

Nile Basin Initiative Shared Vision Programme

Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP)

Terminal Evaluation Report

Alex Muhweezi (Team Leader), Hawa Sekela Msham, Samir Mourshed

July 2010

NILE BASIN INITIATIVE

Initiative du Bassin du Nil

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Team wishes to thank the Nile-SEC for the leadership provided in carrying out the Terminal Evaluation of NTEAP. Specific recognition is extended the Staff and personnel of Nile-SEC Staff, UNDP, UNOPS, GEF, National Implementing Agencies, NTEAP Steering Committee, Nile-TAC, former Staff of NTEAP in all the 9 Countries for their support and guidance during the Evaluation Exercise and to all stakeholders and respondents who provided useful information and contributions towards the successful execution of this Terminal Evaluation.

Qualification:

The views expressed in this Terminal Evaluation Report do not necessarily reflect the Official views of Nile Basin Initiative, NBI member Countries or NBI partners. The Evaluation Team takes responsibility for the views and omissions in this Report.

Table of Contents

Acronyms	6
Executive Summary.....	7
1. INTRODUCTION.....	16
1.1 The Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) Terminal Evaluation	16
1.1.1 Justification/rationale for the Terminal Evaluation	16
1.1.2 Objective of the Terminal Evaluation	16
1.1.3 Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation.....	16
1.2 Terminal Evaluation methodology.....	17
1.2.1 Evaluation Team.....	17
1.2.2 The evaluation process	17
1.3 Limitations.....	17
1.4 Key issues addressed by the Terminal Evaluation	18
2. THE NTEAP AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT.....	20
2.1 NTEAP description.....	20
2.1.1 NTEAP design	20
2.1.2 NTEAP goal.....	21
2.2.3 Objectives, outcomes and outputs	21
2.2.4 Coordination and Supervision.....	22
2.2.5 Mid-Term Review recommendations	23
3. KEY FINDINGS FROM THE EVALUATION OF COMPONENTS	25
3.1 Component findings and assessment	25
3.1.1 Component One: Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation.....	25
3.1.2 Component Two: Community – Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation	33
3.1.3 Component Three: Environmental Education and Awareness.....	36
3.1.4 Component Four: Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation	39

3.1.5	Component Five: Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring	44
3.2	Towards addressing Mid-Term recommendations.....	47
3.3	Gender	48
4.	ANALYSIS OF OVER-ALL NTEAP	49
4.1	Design Validity.....	49
4.2	Relevance	49
4.3	Efficiency	50
4.4	Effectiveness	51
4.5	Synergies	52
4.6	Impacts.....	52
4.7	Sustainability.....	53
4.8	Replicability	53
4.9	Monitoring and Evaluation systems and function	53
4.10	Emerging issues.....	54
4.11	Challenges	54
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	55
5.1	Conclusions	55
5.2	Recommendations	55
6.	LESSONS	57
7.	LIST OF ANNEXES	59
7.1	Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation.....	59
7.2	Annex 2: Documents and Literature Reviewed	63
7.3	Annex 3: People/Institutions Interviewed	64
7.4	Annex 4: Record of Regional Workshop	71
7.5	Annex 5: Evaluation Itinerary.....	75
7.6	Annex 6: Inception Report	78
7.7	Annex 7: Over-all NTEAP Performance Matrix	94

8.	APPENDICES	98
8.1	In Country Report (Burundi, Rwanda and DRC)	98
8.2	In country Reports (Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania).....	98
8.3	In country Reports (Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia)	98

List of Tables:

Table 1: Revised NTEAP Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs

Table 2: NTEAP Supervisions entities and responsibilities

Table 3: NTEAP Mid-Term Review Recommendations

Table 4: Performance of Component #1 against Targets

Table 5: Performance of Component #2 against Targets

Table 6: Performance of Component #3 against Targets

Table 7: Performance of Component #4 against Targets

Table 8: Performance of Component #5 against Targets

Table 9: Performance of Mid-Term Review recommendations

Acronyms

DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ENTAP	Eastern Nile Transboundary Action Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources management
LMC	Local Micro-Grant Coordinator
MGP	Micro-Grant Projects
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NELSAP	Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Plan
NEPS	National Eligible Projects
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
Nile-COM	Council of Minister for the Nile Basin Initiative
Nile-SEC	Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat
Nile-TAC	Technical Advisory Committee of the Nile Basin Initiative
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NTEAP	Nile Transboundary Environment Action Project
SAP	Shared Action Plan
SVP	Share Vision programme of Nile Basin
TEA	Transboundary Environment Analysis
UNDP	United National Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Projects Service

Executive Summary

This is the Terminal Evaluation Report of the Nile Transboundary Environment Action project (NTEAP). The Evaluation report is presented in two parts as follows: Part one is the Evaluation report that presents the introduction of the Terminal Evaluation (Chapter 1), description of NTEAP (Chapter 2), Key findings for each NTEAP Component, progress in addressing mid-term recommendation and gender (chapter 3), over-all analysis of NTEAP (Chapter 4), conclusions and recommendations (Chapter 5), and, lessons (Chapter 6). Chapter 7 presents the Annexes to the main report.

