP have also made it clear that Phase II will build on the effort to mainstream into the PRSP and tackle the challenges of implementation and the required capacity building. A national project manager and an international advisor have been appointed. A pilot integrated ecosystem assessment is planned during Phase I.

237 **Sub-project 2.** The NCCU has been established, its TOR have been finalised and the MGP is up and running. The TOR have a strong focus on the substantive agenda of improved synergistic MEA implementation. A project manager has been appointed. The challenge will be to achieve the specific tasks and there is a question of how the effort required will be resourced. The MGP is being managed by the UNDP SGP. It has approved two projects up to date. They are hopeful about benefiting from the experience of the SGP and are keen to get guidance from UNEP on how best to ensure that lessons can be extracted for the MGP. There is an NCSA about to start under the management of UNDP.

238 **Sub-project 3.** The preparation phase was hindered by the change in government and subsequent restructuring. The urgent need at the country level has been to support the implementation of the new organic environment law – by drafting key laws and regulations. In order to respond to country priorities, there have been several revisions of the initial workplan which covers the period up to mid 2006.

239 **Coordination.** All the sub-project focal points are in REMA and work closely together. They have suggested that the NCCU should include all three focal points. There is limited focus on any potential synergies between the workplans of the sub-projects – possibly because each sub-project is quite well focused on complementary but not overlapping objectives.

<b>Rwanda</b>				
<b>Capacity Building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of good cooperation with UNDP in joint preparation of sub-project 1</li> <li>• High level of commitment by REMA</li> <li>• REMA concern about longer-term continuity of support</li> <li>• Institutional set-up allows good coordination</li> <li>• But limited capacity is available – especially in light of high transaction costs of sub-projects</li> <li>• REMA concerned that capacity building should have an impact on the ground</li> <li>• Concern that capacity needs to be built for implementation phase (especially for sub-project 1)</li> <li>• UNEP-UNDP operational procedures have caused some delays</li> </ul>				
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP project managers should support the participation of all focal points in the NCCU</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should ensure that joint management arrangements with UNDP allow timely disbursement</li> </ul>				
<b>Sub-project 1: Integrating and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs (jointly with UNDP) Phase 1 Dec 05-Dec 06</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Knowledge base improved	Collect and review existing data on P-E linkages.	Started during preparatory phase building on UNDP PE Mapping project	UNEP status report Jan 06; UNEP-UNDP Project Document for Phase I	Workshop in Feb 05 involving various donors and stakeholders to guide preparation phase. Project preparation done in partnership with UNDP from outset (PEI support); REMA to implement with joint UNDP country office – UNEP support.
	Economic assessment of natural resource use.	Draft report of first part of the assessment prepared		
	Ecosystem assessment.	Attendance at SAfMA workshop. Pilot ecosystem assessment workshop being planned.		
	Develop communication tools for p-e linkages to be included in PRSP II	WWF undertaking initial review.		Preliminary activities completed. Phase I has started.
	Media events	Prepared TORs		
Practical mechanisms and tools to integrate	Guidelines on mainstreaming into PRSP and sector			Strong local buy-in but local capacity is overstretched.

environment into PRSP II	strategies			Local project manager and international advisor appointed. Task team established which provides good institutional mechanism for involvement in PRSP process. . Link with UNDP Decentralised Environmental Management Project.  REMA keen to benefit from international partners – but would prefer they had more presence on the ground. Plan to learn from other countries' experience eg Tanzania
	M&E tools	CSC to support		
	Energy-poverty-environment advocacy tool	Draft report prepared		
Capacity Building	Training Learning from Tz experience			
	Project support			
Stakeholder participation	Establish stakeholder group			
Continued PEI programme	Develop Phase II			
<b>Sub-project 2: Capacity Building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Establish National Convention Coordinating Unit	TORs for NCCU 3 year workplan for NCCU.  Activities related to PRSP: manual on integrating MEAs, workshop and awareness.  Activities related to improved implementation of MEAs	NCCU TOR finalised. 2 meetings have taken place. Workplan will be finalised Feb 06. Project manager appointed.	Jan 05-Dec 07 workplan. 06/05 Progress report. 08/05 Mission report. NCCU TOR. Project manager TOR	Project manager in place.  NCCU revised workplan includes a range of specific activities focused on synergetic implementation and poverty alleviation. Recognised synergies with other activities. Workplan has significant resource implications – for support from UNEP.
Establish Micro Grants Programme	Workplan for NCCU – output 3 Preparation of Operational Manual	Agreed MOU with UNDP SGP. Drafted Operational Manual. 2 projects approved Ready to review further proposals.	MOU. Operational Manual  2 project proposals	NCSA managed by UNDP (due to finish mid 06) to feed into work of NCCU  MGP managed by UNDP. Strong motivation to use

				MGP to create strong links between MEA implementation and local activities. Desire for guidance on extracting lessons.
<b>Sub-project 3: Capacity Building for the development of national legislation implementing Rio MEAs – started July 05</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Strengthened legal framework for implementation of MEAs with focus on poverty alleviation	Develop workplan. Awareness building workshop.	Workplan being revised (3 <sup>rd</sup> version).  Workshop held	UNEP MOU with REMA until mid 06	Initial project did not address specific country needs of implementing organic law. Also government reforms caused need for revision and made planned capacity assessment inappropriate. Workplan needs to be initiated without delay.  Challenge of tailoring revised workplan to available budget.  Request for regular guidance from UNEP  Possible synergy with sub-project 2 on databases.  Question as to whether sub-project needs a Task Force and whether NCCU could act as guiding body
	Analytical review of linkages between environmental law and poverty eradication	Identified draft bills of high priority to implement organic law (not supported by project). Some capacity building activities planned		
	Wetland regulations	Has been dropped because funds available from World Bank		
	Capacity needs assessment	Revised to include review of sector legislation; integration of environment into law curriculum; creation of resource centre		
	Training modules	Planned for: judicial intervention into law cases; access to environmental justice; handling environmental litigation.		



### 3.3.4 Mozambique

240 Overall, there was a strong sense of ownership mixed with a feeling of being somewhat unsure about how the programme was going to proceed. The recent revision of the PARPA had given some momentum to getting the programme underway, even to the extent of getting funds from another donor to enable them to start before the UNEP arrangements were in place. However, it appears that the focal points are keen to get direct support from UNEP in response to their concerns and uncertainties.

241 **Sub-project 1.** After a delayed start, the sub-project is now underway. The preparation phase was prolonged – partly due to unfamiliarity with the intended process and partly elections and establishing a new government. However, the timetable for reviewing the PARPA made it urgent to get the work started – resulting in DANIDA providing funds for some activities before the sub-project with UNEP was finalised. Now the PARPA revision has progressed, the workplan is focused on the next steps – for example poverty-environment indicators. MICOA is implementing the work in close collaboration with the Ministry of Planning and Development. There has been no opportunity to work in partnership with UNDP, but it appears that the relationship between MICOA and UNDP is improving. MICOA are very keen to get an international advisor and to receive more direct support from UNEP

242 **Sub-project 2.** There has been good progress so far. The NCCC has been established as a sub-committee of CONDES. The NCCC operational workplan has been prepared for review and has identified specific activities. A project manager has been appointed by MICOA. The current focus is predominately on the MGP – several projects have already been approved. GEF/SGP is providing experience and advice. MICOA attach a high priority to the MGP but are concerned that the limited budget makes it difficult to have an impact at the local level. The NCSA is in its final stages of completion.

243 **Sub-project 3.** The activities under this sub-project are fully integrated into the PADELIA project which provides an efficient management arrangement. There is an initial focus on the legislation required for the MEA implementation, (with particular attention to the legal basis for access and benefit sharing for genetic resources) but the focal point is aware of the need to apply focus to poverty alleviation. This would require a more broad scope and a revised workplan. It appears that this is not being addressed at present.

