

TE Audit Trail : To the comments received on April 2, April 26, April 28, April 30, May 4, May 6 2021
For the Terminal Evaluation of the Project: ENABLING TRANSBOUNDARY COOPERATION AND INTEGRATED
WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN THE DNIESTER RIVER BASIN

PCU	They were created much later, with the EU Association Agreement in 2014	Added
PCU	UNDP Cos did not support the Dniester PCU at the end	Not understood, asked for clarification
PCU	OCCEA is a part of the Secretariat (it does not supervise work of the Secretariat)	Edited.
PCU	In Ukraine it was signed on 31 April 2021	Edited.
PCU	The Dniester Agreement was signed in 2012 , oldova ratified it in 2018 but Ukraine did it only in summer 2017. So the project came just in the right moment of seting up the Commission	Added.
PCU	Considering that we have produced more than planned, we used the resources very efficiently :))	Agreed and expanded. But there were some issues with cash flow, UNDP requisites, etc., which are also pointed out at MTR. This is a composite evaluation of the whole period of implementation. Many stakeholders have indicated that the project would have been more efficient if the administrative issues specially of financing would have been taken care by the implementing agency and even the donor at an earlier stage.
PCU	HS?	Edited.
PCU	They are doing well, especially with the online meetings (no funds are needed), and also they think – for financial reasons – of reducing a number of members of the DC (now there are 17 per a State)	This information added, but cannot
PCU	Approved already :)	Updated.
PCU	We have done so much on floods!	Edited.
PCU	done	Edited
PCU	I would like to discuss these	Discussed.
PCU	could you please explain in more details?	Information added. Explanation is that GEF is getting increasingly strict on extension requests, therefore one should not assume that an extension will be given as a matter of just requesting it, this has been generally done after MTRs for example when the MTR indicates that an extension is needed. Therefore, what is said here and edited in the new version is that the planning and time period set at planning should be what is truly expected as a period to implement, since extensions are becoming less likely.
PCU	At the final stakeholders conference and the final PSC meeting both countries told that even though it would be more difficult without the project, they will continue operation	Already added in the sustainability section in response to another comment. Edited here.
OSCE	What are the sampling strategies?	Added.

OSCE	EU WFD to be added	Added.
OSCE	Suggestion to delete “Phase” –Project Preparation Grant	Edited.
OSCE	Suggestion to remove it, to avoid repetition. It is indicated further above	Edited.
OSCE	Given that these challenges didn’t have a major impact on the project, we would suggest to indicate couple of words indicating that “these challenges did, however, not alter the outcomes of the project.” Regarding the financial flow, the project management ensured that availability of funds is ensured even at times when potential delays may have been encountered through advance requests, etc.	Edited.
OSCE	It would be suggested to refer to political rotations or, alternatively, to “a number of political rotations” as it would be more difficult to define what is a “high number”.	Edited.
OSCE	We usually refer to transboundary (here and throughout the document); of course, it is up to the preference of the evaluator regarding the terminology used.	Edited.
OSCE	In describing the 3 Components, it would be suggested to refer to the main Outcome/ Outputs under each component for an easier reference? The same under Table 4: Project Components	Edited. In order not to be repetitive the outcomes are in table 4. Outputs are too extensive.
OSCE	Are the Ministries of Foreign Affairs meant here? If yes, it would be good to reflect them as such, in order to avoid confusions.	Edited.
OSCE	The check-list for the report says “The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample”.	Edited
OSCE	Could you please elaborate on numbers selected (it seems that only one key informant was representing the whole typology), and limitations of this sample	Added.
OSCE	It was a 9-month extension. The project was envisioned to end in 10 August 2020 and was extended until 10 May 2021.	Edited.
OSCE	It would be suggested to differentiate between the projects and programmes under the ENVSEC Initiative and global or regional conventions/ accords. The ENVSEC Initiative is a partnership of several international organizations that aims at tackling environment and security risks through promoting environmental co-operation. Please see more under: https://www.osce.org/occea/446245 . In this context, it should not be confused with accords. Furthermore, it would be suggested to reformulated along the following lines: “Activities implemented in the framework of the Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative during the period 2004 – 2017”, and refer also the latest project “Climate Change and Security in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus (2013- 2017) which had the Dniester river basin as a pilot region. A number of products were developed in the framework of this project. The ENVSEC Initiative is a broader Initiative that goes beyond the timeframe and geographic area indicated.	Added and edited.
OSCE	?	Edited.
OSCE	This finding does not mention whether the recommendations has been implemented or not	Added. It was already in the section on M&E.
OSCE	The project design?	Yes. Edited.
OSCE	The overall duration of the extension was 9 months, as indicated above	Edited.
OSCE	Suggestion to be slightly reformulated: while the involvement of UNECE in the project enjoyed more clarity, with the role of UNECE being indicated in general terms also in the project document, the challenge was connected more to the administrative layers of enabling the collaboration (legal frameworks, reporting mechanisms, etc.). The agreement was then signed between OSCE and UNECE.	Edited and added.
OSCE	I cannot see the figures in the table	The table was not provided by the project until after the report went through the comments process. They were not there,