Part two consist of the Appendices. These are the in country Evaluation reports presented in three components as follows; component one covers Rwanda, Burundi and DRC; component two covers Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya and, component three covers Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia. The in country reports provide details of NTEAP implementation and performance in each country.

The Terminal Evaluation covered the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) period of seven years, from October 2003 to December 2009 covered the NTEAP activities in all the nine member countries involving both desk work and interviews and in-depth analysis of information from literature and interview responses. The Terminal Evaluation was carried out by a Team of three independent Consultants between 27th May and 29th June 2010.

The Over-all objective of the Terminal Evaluation of the NTEA project was to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness of the project, impact, synergies and linkages and sustainability of the project supported activities in all the nine countries of the Nile basin. The Evaluation aimed at providing an in-depth assessment of the appropriateness of the design of NTEAP and activities in addressing the identified environmental issues and problems in Nile Basin as well as addressing sustainable development needs and priorities within the Nile basin. The Evaluation also assessed extent to which the objectives and outcomes of the project supported activities were fulfilled. Further, it examined the overall project management and implementation, as well as the extent to which recommendations of the 2006 Medium Term Review were addressed. It also examined the performance indicators and gauged the level of implementation of activities against those indicators. The Terminal Evaluation took a broad outlook, including performance of the project against set objectives, indicators and benchmarks in each country.

1. Over-all Evaluation

Over-all, the NTEAP implementation performed well as most targets were met (Annex 7). All components with exception of Water Quality Monitoring comments (Chapter 3) performed above average and are rated successful in contributing to the over-all goal of the NTEAP. Key factors that contributed to the success of the NTEAP included the project design which promoted knowledge generation, piloting collaboration approaches, developing tools and frameworks for facilitating collaboration and ensuring pilot activities in all the nine countries.

2. Design Validity

The design that addressed knowledge generation, piloting approaches, developing tools and frameworks for facilitating collaboration and ensuring pilot activities in all the nine countries demonstrates an appropriate project design that aimed at putting into place foundation for the regional collaboration in environmental management. This design was enhanced in 2007 when the

log frame was revised, although, it missed out on impact and outcome monitoring indicators. In addition, some of the implementation approaches did not fully appreciate differences in policy frameworks in Nile Basin countries that included of financial disbursements and accountability procedures. UNOPS was the main administrative manager for the immediate operational, financial and reporting capacity from the first day of funds programming onwards for the time that the NBI was building capacity to eventually take over and implement NTEAP themselves. More concretely, with UNOPS implementation, NTEAP had immediate disbursement capacities in all Nile Basin countries which was imperative to being operational as project, had diplomatic tax exempt and travel document status even though the NBI was not recognized as legal entity in any of the Nile Basin countries but Uganda, had a sound internal control system for recruitment, procurement and funds administration in place, and an online financial management system that allowed for decentralized budget authority, i.e. the RPMs having budget and disbursement authority over their own projects, and NTEAP had immediate reporting capacity custom tailored to the requirements of the World Bank in order to ensure continuity of funds disbursement as the World Bank required quarterly reporting in order to release additional funds. Without this implementation partnership NTEAP would not have been able to launch as an operational project, considering that critical organizational policies and pertaining executive structures could only be put in place at the NBI in the course of last year of NTEAP.

3. Relevance

Over-all, NTEAP's relevance at national and community level was significant through its five different components. Furthermore, the project was also relevant to the donor policies and strategies of the World Bank's and GEF assistance strategies. By considering the extent to which the project objectives and results were consistent with country needs including policies and priorities on environmental management as well as poverty alleviation, beneficiaries' requirements and donors' policies, the findings confirm that NTEAP:

- a) Contributed towards addressing environmental concerns and challenges facing local communities in all the countries as identified during the Transboundary Environment Assessment exercise of 2001.
- b) NTEAP was consistent with the environmental (and poverty alleviation for the case of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) policies, strategies and complemented the ongoing governments' efforts.
- c) NTEAP was consistent to global environmental objectives and GEF focal areas in addressing national and trans-boundary environmental issues to generate public benefits. The NTEAP was instrumental in enabling NBI Shared Vision Programme (SVP) have practical activities on the ground and to develop and test approached towards management of the environment in the Basin. The impact is visible at specific sites and less at basin levels. However, the level of collaboration in trans-boundary environmental management at field level was hindered by procedural requirements for regional trans-boundary collaboration as well as absence of environmental management framework for trans-boundary collaboration.
- d) With respect to the GEF Focal areas (wetlands, biodiversity, trans-boundary water resources management), the NTEAP contribution was realized. However, this could have been enhanced through synergies with other SVP and other regional programmes in environmental management in the Nile Basin.
- e) With regards to NTEAP relevance to NBI Shared Vision, NTEAP achieved the following outcomes:

- i. Capacity and willingness on the part of Nile Basin countries to collaborate in management of environment in the Nile Basin. The realization of this outcome was enhanced by the processes and tools applied by NTEAP to facilitate collaboration.
 - ii. Knowledge and understanding of sustainable development issues of the Nile Basin among the Nile Basin member countries.
 - iii. Established foundation for regional cooperation in environmental management.
- f) Nile Basin member countries participated in implementation of all NTEAP components notwithstanding the fact that Francophone countries feel that their participation was partly hindered by language. All Nile Basin member countries participated in monitoring and supervision structures and processes e.g., Nile-TAC and NTEAP Steering Committee, and reporting, although activities were more national than being trans-boundary in nature.

4. Efficiency

The project design and implementation approaches aimed at an efficient delivery of the project outputs. Specifically, the following were emphasized:

- a) Linkages and commitment between the project and host-country institutions at national level: Host country implementing institutions demonstrated commitment and support to the NTEAP. They hosted and supervised NTEAP national offices. They instituted coordination and supervision processes and leveraged political support to the NTEAP activities. The level of participation in the Steering Committee sessions further demonstrates the level of commitment. However, continuity of their role in coordinating activities initiated or promoted by NTEAP requires follow up by Nile –SEC in order to achieve integration of NTEAP supported activities into the host institutions and national development plans and programmes.
- b) Integration of Environmental Agenda into NBI: the NTEAP aspired to define an Environmental Agenda for NBI and transfer of responsibility for environmental management to NBI. Whilst the latter has been effected through establishment of an environmental desk at Nile-SEC, the definition of Environmental Agenda is yet to be concluded. Therefore, there is need to complete description of NBI environmental management mandate and Agenda to promote NBI's coordination role over environmental issues in the Nile Basin.
- c) Implementation approaches: the Evaluation noted that the implementation arrangements for the NTEAP were well thought through save for the financial management and procurement procedures and, representation at the NTEAP PSC in relation to the Nile-TAC. NTEAP offices in host country proved instrumental in project coordination and supervision and reporting. However, the NBI Focal Points in Water Ministries need to be assisted to open up and consider environment as an equally important resources for the Nile Basin. UNOPS is acknowledged and appreciated for the scope of the project management and the challenging task behind implementation a project like NTEAP in environment including post conflict in some countries. Very strict disbursement and audit controls were a prerequisite for all NBTF / GEF funds (required annual audits, since all NB countries rank low on the corruption index), which logically necessitated tight application of financial rules and regulations and a continuous struggle between financial and administrative monitoring and programme implementation. Under such arrangement the project and their staff managed to deliver outputs and outcomes in a manner that would not have been easily possible with the situation that was prevailing with NBI at the time.
- d) Level of Partner country contributions: there is recognition for the positive support Nile Basin member countries provided. The Evaluation confirms that member countries provided the required policy and political support to the NTEAP, in addition to the stated in-kind contributions.

- e) Monitoring systems applied: the monitoring systems applied were strong in tracking progress and performance of individual components and activities. The Monitoring system was weak on basin – wide impact monitoring, feedback mechanisms as well as assessment of trends/changes created by the NTEAP. The NTEAP Management Unit (PMU) and Nile-SEC monitoring level function depended largely on desk reports submitted by National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and Local Micro-grant Coordinators (LMC). The Evaluation finds this approach inadequate considering the complexity of the project. Nonetheless, the NTEAP over-all as a project was able to generate good lessons and practices that have potential to be up scaled or replicated in the basin.
- f) Adaptive management and support provided by lead partners (UNOPS, Nile-SEC and WB): Adaptive management was traced from annual reviews, introduction of National Eligible projects (NEPs) and the modifications in the modalities for financial disbursements. The revision of log frame in 2007 is an excellent example of adaptive management. However, the focus as embodied by the technical supervision and advisory of Nile Sec and Nile TAC has always understandably but to some extent unbalanced been on technical delivery only. The double hat function of the RPM as technical implementation coordinator reporting to the relevant supervision entities and UNOPS project / budget managers was a flawed set up and challenging to reconcile both hats.