244 **Coordination.** There is concern at the county level about the separate management of the three sub-projects by UNEP – particularly in terms of the different procedures and timetables for workplans. There appears to be support for the NCCC playing a role in coordinating the country level sub-projects. There are no specific plans to link activities or outputs between the sub-projects.

<b>Mozambique</b>				
<b>Capacity Building programme for the integration and institutionalisation of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial delays caused by elections and government reorganisation</li> <li>• MICOA seem to feel somewhat on the margin</li> <li>• MICOA feel they need more direct support from UNEP</li> <li>• MICOA initially unclear about some aspects of the sub-projects</li> <li>• Concern expressed about being able to make an impact with limited resources – especially outside Maputo region.</li> <li>• Concern expressed about different management arrangements for 3 sub-projects - budgets, timetables, workplans etc</li> <li>• Concern expressed about lack of compensation to focal points for their increased workload and responsibilities</li> </ul>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP project managers should support the proposal that NCCC should play a role in coordinating 3 sub-projects</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should provide more direct support in country and consider request for international technical assistance</li> <li>• UNEP project managers should discuss with Mozambique focal points how they can feel more involved in overall process</li> </ul>				
<b>Sub-project 1: Integrating and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs – start Sept 05.</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Workplan	Develop Workplan	Original workplan has been revised and submitted to UNEP for approval – up to August 06. It takes account of DANIDA funding for initial activities and reallocation of UNEP funds for later activities.	Draft revised workplan, 05 progress report to GoB; UNEP status report Jan 06; Progress report June-Dec 05	Initial focus on preparation of PARPA II. Delays in agreeing and approving UNEP workplan. DANIDA has funded initial activities to enable MICOA to meet timetable for influencing the new PARPA. Limited coordination with UNDP.  Good cooperation between MICOA and Min of Planning. Currently MICOA feel the need for more direct support from UNEP and are requesting an international
Mainstreaming into new PARPA	MICOA participation in PARPA review group to influence environmental integration and workshops	Completed with support from DANIDA. Impact on PARPA II	Draft PARPA II	
	Analysis of integration of environment into previous PARPA;	IISD input; WWF desk study of PARPA I;	WWF report	
	Review of existing P-E data	consultancy has been		

	and activities	initiated		advisor.
	Identification of local partners for pilot projects	Linkage with MGP (sub project 2)		MICOA see priority need for poverty-environment indicators to support implementation of PARPA II.
Micro-programmes	Approve demonstration projects	Reviewing micro projects		
	Launch with project partners	To be initiated		
Macro-programmes	Workshop	To be initiated		
	District and local level capacity building	Preparation started		
	Development of indicators	CSC input; local consultant in place.		Early constraints due to lack of familiarity with issues and absence of materials in Portuguese. MICOA not clear at outset on budget limits. Long drawn out process of developing workplan with UNEP.
Integration into sectoral strategies	Capacity building workshops	SAFMA input in 2005; participation in regional workshop 09/05. To be continued in 2006		
	CSO consultations	Preparation started		
Experiences and good practice	Regional workshops	Preparation started		
	Public awareness raising	To be initiated		
<b>Sub-project 2: Capacity Building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
National Convention Coordination Committee	TORs f or NCCC  Set up NCCC – sub-committee of CONDES.  3 year workplan on coordination and synergetic implementation  Infrastructure support  Annual issues report	NCCC set up. TOR developed. 3 year workplan prepared for review by NCCC. Jan-June 06 operational workplan prepared. Project manager recruited  Equipment bought  First annual issues paper prepared.	Sept 05 mission report. Draft operational workplan.	NCSA in its final stages.  Initiated consultancy on integrating MEAs into PARPA. Now aware that activity has been dropped by UNEP.  Not clear how NCCC workplan will be implemented. Almost complete focus on MGP components
Micro Grants Programme	Management arrangements	MICOA managing: Project	MGP Operational Manual	High level of commitment to

	and allocation of funds	manager appointed; MGP operational manual prepared; 5 grants disbursed		<p>MGP component</p> <p>Cooperation with UNDP SGP. Concern about difficulties of extending projects to northern areas.</p> <p>Concern about limited funds to make an impact. Lack of awareness of MEAs.</p> <p>Interested in how incentives can be provided to local communities to implement micro projects well</p> <p>Aware of challenge of extracting lessons from micro projects</p>
<b>Sub-project 3: Capacity Building for the development of national legislation implementing Rio MEAs</b>				
<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Legal review of MEAs	Study on identification of implementing legislation and gaps for Rio MEAs taking into account poverty alleviation. To be followed by national workshop.	Draft report by consultant in December 2005. Under review by Task Force.	PADELIA progress report Nov 05.	<p>Activities integrated within PADELIA – managed by UNDP.</p> <p>Start delayed by government restructuring.</p>
Assess legal status of access to natural resources and benefit sharing. (relating to Bonn guidelines under CBD)	Review of an ongoing study on Access to Benefit Sharing. Develop necessary legislation. Hold national workshop.	Consultant hired to do review. Report due Feb 06		Judicial community unfamiliar with concept of linking law to poverty.
Capacity Building	To be identified.	To be implemented in 2006		

### 3.4 *Conclusions*

#### 3.4.1 **Sub-project 1**

245 The UNEP Poverty Environment programme has faced a considerable challenge in launching country level projects in the four Belgian funded countries. The programme has moved from a conceptual, supply driven model to a country owned, needs based operational approach. In so doing, it has required considerable, sustained management and technical input from the UNEP team to work with the countries to tailor the activities to the specific circumstances in each country. UNEP has during this period agreed a partnership with UNDP's PEI and has made strong efforts to operationalise this partnership at the country level. The preparation phase has been time consuming and has encountered a range of administrative obstacles, including the different operational procedures between UNEP and UNDP. However, the country level sub-projects are now prepared and launched. Our conclusions are summarised as follows:

##### 246 Project Design. (Relevance)

- The original project design (prior to the start of Belgian financial support) was predominantly conceptual and not well suited to developing country level operational support.
- The initial efforts to launch country level support encountered problems as the countries had not been adequately consulted nor had UNEP taken full account of the substantial efforts by other agencies such as UNDP and a range of bilaterals to build up sustained support to mainstreaming environment into PRSPs at the country level.
- The original project design encompassed the technical inputs of four international partners appointed before country needs were identified – leading to a supply-driven approach to the countries. Although there have been considerable efforts to change this approach and modify the MOUs, it is evident that there are some residual elements in several of the country level workplans. Also, delivery by some partners has been unsatisfactory.
- The mix of technical knowledge and operational management necessary for successful country level support to mainstreaming poverty environment linkages into national development processes, including PRSPs did not match well the comparative advantages of UNEP's traditional "normative" approach.
- In developing the country level workplans, UNEP has needed to allocate a high level of staff time and resources to understanding and responding to the specific circumstances in each country and building relationships with government and donor officials.
- There appears to be some ambiguity at the country level about the nature of "capacity building" – some country officials seem to feel that this is a separate to the practical and technical efforts to achieve mainstreaming at an operational level.
- UNEP plans to establish a Steering Committee to focus on resource mobilisation. The chairman has been selected and this committee will be fully set up once the need to raise more financial resources becomes imminent.
- UNEP has established a Technical Advisory Group – consisting of key donors and UNDP which will be expanded once project implementation has proceeded further.

##### 247 Administrative Issues (Efficiency)

- UNEP's internal procedures have caused a range of problems for the UNEP efforts to launch the country level sub-projects: examples include the relatively low ceilings on

MOUs and staff travel approval procedures. In some cases, there has been a lack of operational urgency in implementing the procedures.