		therefore, when this commentator saw the draft.
OSCE	It would helpful if the para above provides the description of mentioned here ‘minor shortcomings’ that influenced the assessment.	Added.
OSCE	What are the shortcomings?	Added.
OSCE	What exactly does this mean?	Edited.
OSCE	Please refer above to the comment about UNECE’s involvement.	Added.
OSCE	It would be appreciated if the role of the OSCE Mission to Moldova as the facilitator of a comprehensive and lasting political settlement of the Transdniestrian conflict in all its aspects, could be mentioned here. The communication with the Transdniestrian side for a number of activities was facilitated by the OSCE Mission to Moldova, which is a key player in the overall implementation of the project.	Added
OSCE	If my understanding of the phrase is correct, it would be suggested to add all project actors – OSCE/ UNDP/ UNECE and the GEF as donor, as they all contributed to reaching the final outcomes.	Added.
OSCE	Kindly note the project end date of 10 May	Noted although the documentation that got indicated a July final closing date.
OSCE	It would be suggested to indicate the fact that the documents (both the TDA and the SAP) have been developed in accordance with the structure established by the EU Water Framework Directive.	Added.
OSCE	Including publishing on the Dniester-commission website for public consultation	Added.
OSCE	Please see above the comment regarding the suggestion to refer to the EU Water Framework Directive	Added.
OSCE	It would be suggested to indicate that the Dniester River Basin Commission has been established and operated also through support provided by the project.	Added.
OSCE	The Dniester Basin Commission was not formed before the project began.	Edited.
OSCE	2017	Edited
OSCE	Suggestion to replace with “its working groups”. I believe reference is made here to the working groups of the DNC	Edited.
OSCE	The report’s structure does not follow the logic of the Evaluation Matrix (e.g. reflecting findings related to all questions for each criterion at one place), but rather presents the findings related to project’s stages, i.e. design/formulation, implementation and results. This creates an impression, that the assessment of each criterion is based only on selected questions.	<p>The report structure strictly follows the UNDP / GEF guidance on report structure as indicated in the latest manuals (as prescribed in Terms of References and as we discussed with UNDP regional office when this process began). They indicated that the structure needs to be the one of June 2020. Therefore that is what has been followed.</p> <p>Some might find it confusing, and even repetitive but this is how it is supposed to be.</p>
OSCE	For example, for Relevance the answers related to ToC, SMART indicators, baselines and targets of the result framework, risk management, and some others are described in different sections of the report. The reader has to jump from section to section to look for all information related to Relevance to understand whether the assessment of <i>Highly Satisfactory</i> is valid.	Idem above.
OSCE	It would be easier if the reported findings follow the logic of Evaluation Matrix with the answers to all evaluation questions pulled together, with references to project management stages where needed.	Idem above. Structure followed is UNDP determined.
OSCE	This comment is also relevant to my above comment – in certain components I do not see that the Evaluation Matrix was fully used and explained by the findings’ section of the report.	