5. Effectiveness

The Evaluation concludes that project resources were effectively utilized. The project utilized 97.8% of the donor budget. There were no substantial financial audits issues. The Evaluation further notes that:

- a) Capacity for collaboration in regional environmental management: NTEAP implementation and coordination tools or systems such as Project Implementation Manual (PIM), Project Implementation Plan (PIP), Procurement Manual, and Results Based Management Systems, etc., were developed and applied. NTEAP efforts in this aspect at regional level, having been a pioneer project, are commended. The procedures and systems for ensuring participation of Nile Basin countries in identifying in-country priorities through work plans and supervision (Steering Committee) are strong foundations for regional collaboration. In terms of environmental management tools, NTEAP made big strides to develop and test approaches in all NTEAP components. However, these capacities and tools require to be sustained further in order for them to continue to be utilized.
- b) Benefits and satisfaction with project outputs and impacts: at community level, the NTEAP activities are considerably appreciated to have delivered benefits. At Nile Basin member countries level, the benefits vary because of the significance of the Nile basin in each member country. As indicated in Section 3.1.1, benefits to Francophone countries were undermined by language barrier. At regional level, the SVP benefitted immensely from the NTEAP through translating the “political collaboration” into direct investments and activities on the ground. However, this benefit fell short of being fully optimized because most activities were local and national in character and the NTEAP did not fully utilizing synergistic opportunities with other SVP projects.
- c) Participation and ownership: as indicated in section 3.1.1, community participation and ownership of the NTEAP project activities was realized. This level of participation and ownership declined at national level and eventually at Basin level as the project came to an end. The levels of ownership at national and regional levels could have been boosted by facilitating stakeholder participation in all stages of NTEAP formulation. Further, the integration of NTEAP implementation approaches and modalities into national policy and decision making processes could have improved on the levels of ownership. Lastly, the NTEAP design and decision making

left out civil society and private sector which are key development players at national and community levels.

- d) Indicators for measuring performance as well as outcomes: the NTEAP log frame and Monitoring and Evaluation system measured progress but did not adequately capture outcomes and or impacts.
- e) Financial investments: the evaluation notes that the size of budget was not able to translate into significant investments on the ground given the diversity of environmental issues in the wide geographical area. The MGP catalysed action at small scale that has potential for replication or up-scaling. The costs of administration (Consultants, audits, agency fees, operating costs) represent 68.7% of total disbursements as at 31st December 2009. This portrays the picture that there was higher proportion of expenditure on administration and operational costs than field activities. Since the objective of the project was to develop framework for regional collaboration in environmental management, this proportion can be justified to some extent when field activities are regarded as pilot.

6. Synergies

The Evaluation is of the opinion that this aspect did not perform well at strategic level thereby denying NTEAP opportunity to gain more impacts on the ground. This is derived from the following:

- a) Collaboration: there was excellent collaboration with the UNDP/GEF Small Grants programmes in all countries. However, the collaboration among the NTEAP components and between NTEAP and other environmental Programmes in the region/member countries was inadequate.
- b) Co-financing: at community level, there are success stories of leveraging action, co-financing and networking with other development processes of governments and non government alike, through MGP. Over-all NTEAP was a co-financed arrangement between GEF and Nile Trust Fund.

7. Impacts

Overall, the NTEAP has realized positive impacts at various levels as follows:

Goal: The NTEAP aspired to strengthen regional collaboration and coordination on environmental management in Nile Basin. Recognizing that this goal is influenced by others factors beyond the NTEAP such as the Nile Framework Agreement, the evaluation finds that the momentum generated by NTEAP to work together and implement regional environmental programme is a strong foundation for supporting regional collaboration and coordination. Furthermore, the tools developed by NTEAP, e.g., the Regional Wetlands Strategy contribute towards defining the agenda for regional cooperation in environmental management.

On the other hand, there were missed opportunities for advancing this goal due delayed conclusion of Nile Cooperative Framework which would have facilitated progress in completing EIA Guidelines, definition of Regional Agenda for Environmental management under NBI and, Policy recommendations for environmental management in the Nile basin.

Objective level: the NTEAP succeeded to pilot and demonstrate local level action of engaging stakeholders in Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) principles. The various pilot activities under the MGPs, NEPs and Wetlands Component contributed to this success. Regarding the frameworks for protecting critical Basin ecosystems, the NTEAP outputs on Transboundary Wetlands Management Plans, Water Quality Monitoring Strategy, Nile Basin Wetlands Strategy, and the information and knowledge generated will go a long way towards protection of critical

ecosystems. These frameworks will be complimented by the various capacities established at various levels across all NTEAP components.