- UNEP's administrative procedures are not compatible with UNDP's in many instances which has caused problems in launching joint projects in certain countries – we understand a study has been commissioned to examine this problem.
- There was evidence from some countries that UNDP country offices may have inefficiencies in their financial and disbursement procedures which will cause delays to the country sub-projects which are managed through the UNDP country office.
- At the country level, some focal points are not clear about the overall scale, content and timeframe of the UNEP support – as the focus has been on MoUs and workplans of a limited duration

#### 248 Delivery (Effectiveness)

- The UNEP unit has a good working relationship with the UNDP PEI manager (based in New York) and the Nairobi based focal point for the UNEP-UNDP MOU.
- It is clear that timely preparation of the country level workplans requires extensive time inputs, frequent travel and good communication from the staff of the UNEP unit – and we believe that they need more resources to sustain the activities effectively. There is evidence from the country level that more direct support, visits and technical advice would be welcomed – as has been done in Rwanda for example. Some countries expressed the view that the process of agreeing the workplans has been very prolonged.
- It is also the case that the team did not initially have the benefit of relevant technical expertise and back-up suited to country level mainstreaming environment into PRSPs – in part because UNEP has not had that experience previously. There is no evidence that this has caused shortcomings but it will be valuable to apply the technical lessons learned to date to ensure that the agreed activities deliver the desired results – especially in the case of the technical analysis activities.
- The dependence on project staff rather than permanent Environment Fund staff makes the work of the team vulnerable to high turnover.
- The evidence from the country level is that the UNEP team has communicated and responded well to the country requirements and has successfully launched agreed sub-project workplans tailored to the needs of each country – a significant achievement given the earlier problems.
- The role of the international partners is changing. In some cases, the MOU has come to an end; in others, it is being reviewed with the intent of ensuring more relevant inputs to meet the specific country needs. As a result, there is some confusion at the country level about whether and how to access their services in the course of the agreed workplans.
- The evidence suggests that the regional workshop organised in May 2005 was very useful to the countries as have regional exchanges of experience such as the Ghana meeting in October 2005 and that there is demand for more among the participating countries.

#### 249 Coordination

- In two of the four countries supported by Belgian funds, UNEP and UNDP are working effectively as partners – in one case, having jointly prepared and launched the sub-project from the outset. In the other two countries, UNEP is working on its own – as a result apparently of limited interest or lack of available staff on the part of the UNDP Country Office.

- The process of launching the sub-project at the country level requires effective consultation and coordination with the other donors actively supporting this area – for example via donor coordination groups. In the cases where UNEP is working in partnership with UNDP, the capacity and role of the local UNDP office can be helpful. In the cases, where UNEP is working alone this is a greater challenge. In either case, coordination is difficult and time-consuming.
- There is some evidence of potential overlap between the work of the UNEP poverty environment unit in DPDL and some activities of other UNEP Divisions. For example, the Economic and Trade Branch of DTIE is supporting a series of pilot applications of its integrated assessment methodology including an application to the PRSP in Uganda. Also, the Production and Consumption Branch of DTIE has launched a project piloting the integration of sustainable consumption and production into PRSPs. In each case, the evidence suggests that the communication between the relevant DPDL and DTIE staff members has improved with a view to avoid confusion at the country level. It is also apparent that the DTIE activities are more focused on piloting a methodology in contrast to broader the operational nature of the DPDL sub-project.
- There has been limited coordination during the project preparation process with the other two sub-projects. It would appear that there has been a concentrated effort by the UNEP team to achieve agreed country level workplans tailored to the specific local circumstances. They have seen less need to coordinate with the two other sub-projects given their different content and institutional context. However, there has been a recurrent message from the countries that they would welcome more coordination.

### 3.4.2 Sub-project 2

250 This sub-project is integrated within the Environment Action Plan of NEPAD and with the overall GEF implementation process. There has been a simplification of the sub-project elements over the period of agreeing how it would be launched at the country level – reflecting a widely recognised conclusion that it was too top-down in approach originally. There was initially considerable resistance to coordination among the different Conventions’ staff and it has been a significant achievement to get the sub-project underway.

#### 251 Project Design (Relevance)

- The original project design reflected in the logframe submitted to Belgium was primarily focused on establishing a regional coordination body and on producing knowledge-based outputs to support more synergistic implementation of the Rio MEAs.
- In the early stages of preparing the sub-project at the country level, UNEP adopted a more operational project design focused on establishing NCCCs, developing methodologies to mainstream implementation of MEAs into PRSPs and an delivering an MGP. This project design was launched consistently in the four countries. Subsequently, the second component was dropped on the grounds that it was covered by other ongoing activities or by sub-project 1 or 3. This is however not the case in all countries.
- The resulting project design is therefore simple and consistent between the four countries. However, the evidence from the workplans so far agreed would suggest that the agenda of the NCCCs is not fully articulated yet – beyond the urgent task of overseeing the MGP. The objectives of the NCCC workplan related to strengthening national capacity for synergistic implementation have yet to be fully addressed.

- The lack of prior consultation with the countries resulted in initial resistance to coordination between the Convention staff and time was needed to team build and develop consensus.
- It is clear however that the countries are very focused on the MGP and value its potential to provide direct benefits to local communities and to contribute to implementation of the MEAs in the local context. However, the funds available for the MGP are very small (USD 150,000 per country). The criteria for selecting the projects focus on demonstrating the links between MEAs and poverty reduction and on the potential to influence better MEA policy development at all levels.
- The evidence suggests that the countries value the MGP highly because it will benefit local communities directly. The overall objective of the MGP however is to influence the synergistic implementation of the MEAs at the policy level and it was not fully clear to countries how best to achieve that – both through the choice of projects to fund and the way in which lessons might be drawn from their experiences.
- The scale of the MGP also limits the potential for achieving a balanced range of replicable demonstration impacts – taking account of the diversity of specific activities relevant to the three MEAs and the diversity of local conditions.
- For these reasons, it seems that the countries do not have a very clear idea of the results they are trying to achieve in this sub-project beyond the practical achievement of establishing the NCCCs and administering the MGP.
- There is a parallel programme of National Capacity Self Assessments which will have outputs (such as identifying gaps in MEA implementation capacity and opportunities for synergies) that are very relevant to this sub-project. It is important that the countries make specific plans to adopt the action plans for the NCSAs.

#### 252 Administrative Issues (Efficiency)

- The sub-project is managed by the Division of GEF Coordination and is integrated within their existing arrangements for the NEPAD implementation.
- In two of the four countries, the GEF SGP (usually within UNDP) is being used to implement the MGP; and in the other two, the SGP coordinators are sharing experience for the benefit of the MGP and are members of the NCCCs.
- The sub-project has been slow to get started – partly due to changes in staffing at UNEP.

#### 253 Delivery (Effectiveness)

- Each country has established its NCCC and has adopted the Operational Guidelines for the MGP.
- At this point, the workplans for the NCCCs have limited focus on the substantive agenda of building capacity for synergistic implementation of the MEAs.
- The recent focus has been to get the MGP up and running as it will take two years for the projects to be completed and for lessons learned to be extracted. It is intended to refocus on the NCCC agenda now that this has been accomplished.
- Two of the four countries have already approved MGP projects and there is evidence that the countries are trying to ensure that the funds are all approved before the end of 2006.
- The sub-project design provides for full-time project manager which should enable the sub-project to deliver the intended outputs – although a project manager has not yet been appointed in one of the countries (process underway).
- UNEP organised a regional workshop in November 2005 – as part of the NEPAD Environmental Initiative – which included in its programme some focus on this sub-



project – in particular on synergistic implementation and reporting under the MEAs. A manual is in preparation on integrated reporting and coordinated response.