OSCE	For example, the evaluator does not mention any project's explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities, neither it is elaborated whether the project had an Exit Strategy or not.	<p>They are mentioned in the section on financial sustainability further along, the mixed prospects of funding for the commission, the lack of funding for infrastructure/major works, and the greater probability of funding from enterprises.</p> <p>There is no elaboration on explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability since that was never part of the project. Therefore to add that is not relevant since it was not an expected nor planned result. Idem exit strategy.</p> <p>Also the new information of expressed funding commitment is added, although should not have been asked to add given that the information was generated after finished drafting this report and after the time scope of this terminal evaluation.</p>
OSCE	During the Final Stakeholders Conference, held on 22 April 2021, the two Co-Chairs of the Dniester Commission indicated their countries' readiness to continue with the work of the Commission in the next period, after having realized the added value of the already established platform for cooperation (DNC). On both sides, it was indicated that the countries stand ready to cover the costs for the continued work of the Commission.	Added although should not have been asked to add given that the information was generated after finished drafting this report and after the time scope of this terminal evaluation. This changes the whole scope of the evaluation, time wise and therefore will have to change this in the report in order to accommodate this comment.
OSCE	Couple of words could maybe be added here about the demonstration projects?	Added.
OSCE	It would be suggested to add “, without impacting the overall project implementation”	Added.
OSCE	It would be suggested to reformulate this part (“within the OSCE?”) or to leave it out. The PCU are OSCE staff members, therefore to avoid a potential misunderstanding that they were treated as external to the OSCE.	Edited. It has been deleted although do not fully agree since the PCU is of a Project Unit and an implementing partner unit. Much as when GEF/UNDP utilizes a government ministry as an implementing partner, the PCU members are not stricto sensu government employees. This was also here since it was indicated by OSCE staff that in the latter part of implementation PCU was linked more to the OSCE. But, as indicated, have edited and deleted.
OSCE	Suggestion to reformulate more along the lines of “within the framework of the Dniester Project” or, alternatively, “with the support of the Dniester Project”.	Edited.
OSCE	The remaining period is exactly 1 month from the date of this TE (project end date: 10 May 2021)	Edited.
OSCE	It would be good to indicate what could be done in this area, as expressed above, potentially by adding information about the role of professional mediators/ conflict resolution experts	Added.
OSCE	Replace with outcomes	Added.
OSCE	The meaning is ckear, but the wording is not	<p>Don't understand the comment on how a meaning can be clear but a wording not since meaning is transmitted by words.</p> <p>Nevertheless, edited.</p>

OSCE	Is there a feeling or a finding that this value has been underestimated by/within the project? Based on the narrative analysis, it doesn't seem so.	The GEF / UNDP guidelines indicate that these are supposed to be very short, it has been expanded due to the comment here, but full information is in the narrative as well as in the full lessons learnt best practices section at the end of the report.
OSCE	Same here	The GEF / UNDP guidelines indicate that these are supposed to be very short, it has been expanded due to the comment here, but full information is in the narrative as well as in the full lessons learnt best practices section at the end of the report.
OSCE	Please include a reference with a weblink in a footnote and edit based on the comment above. This specific entry differs from the rest of the list—which consists of conventions and directives—and requires a proper explanation..	Already part of a comment two weeks previous to this one. Taken care of. See above.
OSCE	Moldova or Republic of Moldova	Changed to Republic of unless quoting
UNDP	it is a very well balanced, positive and supportive report with good scoring,	Noted.
UNDP	the list of recommendations a bit too long and somehow out of track... but, see no problems,	The list of recommendations is within the guidance of UNDP/GEF terminal evaluation. It is not understood what out of track might mean. The first few are for project closure and the last group are for further programming. They might seem off track, if I understand correctly, due to the timing of the evaluation vis-à-vis development of further project related to Dniester, but nothing can be done about this at this point.
UNDP	please elaborate a bit more on the lessons learned and identify at least a few good practices to be recommended to other IW projects,	The section lessons learned is now lessons learned / best practices. They are further elaborated there. Note that UNDP/GEF guidance for the introduction section with lessons learned is indicated that these need to be very summarized. For the full picture refer to the lessons learnt/best practices section in the text and not the summary.
UNDP	please provide a clear recommendation to go ahead with the SAP implementation project as the GEF Sec will be looking for this.	First one.
UNECE	Not only technical issues but also at strategic level by providing a platform for strengthening transboundary cooperation.	Added.
UNECE	The sentence seems incomplete.	Edited
UNECE	We did not develop the strategies but the climate change adaptation projects. But it seems to be another output (better to check).	Edited.
UNECE	We did not develop climate strategies but climate change adaptation projects.	Edited.
UNECE	The reporting under the Water Convention and SDG indicator 6.5.2 could be mentioned here to strengthen relevance.	Added.