The over-all conclusion on NTEAP impacts is that the outputs and some of the intermediate results point to the direction that NTEAP will have a strong impact on the Nile Basin in the long run. NTEAP duration of six years may not have been adequate time to register impacts considering the diverse regional character of the Nile basin. More so, impacts from environmental projects tend to take longer period to become visible on the ground.

8. Sustainability

The Evaluation is of the opinion that regional processes will be sustained through the NBI process whereas the national level and community actions risk being unsustainable. Specifically, NTEAP supported the following processes geared towards sustainability:

- a) Integration: The Nile-SEC has established Environment Desk at Centre and within the Subsidiary Action programme levels to follow up the integration of environmental programmes in the Basin. There is need for follow up with integration into national level environmental management processes as well as follow up with identified policy reforms within the NBI to complete description of the environmental function.
- b) Environmental policy reforms: the Evaluation appreciates the fact that policy reform is a slow process and the intended effect on national policies would take its own course. However, the Evaluation finds the tools and framework (e.g., Regional Wetlands Strategy) have potential to influence policy reforms. At Nile basin level, the tools and framework developed by NTEAP have potential to inform basin level development policies and practices. These are good indications that future policy framework could evolve in support environmental management in the Basin.
- c) Capacities, tools and mechanisms: for regional collaboration e.g., Specialist Networks, Working Groups, NTEAP Steering Committee that were facilitated by NTEAP to enhance participation and sustainability of NTEAP supported activities need to be facilitated to continue to perform.

9. Replicability

The project has identified good practices to be replicated or scaled up and hence there is potential for replicating these activities, especially at community level.

10. Monitoring and Evaluation systems and function

There was an Evaluation framework for the project. The Nile-SEC developed tools for integrating the NTEAP results into the over-all NBI M&E System. The Evaluation is of the opinion that the evaluation system was not strong enough to support implementation of such complex project. The baseline that was used to design the project has since changed and new dimensions such as Climate Change issues and effects were not captured during monitoring. In evaluating the relationships between NTEAP Log frame the NBI Results Based Management system, the Evaluation notes the following:

- a) There is clear linkages and relationship between the NTEAP log frame and the NBI Results Chain. This assures Evaluation that NTEAP Goals, Objectives and Results contribute to the NBI Shared Vision Programme.
- b) Indicators did not capture intermediate and longer-term impacts. Likewise, indicators for measuring impacts and outcomes of Transboundary issues were not included. The NTEAP applied participatory supervisions and monitoring process at basin, national and site levels in some of the countries.

11. Emerging issues

The following issues have emerged during and immediately after NTEAP:

- a) New sustainable development issues in Nile basin including Climate Change, oil discoveries in Albertine Rift and Nile Framework agreement. Future environmental programmes or projects should include these issues.
- b) Transfer of NTEAP activities to be implemented by Nile-SEC. This requires commensurate capacity and mandate at Nile-SEC.

12. Challenges

The major challenges faced by NTEAP during implementation included the following:

- a) Budget management and operational procedures which caused delays in disbursements and accountability of funds resulted into slow absorption of the project grants.
- b) Integration of NTEAP implementation procedures and systems into national development policies and procedures.
- c) Diversity in languages and cultures and ensuring full participation of member states in all stages of project formulation and implementation, including information sharing
- d) Utilizing synergies within the SVP and other programmes in the Nile Basin.
- e) Sustainability and ensuring that the NTEAP investments bear long lasting impacts and achieve replications.
- f) Learning lessons from former NTEAP activities. This should be a continuous process beyond the life span of the NTEAP.

13. Conclusions

On over-all, the NTEAP was successful in demonstrating the need for regional collaboration in environmental management and initiating description of the environmental function of the NBI. NTEAP developed and promoted tools, frameworks and processes for facilitating the collaboration and mobilizing member countries to collaborate. Further, the implementation structures and procedures made it possible for NTEAP to deliver the intended outputs, although, this was achieved after granting the project a two year no-cost project extension. This is in view of the fact that the project operated in a diverse region in terms of environmental, policy, social- economic, political and cultural diversity which required management of staff and operations in nine countries and coordination with the Nile-SEC centre.

14. Recommendations

The Evaluation recommends the following in reference to future environmental programmes of the NBI SVP.