- UNEP DGEF has provided effective and well targeted technical support to the countries – for example on a generic NCCC TORs, MGP Operational Manual and TORs for project managers – and there are further opportunities to provide more. A draft manual on integrated reporting and coordinated response is under preparation.

#### 254 Coordination

- In several countries, focal points suggested that the NCCCs could act as a coordinating body to ensure that the synergies between the three sub-components could be achieved. The three focal points could all be members of the committee.
- There has not been significant coordination between the workplans of sub-projects 1 and 2. On the one hand, it has not been high on the agenda of sub-project 1 to make an explicit effort to highlight the integration of MEAs into PRSPs. On the other, the component in sub-project 2 about mainstreaming MEAs into PRSPs has been dropped.
- There appear to be considerable opportunities for coordination between sub-projects 2 and 3. However, the predominant focus on the MGP may have obscured the linkage between synergistic MEA implementation at a policy level and the legal arrangements for MEA implementation.
- There is a clear need for the sub-project to coordinate constructively with the NCSA project in each country.

### 3.4.3 Sub-project 3

255 This sub-project is closely linked with the UNEP PADELIA programme, implemented by the Environmental Law Branch of DPDL. The original project design was specifically focused on the legislation for implementing Rio MEAs with a consideration of poverty reduction. To differing extents, the adaptation of the sub-project to the national level has focused more on the linkage between environmental legislation in the broad sense and poverty alleviation.

#### 256 Project Design (Relevance)

- The sub-project design at the country level differs from country to country. In some there are specific activities related to the legislation required to implement the Rio MEAs ; in others the focus is on making environmental legislation more broadly consistent with poverty alleviation.
- UNEP has indicated that it intends to revise the overall sub-project logframe to reflect the changes in focus – although the countries are now in the process of implementing the first stages of their workplans.
- UNEP has also stated that it will prepare a guidance paper for the countries on the linkage between environmental law and poverty alleviation. While this may be helpful to the countries, it may be too late to ensure that the initial phase of activities has a consistent approach across the countries.
- There is potential for confusion about the intended project results. However, UNEP has stated that it wants to be flexible and responsive to the country needs.

#### 257 Administrative Issues (Efficiency)

- The sub-project has been slow to get started.

- In two countries, the activities under this project are fully incorporated into the PADELIA project which should improve management efficiency – although in Uganda it has slowed down the procurement process.
- In some cases, the workplans are very short in duration and give little indication of the overall direction of the sub-project

258 Delivery (Effectiveness)

- The revision of the project logframe and preparation of a guiding concept paper are likely to come late in the process.
- There is a need to establish clearly what the intended results of the sub-project are and how they can be achieved given the remaining timescale.
- Some of the TORs (provided by UNEP) for the initial studies to be undertaken in the countries were unnecessarily ambitious and complex.

259 Coordination

- There are in some cases evident overlaps between the activities of sub-projects 2 and 3. For example, one of the studies in Tanzania should provide the starting point for the NCCC workplan on strengthening synergistic implementation of MEAs.
- There should be common ground between the substantive workplan of the NCCCs under sub-project 2 and the focus of improved legislation in sub-project 3.
- The intended shift in emphasis to the poverty alleviation impact of environmental legislation should create synergies with sub-project 1 depending on the stage in the PRSP process that the country is at.

## **Annex B            Terms of Reference**

### **Terms of Reference Evaluation of the Partnership between the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and UNEP**

#### **I.        Abstract**

A midterm evaluation of the Partnership<sup>18</sup> to be conducted jointly by the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and UNEP has been scheduled for 2005. The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to review progress toward the implementation of project activities, identify bottlenecks and reorient the direction of the project activities where necessary.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to review the effectiveness of the approach used in developing the partnership by assessing the efficiency and effectiveness with which programme activities are being implemented and progress being made towards the achievement of stated results. The focus of the evaluation will be on three key questions:

1. Does the existing mechanism for support provide an adequate framework for policy dialogue and provide a means for long-term coherent support for the UNEP programme of work?
2. What progress has been made towards achieving the stated results and outputs of the various components of the partnership?
3. How effectively has UNEP collaborated with partners in the implementation of the Partnership including national authorities, regional resource centres, UN-Agencies (e.g. UNDP and UN-Habitat), other donor Governments (e.g. Norway) inter governmental organisations, NGOs and civil society etc.?

The Partnership between the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and UNEP consists of three programme components (assessment, water, and poverty and environment). The evaluation will determine the effectiveness of the approach used in developing the partnership and review all key activities of the three project components to determine progress towards achievement of results. Desk reviews will be undertaken of the

---

<sup>18</sup> **The term Partnership refers to the structured Collaboration between the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and UNEP, including the earmarked support towards UNEP programmes through Unilateral Acts from DGDC.**

assessment and water components and an in-depth review of the poverty and environment component will be conducted.

The users of the evaluation will primarily be the Belgian Directorate General for Development and UNEP who will use the evaluation for taking corrective action where needed and for determining the future of the partnership.

## **II Background of the UNEP Partnership**

In 2003 the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation consolidated and streamlined its collaboration with UNEP through developing a framework for collaboration which focuses on three programme components (assessment, water, and poverty and environment) for the years 2004-2007.

This Partnership is one among several agreements (e.g. the Framework Agreement with Norway, the Partnership Programme with the Netherlands, the Agreement with Ireland and the Memorandum of Understanding with Sweden) between donors and UNEP that have been established over the period 2001-2005. The Partnerships were set up to fulfil the following two main functions:

- a) Provide a framework for strategic policy dialogue and programme collaboration and;
- b) Provide a mechanism for long-term and coherent support ensuring stable and predictable financing of the UNEP programme of work<sup>19</sup>.

The total support for the Partnership is USD 12.1 million over the 4 year period.

### **Partnership Components**

*A. Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment.*

The Belgian authorities have provided US \$ 4 million of a total budget of US \$ 4.920 million to be spent over a three year period. The main elements are:

- (i) Increasing the involvement of the scientific community in the development of the Global Environment Outlook (GEO).
- (ii) Preparation of the Africa Environment Outlook.
- (iii) Supporting Integrated Environmental Assessment of Cities in LAC.

---

<sup>19</sup> Strengthening of the financing of the United Nations Environment Programme, Note by the Executive Director, GC 23, 2005.

- (iv) Assessing vulnerability of water resources to environmental change in African, Latin American and Asian countries including trans-boundary fresh water treaties and agreements at regional scale.

The Division for Early Warning and Assessment is responsible for implementing this component but works in cooperation with UNEP regional resource centres in Nairobi, Bangkok, Mexico, Geneva, Cambridge and Sioux Falls, GEO regional collaborating centres, World Metrological Organisation (WMO) and World Health Organisation (WHO).

***B. Implementation of the GPA (Global Programme of Action) Partnership Programme: Protection of the marine environment from land-based activities (LBA) and support to the Nairobi River Basin Programme Phase III.***

The Belgian authorities have contributed US \$2 million to the GPA Programme and US \$ 744,000 to the Nairobi River Basin Programme (US \$ 100,000 towards the bridging phase and US \$ 644,000 committed later in 2004 towards phase III). The main elements of the component related to water are:

**GPA**

- (i) Supporting the development of National Programme of Actions for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land based Activities (NPA);
- (ii) Supporting global, regional and national activities within the framework of on-going Physical Alterations and Destruction of Habitats (PADH) programmes;
- (iii) Supporting Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM);
- (iv) Supporting further implementation of Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater (SAP –Wastewater);
- (v) Supporting overall coordination.