- a) Project design:**
 - i. Take into account national policies and procedures in the project implementation strategies.
 - ii. Base future projects on up-to-date baseline information.
- b) Monitoring and Evaluation**
 - i. Strong M&E framework as part of Project documentation that takes into need for robust baseline, measuring impacts, outcomes and trends in addition to project performance.
 - ii. Allocation of adequate resources within the budget to ensure that M&E functions is well facilitated to service the project.
- c) Synergies**

- i. Entrench strategies for synergistic approaches within the SVP. This could in part be achieved if “special” requirements are emphasized in the M&E system.
- ii. Develop and apply procedures for fostering interactions between the SAP Projects at technical and work planning levels. This would help SAP projects to inform each other and assist to identify areas of collaboration.
- iii. Strengthen NBI in-house capacity to capture and enforce utilization of opportunities for synergies.

d) Sustainability

The following strategies are recommended:

- i. Develop and apply sustainability strategy from project onset till the end
- ii. Design and apply approaches for learning and sharing lessons and applications of lessons captured to inform implementation and decision making.
- iii. Consider commissioning a Lesson Learning exercise for the NTEAP.
- iv. Entrench requirements for sustainability strategies within the activity designs at thematic and individual activity levels.

14. Lessons

The Evaluation notes that NTEAP engaged in analysing and documenting lessons. The following lessons are drawn from the Evaluation and are presented to NBI, Nile Basin Countries and NBI Partners.

- a) Multi-faceted environmental issues in a wide and diversified geographical coverage require a long-term commitment and uninterrupted facilitation and engagement.
- b) The success of Basin wide programmes of magnitude of NTEAP requires robust Results Based Management System as well as measures for ensuring partners’ and stakeholder’s participation at all levels. For Example, The participatory M&E of the NTEAP focused on the MGs and NEPs. The other components (Environmental Education and Awareness (EEA), Water Quality Monitoring (WQM) and Wetlands) depended on reports submitted from the (NPCs).
- c) A multi-pronged institutional approach from the community to basin-wide is very important in realizing significant change in the environment. Equally, it should be mindful of diversity in policies related to environment/water in the NB countries.
- d) Political leverage for such a project such as NTEAP can be enhanced through participation of high level officials in project planning and supervision such as the NTEAP PSC.
- e) Sustainability of project supported activities requires integration of such activities in host institutional mandates and programmes. Project implementation systems and facilities ought to be accommodated into host institutions procedures and policies if they are to be smoothly implemented.
- f) Designing and implementing project sustainability plans and phasing out strategies should distinguish between project activities and institutional process and provide for phase out plans and actions that take into account uniqueness of activity and or process. For example, the closure of NTEAP offices in Nile basin countries could have been left as responsibility of hosting institutions. In this way, choices to close or retain offices and staff would have been at discretion of the host institution.
- g) MGs that were community based are more sustainable than NGOs that got MG funding to implement projects.

- h) Ensuring national ownership and leadership should be a prerequisite from project formulation, inception and implementation. Multi-stakeholder participation, consultation and decision making, through appropriate institutional arrangements is essential.
- i) Using existing coordinating structures and mechanisms at national level may enhance sustainability of project activities rather than establishing new networks and structures.
- j) Building on ongoing/existing work relevant to environmental management, conservation and sustainable utilization especially for MGP would have ensured successful completion of activities.
- k) Adopting a holistic approach to capacity building that addresses capacity needs at the systemic, institutional and individual levels while integrating such capacity building into wider sustainable development efforts, to the extent possible and appropriate.
- l) Adopting a long-term approach to capacity building within the context of sustainable development ensures sustainability rather than project/time bound capacity building.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) Terminal Evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation which covered the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Plan (NTEAP) period of seven years, from October 2003 to December 2009 covered the NTEAP activities in all the nine member countries (Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation). The evaluation involved both desk work (Annex 2: Documents/Literature reviewed) and interviews (Annex 3: List of People and Institutions interviewed) and in-depth analysis of information from literature and interview responses. The draft Evaluation Report was presented and discussed by a Regional Workshop convened by NBI on 28th-29th June 2010 in Kampala Uganda (Annex 4: Record of the Workshop).

1.1.1 Justification/rationale for the Terminal Evaluation

The Nile Trans-boundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) was implemented with an original objective to support the development of a basin-wide framework for actions to address trans-boundary environmental issues within the context of NBI's Strategic Action Program. The Project also intended to encourage more effective basin wide stakeholder cooperation on trans-boundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of the actions prioritized by the Transboundary Environmental Analysis. Later in 2007, the project objective was revised to protect critical Nile Basin ecosystems from trans-boundary threats through the provision of a strategic environmental framework and the engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM).

The NTEAP completed in December 2009 and a Terminal Evaluation is undertaken to evaluate the extent to which the project realized its objectives stated above. The Evaluation is expected to make conclusions and recommendations that would inform NBI and member countries on the status of regional cooperation in environmental management as a result of this project as well as actions needed to strengthen regional cooperation in environmental management.

1.1.2 Objective of the Terminal Evaluation

The Over-all objective of the Terminal Evaluation of the NTEAP project is to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness of the project, impact, synergies and linkages and sustainability of the project supported activities in all the nine countries of the Nile basin.

1.1.3 Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation

The purpose of the Terminal Evaluation is to provide an in-depth assessment of the appropriateness of the design of NTEAP Project and activities in addressing the identified environmental issues and problems in Nile Basin as well as addressing sustainable development needs and priorities within the Nile basin. The Evaluation intends to assess extent to which the objectives and outcomes of the project supported activities have been fulfilled. The Terminal Evaluation also examines the overall project management and implementation, as well as the extent to which recommendations of the 2006 Medium Term Review were addressed. It also examines the performance indicators and gauges the level of implementation of activities against those indicators. The Terminal Evaluation

takes a broad outlook, including performance of the project against set objectives, indicators and benchmarks in each country.

1.2 Terminal Evaluation methodology

1.2.1 Evaluation Team

The Terminal Evaluation was carried out by a Team of three independent Consultants between 27th May - 29th June 2010 (Annex 5: Evaluation Itinerary/Programme).

Following orientation meetings at Nile-SEC at the onset of Evaluation exercise, the Evaluation Team presented an Inception Report that elaborated on the methodology and schedule of evaluation activities (Annex 6: Inception Report). The Terminal Evaluation Team jointly interviewed the implementing institutions for Component # 4 (Regional Wetlands and Biodiversity) and Component # 3 (Education and Awareness) in Uganda to test the methodology. Thereafter, the Evaluation Team split into three- one-person led Evaluation missions each covering three of the 9 member countries in the Nile basin. In each Country, the Terminal Evaluation was facilitated by either a former NPC or former NPC Office Staff or staff to former implementing /beneficiary institutions.

Details on in-country Evaluation exercise are presented in Appendix 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

1.2.2 The evaluation process

The Evaluation process involved:

- a) Orientation and planning meetings and planning at Nile-SEC (27th -31st May 2010).
- b) Reviewing documents and literature including Regional and Country specific reports, publications, work plans, minutes of meetings, mid-term and project implementation reviews (Annex 2).
- c) Interviews with Nile-SEC Staff, former NTEAP staff (NPC and MGP), staff of host institution/implementing institutions, former members of NTEAP Steering Committee, members of Nile-TAC, UNOPS, NTEAP Steering Committee Members, Nile-TAC representatives, project beneficiaries at national and field level, personnel from collaborating institutions and programmes (Annex 3).
- d) Visits to field activities encompassing all the NTEAP Components (Annex 5).
- e) Preparing reports.
- f) Stakeholder's workshop on 28th - 29th June 2010.
- g) End of Evaluation Reporting.

1.3 Limitations

The Evaluation process in all the 9 countries went on well. Nearly 90% of the targeted interviews and field visits were accomplished. However, the following constraints or limitations were encountered:

Insufficient time to visit field activities: The Evaluation Team notes that time allocated to travel and field visits were inadequate to cover all NTEAP activities per country. Therefore, the Evaluation methodology applied sampling of representative activities under Micro grant, School based projects and national eligible Projects. The implication of this methodology is that the conclusions are based on a sample and not all activities.

Timing of the evaluation: The Terminal Evaluation was undertaken six months after the closure of the NTEAP. This timing for the Evaluation is O.K provided the purpose and scope of evaluation is designed taking such factor in mind. However, the Evaluation Team observed that the approach depended on availability or support of former NTEAP project staff. This was not possible in all countries because the targeted personnel were not readily available to render this support. Nonetheless, the Evaluation Team greatly appreciates the invaluable support received from those who eventually participated in the exercise.

The Evaluation notes that these limitations notwithstanding, the conclusions and recommendations of this Evaluation are valid and reflect a fair representation of NTEAP activities, results and impacts.

1.4 Key issues addressed by the Terminal Evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation focused on the following issues at regional and in country level evaluation:

- a) **Relevance:** The extent to which the NTEAP addressed the identified problems and needs in the Nile Basin. The Evaluation took into account the following:
 - i. Appropriateness of the NTEAP design and project interventions to the identified problems and towards supporting Nile basin level priorities whilst contributing to the implementation of the GEF areas of focus and the NBI Vision, as well as global environment benefits.
 - ii. Complementarities and coherence with other related programs and activities at regional, national and local levels.
 - iii. Extent of participation by host country institutions and beneficiaries.
 - iv. Level of co-financing secured by the NTEAP supported activities.