**Nairobi River Basin Programme**

- (i) Supporting the bridging phase of UN-habitat/UNEP Joint Nairobi River Basin Programme;
- (ii) Supporting Environmental Management and Urban Planning Systems;

(iii) Supporting Environmental Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Resources.

The GPA Secretariat which is based in the Netherlands is part of UNEP's Division for Policy Implementation (DEPI) in UNEP and responsible for implementing the GPA project. Other implementing partners also include the UNEP Regional Seas Programme (DEPI) whereas the Netherlands, Ireland Norway, Italy and the United States are funding partners.

The Regional Office for Africa (ROA) of the Division for Regional Cooperation (DRC) in UNEP is responsible for coordinating the joint UNEP – UN-Habitat - UNDP Nairobi River Basin Programme. Other partners include United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Government of France, the Government of Kenya and NGOs.

***C. Capacity building programme for the integration and institutionalization of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities.***

The total contribution of the Belgian government to this component is US \$ 4 million. The capacity building programme aims at assisting 4 countries in Africa (Uganda, Tanzania, Mozambique and Rwanda) in creating an institutional framework and linkages between poverty alleviation and environment through the process of implementing Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and the development of poverty reduction strategies at the national level.

This component is made up of three project activities. They are:

- (i) Integration and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs.
- (ii) Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of RIO MEAs.
- (iii) Capacity building for the development of national legislation implementing RIO MEAs.

The divisions in charge of this programme are Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF), Division of Environmental Conventions (DEC), Division of Policy Implementation (DEPI) and Division for Policy Development and Law (DPDL). Other cooperating agencies include the African Union, New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), secretariat for the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), the secretariat for the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Millennium Eco-system

Assessment, International Institute Sustainable Development (IISD), Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank, World Health Organisation (WHO), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) and national institutions in the collaborating countries

An additional amount of US\$1.2 million was committed later in 2004 towards a related project on strengthening stakeholder participation in the integration and mainstreaming of environmental issues into PRSPs. This project is coordinated by DPDL.

### **III. Purpose of the evaluation**

This midterm evaluation of the partnership programme which will be conducted in 2005 will be followed by a terminal evaluation in 2007. The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to help UNEP and the Belgian authorities make sure that the projects are well on track and are likely to reach their results.

### **IV. Objectives of the evaluation**

The overall objective of the evaluation is to review the approach used in developing the partnership by assessing the efficiency and effectiveness with which programme activities are being implemented and progress being made towards the achievement of stated results. The evaluation will focus on three key questions:

1. Does the existing mechanism for support provide an adequate framework for policy dialogue and provide a means for long-term coherent support for the UNEP programme of work?
2. What progress has been made towards achieving stated results of the various components of the partnership agreement?
3. How effectively has UNEP collaborated with other partners in the implementation of the Partnership including national authorities, regional resource centres, UN-Agencies, inter governmental organisations, NGOs and civil society etc.?

### **V. Scope of the Evaluation**

The scope of this evaluation will be to review all key activities of the three programme components in the areas of assessment, water and poverty and environment from their initiation to the present. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project components to actual outputs and assess progress towards achievement of results.

The evaluation will diagnose problems if any and suggest necessary corrections and adjustments. It will assess the efficiency of project management, including delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency, overall implementation approach of the project, stakeholder participation, country ownership, likely results of the projects, and issues related to sustainability.

Two approaches will be used in this evaluation to include a desk evaluation of the assessment and water components (A+B) and an in-depth evaluation of the poverty and environment components (C). The relative importance placed by governments on issues related to poverty and the environment and the fact that implementation of the programme activities are not too far advanced for course correction provides the justification for the focus of this evaluation on the poverty and environment component.

## **VI. Terms of the evaluation:**

### **A. Overall Performance of the Partnership**

- Establish the extent to which progress has been made towards achieving the stated objectives and results of the partnership programme and determine the usefulness of the outputs produced to date.

### **B. Performance of the Capacity Building Programme on Poverty and Environment**

- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the support provided and the achievements to date in Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda in terms of capacity development for:
  - Formulating and monitoring policies that address poverty-environment linkages;
  - Incorporating environmental concerns in the expenditure framework of PRSPs;
  - Implementing environmental laws, regulations and policies developed and/or strengthened and harmonized;
  - Strengthening and harmonizing institutions dealing with management of biodiversity, climate change, desertification and poverty reduction;
  - promotion of ownership and homegrown environmental laws;
  - Strengthening legal expert's technical capacity and capability to develop and draft environmental laws, regulations and policies;
  - Fostering synergistic approaches to implementation of MEA's;
  - Strengthening reporting, planning and implementation of MEAs.
- Determine how the project was conceptualized and designed. This should include an assessment of the approach used in design and appropriateness of problem conceptualization. More particularly, the level of information dissemination, consultation, and stakeholder participation in project design should be assessed. The logical framework of the project should be reviewed with the objective of determining whether the different project components and activities proposed were appropriate and viable. Furthermore, the evaluation should determine how project design took into account other on-going interventions in the area of poverty and environment.
- Assess the level of ownership of the projects in terms of relevance to the countries' national development plans and environmental agendas and assess the likelihood of the projects being sustainable in terms of enabling environment, institutional sustainability and financial sustainability



- Determine the effectiveness of UNEP's collaboration with UNDP and other key partners in the four countries and highlight the best and worst practices.
- Assess the complementarity and integration between the support at the regional level and achievements in promoting information sharing and collaboration;
- Assess the effectiveness of evaluation and monitoring and other feed-back mechanisms;
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of systems for financial management, budgeting and accounting.

C. Effectiveness and Efficiency at the Partnership Level

- Examine the appropriateness and usefulness of reporting mechanisms used and establish whether there is effective transparent communication between all parties;
- Review the institutional arrangements, management and financial systems, and determine whether the programme was managed efficiently and effectively thereby reducing the administrative burden;

D. Coordination at the Partnership Level

- Determine whether the Partnership has strengthened UNEP's efforts to co-ordinate and harmonise its activities internally in UNEP as well as with outside partners;
- Determine whether collaboration and any synergies have been created between Partnership components and evaluate their relative significance;
- Assess the extent to which the Partnership Programme has catalyzed resource mobilization and opportunities for joint activities with other donors and partners;

E. Recommendations at the Partnership Level

- Identify strengths and weaknesses in each of the programme areas and provide recommendations for future action.
- Provide recommendation, if necessary, to improve the partnership approach and the mechanisms for its implementation.

## VII. Methodology

The study will be conducted using a participatory approach. The Chief of UNEP's Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU), the Deputy Executive Director of UNEP, the Permanent Representation in Nairobi, the Division for the United Nations of the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGDC) and the development cooperation attachés posted in Rwanda, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda will be kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The evaluation will be carried out in two parts.

The first part will include desk reviews of component A (strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment) and component B) implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) and the Nairobi River Basin Programme; This will include review of progress reports and reports of workshops, interviews of stakeholders preferably through the use of questionnaires, telephone interviews with project staff and beneficiaries and face to face interviews with UNEP staff.

The second part will include in-depth review of the three sub projects in the environment and poverty component: i) Integration and mainstreaming of key environmental issues into PRSPs ii) Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic implementation of RIO MEAs; iii) Capacity building and technical assistance to develop, and strengthen institutions and national legislation implementing RIO MEAs with specific consideration of poverty reduction measures, including training and awareness in 4 African countries. The methods used will include review of progress reports and reports from workshops and other relevant documentation, development of questionnaires, interviews with UNEP staff and staff in the field and field visits to Rwanda, Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda. More particularly, participatory consultations will take place with the key stakeholders in all four countries including Norwegian representatives, research institutes, national authorities, NGOs and civil society. The relevant UNEP task managers will join the consultations in Rwanda and Tanzania.

### **VIII. Report Format and Structure**

The evaluation report shall be a detailed report, written in English and composed of 1) a concise summary, not exceeding five pages, including findings and recommendations; 2) a detailed analysis which supports findings and recommendations; 3) separate section on lessons learned; 4) separate section on findings and recommendations; and 5) annexes (all typed in English). The detailed evaluation report without annexes should not exceed 35 pages.

The detailed evaluation report should be submitted in electronic form in MS Word and be addressed as follows:

Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel  
Deputy Executive Director  
UNEP, P.O. Box 305552  
GPO 00100, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: (254-2) 624020

Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey,  
Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit

UNEP, P.O. Box 30552  
GPO 00100 Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: (254-2) 623387  
Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)

Ms. Roxane de Bilderling  
Charge d'affaires  
Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Belgium to UNEP  
Limuru Road, Muthaiga  
P.O. Box 30461-00100  
Nairobi  
Tel: (254-2) 7122011  
Email: [nairobi@diplobel.org](mailto:nairobi@diplobel.org)

Division for United Nations (D4.3)  
Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation (DGDC)  
Rue Brederode 6, 1000 Brussels  
Belgium  
Tel: +32(0)2-5190646  
Fax: +32(0)2-5190570

## **IX. Schedule and Resources**

Under the overall guidance of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) and relevant unit in the Belgian Government, an evaluator shall be recruited to undertake an evaluation of the Partnership Programme during the period 28<sup>th</sup> November 2005 – 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 (7 weeks spread over 4 months). The evaluator will be assisted by a staff-member from the Evaluation and Oversight Unit in UNEP.

The draft evaluation will be discussed with the DED, all the divisions involved (DRC, DEPI, DEC, DPDL, DEWA, DGEF) and the Belgian authorities before it is submitted for comment to other UNEP Divisions and offices. A draft of the evaluation report in English will be presented to the Belgian Authorities, the DED and the respective Division Directors by 20<sup>th</sup> February 2006. Written consolidated comments on the draft report will be submitted by EOU by 13<sup>th</sup> March 2006. After careful review and revision of the draft report based on the comments submitted, the evaluator will present a final version of the evaluation report to EOU by 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006.

The evaluator should have the following qualifications: i) Relevant environmental background ii) Basic expertise in international environmental governance, iii) Minimum 10 years of evaluation experience; fluency in English; fluency in French desirable.

Due to the travel involved, the evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the lump sum fee upon signature of the contract. 30% will be paid upon submission of the first draft report and 40% will be paid upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSA of the evaluator and is inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

The evaluator will make his own travel arrangements according to the evaluation schedule provided in Annex I.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the product in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or where the product is substandard, payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the product is modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case, the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the consultant may not constitute the report.

9<sup>th</sup> November 2005

**Annex 1: Tentative Evaluation Schedule**

	<b>Team Leaders Schedule</b>	<b>Second Evaluator's Schedule</b>	<b>Deadlines for Team Leader</b>
<b>28 November 2005 - 19 December 2005 (2 weeks of work spread over 3 weeks)</b>	Desk review of documentation and planning of country visits and consultations in (Kampala, Maputo, Kigali, Dar Es Salaam), preparation of questionnaires and interview guides.	Same as for team leader	Agenda for country consultations prepared; stakeholders identified and contacted; questionnaires and interview guides developed.
<b>19 December 2005- 8 January 2006</b>	Break due to Christmas holidays	Same as for team leader	
<b>8 January 2006</b>	Arrival in Nairobi		
<b>9 January 2006 - 15 January 2006</b>	Meeting with Evaluation and Oversight Unit, Belgian Permanent Representative to UNEP, programme managers, telephone interviews with Belgian authorities.	Same as for team leader	
<b>16 January 2006- 27 January 2006</b>	Travel to Kampala, Maputo, Kigali, Dar Es Salaam	Same as for team leader (depending on costs maybe only Kigali and Dar Es Salaam)	
<b>27 January 2006</b>	Departure Nairobi		
<b>30 January 2006 – 19 February 2006</b>	Drafting of report	Same as for team leader	
<b>20 February 2006</b>			Submission of draft report.
<b>13 March 2006</b>	Consolidated comments from stakeholders received.	Same as for team leader	
<b>20 March 2006</b>			Submission of final report.

## **Annex C List of Persons Interviewed**

### **List of Interviewees Kenya**

#### Foreign Representations

- Roxane Bilderling, First Secretary, Belgian Embassy Kenya
- Jean Moulin, Attaché - D4.3 Division of United Nations and International Organizations. Directorate General Development Cooperation Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation
- Trond Jorgen Glasser, Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway
- John Virgoe, High Commissioner, British High Commission, Kenya

#### UNEP

- Shafqat Kakakhel, Officer-in-Charge, UNEP
- Jochem Zoetelief, Programme Officer, UNEP/PCMU
- Cristina Boelcke, Acting Director, UNEP/DPDL
- Kilaparti Ramakrishna, Deputy Director, DPDL
- David Smith, Programme Officer, UNEP/DPDL
- Kamilla Henningsen, Associate Programme Officer, UNEP/DPDL
- Esther Reilink, Programme Officer, DPDL
- Robert Wabunoha, Legal Officer, UNEP/DPDL
- Alexandra Karekaho, Task Manager, UNEP/DGEF
- Carmen Tavera, Portfolio Manager, UNEP/DGEF
- Henry Ndede, Coordinator, Nairobi River-Basin Project, UNEP/ROA
- Anjan Data, Programme Officer, UNEP/ GPA Coordination Office

#### UNDP

- Philip Dobie, Director, Drylands Development Center, UNDP

#### UN-HABITAT

- Ole Lyse, Chief, Urban Environment Section, UN-Habitat

### **Participants at National Consultation Meetings**

#### Mozambique

- Lolita Fondo, Technician, MICOA/DP
- Anselmina L. Liphola, Technician, MICOA/DNGA
- Augusto V. Correia, Coordinator, UNDP Small Grants Programme
- Erasmo Nhachungue, Director, MICOA/DP
- Guilhermina Amurane, Technician, MICOA/DNGA
- Rev. Mogstard, Consultant, Embassy of Norway
- Telma Manjante, Technician, MICOA/DCI
- Damboza Chissano, MICOA/DNGA
- Issufo Tankar, Delegate, ORAM
- Antonio Reina, FNP
- Andre da Silva, MICOA/CONDES

- Anifa Ismael Soma, MOPH/DNA
- Sandro Jorge, MICOA/GI
- Jean Paul, Consutor de Meio Ambiente
- Ismenia Augusta G., ABIODES
- Judite Muchanga, MPD/DNPR
- Teresa Pinto, MICOA/DP
- Graciete Socrates, MICOA/DP
- Virgilio Antonio Fumo, MIC/DNI
- Leen Verstraelen, Belgian Embassy
- Aurora Muzima, MICOA/DP
- Fausto Vicente Mbazoo, MICOA/DNPA

#### Tanzania

- Richard Muyungi, VPO
- Ladislaus Kyaruzi, VPO
- George R. Kafumu, VPO
- Robert Wabunoha, UNEP
- Alexandra Karekaho, UNEP
- William Rwechungwa, PEE
- Nehemiah Murusuru, GEF/SGP
- Gemma Auti, UNDP
- Blandina Cheche, PED
- Richard Magoma, MAFSC
- Theodore Silinge, MEM
- Stephen E. Msemo, MNRT
- Ruzika N. Muhito, NEMC
- Herman Boomen, Belgian Embassy, Tanzania
- Rosemary Mpendazoe, Belgian Embassy, Tanzania
- George Kafumu, Ministry of Environment, Tanzania
- Hussein Sosovele, WWF Tanzania

#### Uganda

- John Ssendawula, MWLE – UNEP/NEPAD Project
- G. H. Obua, MWLE-MET
- Frank Kansiime, MVIENR
- Kaggwa Ronald, NEMA
- Cornelius Kazooa, SDC
- Alice Ruhweza, NEMA
- Francis Ogwal, NEMA
- Kathlyne Craenen, Belgian Embassy, Uganda
- Alex Muhweezi, IUCN
- Pauline Akidi, MFPED

- Vicky Luyima, ACODE
- S.A.K. Magezi, MET
- Christine Akello, NEMA
- Stephen Muwaya, MAAIIF
- Paul Nteza, UNDP
- Paul Mafubi, Ministry of Water Lands and Environment
- Nshemereirwe Lauben, Ministry of Water Lands and Environment
- Henry Aryamanya-Mugisha, NEMA

#### Rwanda

1. Dirk Heuts, Belgian Embassy
2. Miko Maekawa, UNDP
3. Vincent Gatwabuyege
4. Rose Mukankomeje, REMA
5. Eilezer Rusakana, Synergies
6. Molly Rwigamba, Legal Framework
7. Jean Bigagaza, PEI
8. Frank Gerard, UNDP
9. Sebastien Dusabeyezu, NCCU
10. Suzannw Uwimana, NCCU
11. Oda Gasinzigwa, NCCU
12. Claude Rwagitare, NCCU
13. Emmanuel Muligirwa, NCCU
14. Maximilien Usengumuremyi, MINECOFIN
15. Miko Maekawa, UNDP
16. Cassien Byamushana, ISAR
17. Vedaste Kajangwe, IRST



## **Annex D: List of Documents Reviewed**

### **General Documents**

- Report by the Executive Director, Financial strengthening of the United Nations Environment Programme
- Memorandum of Understanding Between the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme
- Agreement between the Ministry of Development Cooperation of Belgium and the United Nations Environment Programme, February 2004
- Allocation of Belgian Partnership Funds 2004 – 2005
- Agreement between the Ministry of Development Cooperation of Belgium and the United Nations Environment Programme, November 2004
- Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for the Implementation of the Agreement with Belgium, Statement of Income and Expenditure
- Minutes Belgium-UNEP Consultations, Nairobi, 5 – 6 May 2004

### **Documents Related to Assessment**

- Programme Submission to the Government of Belgium, Environment and Early Warning
- Annual Substantive Report on the Implementation of the Partnership Programme between UNEP and the Government of Belgium September 2004
- Final Report of the Expert Consultation on GEO-4 in Latin America and the Caribbean, September 2004

### Increasing involvement of the scientific community in the GEO

- Memorandum of Understanding between The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) and the United Nations Environment Programme, August 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations University, Institute for Advanced Studies and the United Nations Environment Programme
- Meeting Record of the Expert Meeting on GEO 4, September 2004
- Meeting Report of the GEO4, Chapter 2 – Atmosphere, Lead Authors Meeting, September 2005
- Meeting Report of the UNEP GEO-4 Stakeholders Meeting, November 2005
- Statement by the Global Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder Consultation on GEO-4, February 2005
- Meeting Report of the Expert Meeting on GEO 4, September 2004
- Memorandum of Understanding between the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency associated with National Institute for Health and the Environment and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between the SEI-BOSTON Centre and UNEP, August 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Denver (Colorado Seminary) and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between the University of the West Indies and UNEP

- Final Report of the GEO Regional Workshop for Latin America and the Caribbean, August 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between the African Futures Institute and UNEP, June 2005
- Information Note for Evaluation of Belgian Partnership Component: Strengthening the Scientific Base and Regional Capacity for Integrated Environmental and Water Assessment
- Information for Evaluation of Belgian Partnership Component: Strengthening the scientific base and regional capacity for integrated environmental and water assessment.
- Publication: Priority Environmental Indicators in West Asia, Arab, Africa Regions – Indicators of Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture (and Land), Biodiversity, Coastal and Marine Environment
- Memorandum of Understanding between the General Directorate for Protection of Environment and Wild Life, Public Commission for the Protection of Marine Resources, Environment and Wild Life of Syria and UNEP
- UNEP Strategy on Capacity Building for Integrated Environmental Assessment in West Asia
- GEO Data Portal
- CDs, Knowledge Base Version 1 for Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen and UAE
- Meeting Report of the Regional Workshop on Policy Analysis for Integrated Environmental Assessment, December 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between Alcaldía de Cartagena y Observatorio del Caribe and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between the Secretaría de Medio Ambiente - Gobierno de la Provincia de Santa Fe and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between the Cropper Foundation, the Institute of Marine Affairs and the University of the West Indies Trinidad Campus and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between Office of the President in Guyana herein referred to as Office of the President, and the University of Guyana, School of Earth and Environment Sciences and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between Gobierno Regional de Atacama, la Dirección Regional de Atacama de la Comisión Nacional de Medio Ambiente, en adelante CONAMA Atacama, la Ilustre Municipalidad de Copiapó and UNEP

#### Africa Environmental Outlook (AEO)

- Meeting report of the AEO-2 Regional Consultative Meeting, April 2004
- AEO-2 Theme Indicator Matrix
- Brochure on Africa Environment Tracking: Issues and Developments
- Meeting Report of the Workshop on Environment Statistics for the Countries in the ECOWAS Region, March 2005
- Publication on Guidelines for Integrated Environmental Policy Analysis and the AEO Process
- NEPAD/AEO-2 Themes-Issues-Indicator Data Matrix

- Brochure on Africa Environment Outlook: Past, Present and Future: Towards AEO-2

#### GEO-LAC/ GEO Cities

- GEO Cities Brochure: Environmental Integrated Assessments for Cities in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Brochure: GEO Chiclayo: Perspectivas del Medio Ambiente Urban
- Estrategia Ambiental-Urban para America Latina y el Caribe, PNUMA/UN-Habitat

#### Water

- Annual substantive report on the implementation of the Partnership Programme between UNEP and the Government of Belgium – Water Policy
- Final Evaluation of Assessment of Pollution Status and Vulnerability of Water Supply Aquifers of African Cities
- Publication on Fresh Water Resources in Africa

#### **Documents Related to Water**

- Project Document Belgium Contribution to the Implementation of the GPA Partnership Programme: Protection of the marine environment from land-based activities (LBA), 2004-2007.
- GPA Final Report on projects funded through support by the Belgian Government (2000-2003)
- Final Report on projects funded through support by the Belgian Government on the Nairobi River Basin Project

#### GPA

- Website: [www.gpa.unep.or](http://www.gpa.unep.or)

#### Nairobi River Basin

- Memorandum of Understanding between the World Conservation Union and UNEP, June 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between UN-Habitat and UNEP, June 2005
- Memorandum of Understanding between UNDP and UNEP
- Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Nairobi and UNEP
- Funds Transfer Remittance Advice against the MOU between UNDP and UNEP
- Update on Status of Nairobi River Basin Programme, February 2005
- Agenda and Final Report of the Nairobi River Basin Project (NRBP) Stakeholder Workshop, March 2004
- Progress Report and Re-allocation of funds for the Nairobi River Basin Programme, June 2005
- Annual Progress Report to the Irish Trust fund on the Nairobi River Basin Programme
- Agenda for UNDP Stakeholders Consultative and Planning Meeting, November 2005
- The Nairobi River Basin Project: Collaborative Framework: A Discussion Paper
- Responses to Mr. Moussa Badji, DGDC Belgium, recommendations
- UNEP Briefing to UNDP and UN-Habitat on the Progress of the Nairobi River Basin Project, February 2005

- Project Document submitted for funding Nairobi River Basin Programme, Phase III
- Annual Progress Report to the Irish Trust fund on the Nairobi River Basin Programme, September 2005
- Nairobi River Basin Programme Budget 2005 – 2008
- Project Document, Nairobi River Basin Project Bridging Phase
- Schedule of disbursements to UNDP over four years
- Minutes of the First Steering Committee of the Nairobi River Basin Project Phase III, February 2005
- Minutes of the UN Inter-agency Meeting for the Nairobi River Basin Project Phase III, February 2005
- Minutes of meeting at University of Nairobi on the Nairobi River Basin Project Phase III, October 2005
- Summary of the Workshop on Existing Capacity of Laboratories in the Nairobi River Basin, November 2005
- Report of the Workplanning Meeting for Implementation of Nairobi River Basin Programme Phase III, August 2005
- Briefing Notes for the Naivasha Retreat for the Nairobi River Basin Programme Development Process, November 2004
- Report of the expert short visit mission to appraise the outcomes of the completed operations related to the NRBP – Phase III
- Report of Mr. Moussa Baddji on the Appraisal of the NRBP Bridging Phase Achievements

#### **Documents Related to Poverty and Environment/Capacity Building**

- Programme Submission to the Government of Belgium: Capacity building programme for the integration and institutionalization of environmental management into national poverty reduction programmes and related activities
- Annual Progress Report Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalization of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reduction Programmes and related Activities, March 2005
- Reports 2005 Financial Statements
- Summary notes of UNEP meeting on the Belgian Funded Capacity Building Programme in 4 African Countries, June 2004
- Minutes of the Second UNEP Task Force meeting on the Belgian Funded Capacity Building Programme in 4 African Countries, June 2004
- Revised Implementation Plan for the Belgium-funded Capacity Building Programme, January 2005
- Terms of Reference for UNEP's Interdivisional Task Force for the Implementation of the Belgium-Funded Capacity Building Programme in Uganda, Tanzania, Mozambique and Rwanda

Sub-project 1-Intergration and Mainstreaming of Key Environmental Issues into PRSP-(DPDL)

- Annual Progress Report 2005 for Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalization of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reduction Programmes and related Activities
- Work Plan for Poverty and Environment projects, July 2005

### **Mozambique**

- Project Status Report November 2005 Strengthening Environmental Policy at Local and National Levels for Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Development
- PRSP Qualitative Assessment for PARPA 2001-2005
- Work Plan Budget and timetable for the project Strengthen Environmental Policy and Management Capacity, September – August 2006

### **Rwanda**

- Work Plan, Budget and timetable for the project Mainstreaming environment in the Poverty Reduction Strategy and formulation of Rwanda's Poverty-Environment Initiative
- Project Status Report October 2005

### **Tanzania**

- Notes on Training and awareness raising on poverty-environment linkages to support civil society organizations in the implementation of MKUKUTA
- Project Status Report October 2005
- Follow-up Report on Workshop on Ecosystem Assessment, July 2005
- Work Plan and Budget for Integrating Environment into PRS process, March 2005

### **Uganda**

- Memorandum of Understanding between the National Environment Management Authority of Uganda and UNEP
- Government of Uganda-UNEP Poverty Environment Project, Progress Report (April 2005 – September 2005)
- Uganda Project Status Report, October 2005

## Sub-project II- Synergistic Implementation of RIO MEAs-(GEF)

### **Mozambique**

- Sub-project Document for Development of Sub-Regional Environmental Action Plans of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), Mozambique
- Project Progress and Financial Report, July – September 2005
- Report of monitoring mission to the project Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs, September 2005
- Operational Manual for the Micro-Grants Programme of the Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio Multi-Lateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) Project
- Report of the Technical Council Meeting of CONDES October 2004

- Minutes of the National Launching Workshop of the NCSA Project and Poverty Reduction Synergies

### **Rwanda**

- Sub-project Document for Development of Sub-Regional Environmental Action Plans of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), Rwanda
- Memorandum of Understanding between UNDP on behalf of Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme and UNEP
- Terms of Reference for the National Convention Coordination Unit-Rwanda
- Operational Work Programme for the National Convention Coordination Unit – Rwanda
- Quarterly Financial Report for the Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Rwanda
- Revised Operational Manual for the Micro-Grants Programme of the Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of the Rio Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) Project
- Half-Yearly Progress Report, December 2005 for the sub-project Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs – Rwanda
- Mission Report for the Consultative meeting for the sub-project Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs – Rwanda, February 2006
- Mission report for the recruitment of a project manager for the sub-project Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs – Rwanda
- Minutes of the National Convention Coordination Unit, August 2005
- Minutes of the National Convention Coordination Unit, Interviews, August 2005

### **Tanzania**

- Sub-project Document for Development of Sub-Regional Environmental Action Plans of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), Tanzania
- Operational Work Plan for the project Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Tanzania Project
- Operational Manual for the Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Tanzania Project
- Tanzania project status report June 2005
- Mission Report on Implementation Strategy for Tanzania project, February 2005
- Tanzania project expenditure reports January – March 2005
- Tanzania project expenditure reports July – September 2005

### **Uganda**

- Sub-project Document for Development of Sub-Regional Environmental Action Plans of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), Uganda
- Memorandum of Understanding between UNDP on behalf of Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme and UNEP

- Operational Work Plan for the project Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Uganda Project
- Operational Manual for the Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Uganda Project
- Mission report on the launch of the Capacity Building to Alleviate Poverty through Synergetic Implementation of Rio MEAs –Uganda Project, June 2005
- Mission report for the recruitment of a project manager for the sub-project Capacity building to alleviate poverty through synergistic Implementation of Rio MEAs – Uganda, May 2005

#### Implementation of RIO MEAs- (DPDL)

- Report of the UNEP National Focal Points Meeting for the Belgium Project on Development of National Legislation, Rio Multilateral Environmental Agreements & Poverty Alleviation

#### **Mozambique**

- Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs in Mozambique and UNEP
- Progress Report of the Partnership for the Development of Environmental Law and Institutions in Africa (PADELIA)

#### **Rwanda**

- Memorandum of Understanding between Government of Rwanda [represented by the Rwanda Environment Management Authority] and UNEP
- Terms of Reference for a consultant to draft the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and Guidelines
- Terms of Reference for Consultancy to Draft Legal Regulations in the Sector of Wetlands
- Terms of Reference for National Consultant for the Belgium Project on Assessing the Needs for Capacity Building for Implementation of MEAs in Relation to Poverty Reduction in Rwanda
- Half yearly progress report for the project Capacity building for the development of National Legislation implementing Rio MEAs with specific considerations for poverty alleviation – Rwanda

#### **Tanzania**

- Memorandum of Understanding between the Vice President's Office, Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and UNEP
- Project Expenditure Report for the Tanzania project
- Terms of Reference for National Consultant for the Belgium Project: Enhancing capacity in the Implementation of MEAS with Focus on Poverty Reduction in Tanzania
- Short Status Report on Evaluation of Belgium Project on MEAs and Poverty Reduction in Tanzania, October 2005

#### **Uganda**

- Report of the meeting MEAs and Poverty Alleviation Meeting of National Focal Points

- MEAs, Law and Poverty Alleviation – Uganda Project Status Report, December 2005
- Detailed Budget for MEAs and Poverty Alleviation for the Period 2005 – 2005, Uganda project.





United Nations Environment Programme, Evaluation and Oversight Unit,  
P.O. Box 30552-00100 Nairobi, Kenya. Tel: + 254-20-7624155,  
Fax: + 254-20-7623158, Email: [Lisa.Njonjo@unep.org](mailto:Lisa.Njonjo@unep.org), Web: [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)