- b) **Efficiency:** An assessment of how well the various activities transformed the available resources into intended outputs in terms of quantity, quality, and timelines and where possible unit cost. The Evaluation considered the following:
 - i. Linkages and commitment between the project and host-country institutions at national level.
 - ii. Approaches used to deliver project support.
 - iii. Planning and decision making processes and procedures.
 - iv. Linkages between in country activities coordinated by the NPC and LMC.
 - v. Levels of country contributions in the project, including fulfilling hosting obligations.
 - vi. Extent and quality of monitoring systems that were used to measure progress and impact.
 - vii. Extent of the project's ability to adapt its program and approach in response to changing assumptions and risks.
 - viii. Impact and extent of support/guidance provided by NTEAP Coordination Office in Khartoum and UNOPS in Nairobi.

- c) **Effectiveness:** To extent to which the project outputs were achieved and to what extent they contributed to achieving the project outcomes. The Evaluation considered:
 - i. Progress towards targets/milestones defined in the work plans and indicators to measure the achievements of the project outcomes.
 - ii. Appropriateness of the indicators to measure the achievements of the project objective.

- iii. Validity of the assumptions and risks of the project at the objective level, including discussion of unforeseen benefits or risks.
- d) **Impact:** To extent to which the project objectives and intended impact were achieved and thus contributing to the overall NTEAP goal and SVP outcomes. The Evaluation considered the following:
- i. The extent the project activities and achievements might have contributed to the overall NBI/SVP regional targets.
 - ii. Changes that could have been effected by the project implementation or likely impacts.
 - iii. Unplanned outcomes and impact (negative or positive) resulting from the project and their consequences as well as national, regional or global environmental benefits.
 - iv. Gender-related or poverty related impacts rising from the project activities.
- e) **Synergies and linkages:** Extent to which the project managed to establish synergies and linkages with other stakeholders/partners. The Evaluation considered the following:
- i. Extent of linkages with other SVPs and SAPs activities in each country and at basin level.
 - ii. Extent of linkages between the various NTEAP components.
 - iii. Extent of linkages with other programmes under the UN family.
 - iv. Effectiveness of networks developed by the project and networks involving the project.
 - v. Extent of linkages with existing initiatives at region level.
- f) **Sustainability:** Extent to which the impacts or outcomes of the project are likely to continue after the end of the project. The Evaluation considered the following:
- i. Extent of “ownership” of the NTEAP by national institutions and means for ensuring integration of NTEAP supported activities into national programmes.
 - ii. Extent of the prevailing and expected policy environment in support of the project objectives and achievements.
 - iii. Extent of the institutional capacities of host countries institutions to carry forward project outcomes after the end of the funding support, at all levels.
 - iv. Extent and nature of needs beyond the project and how these might be best met through future phases, programmes, or institutionalization of work begun under NTEAP.
- g) **Lessons learning:** The Extent to which experiences and lesson learnt were captured and utilized to inform NTEAP implementation and decisions. The Evaluation considered the following:
- i. Appropriateness of lesson learning processes and feedback mechanisms.
 - ii. Extent to which lesson learnt were utilized in subsequent implementation approaches (planning, decision making, financial management, etc.).

2. THE NTEAP AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

The following sections provide a summary of the NTEAP design, logical framework, implementation and coordination structures and recommendations of 2006 mid-Term review. This information summarizes the context under which the NTEAP was developed and implemented.

2.1 NTEAP description

2.1.1 NTEAP design

The Nile Trans-boundary Environment Action Project (NTEAP) was one of the eight thematic projects within the Nile Basin Shared Vision Program (SVP).¹ NTEAP aimed to promote cooperation among the Nile Basin countries in protecting and managing the environment and the delicate ecosystem of the Nile River Basin. Specifically, NTEAP was intended contribute to the sub-regional investment programmes (Nile Equatorial Subsidiary Action Plan (NELSAP) and Eastern Nile Subsidiary Action Plan (ENSAP). The design took into consideration by the Nile countries that future development of the Nile Basin must be environmentally sustainable. The design was based on information generated through the Transboundary Environmental Analysis (TEA) study.

The project had a budget of US\$43.6 million, over an implementation period of five years, with funding provided by the Global Environment Facility (through the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank) and the multi-donor Nile Basin Trust Fund, managed by the World Bank. Collectively, the Nile Basin countries were to contribute about US\$4.0 million to the project by providing office space, staff time, and meeting own travel costs.

The project was designed to specifically, address the following:

- a) Improve the understanding of the relationship of water resources development and environment;
- b) Provide forum to discuss development paths for the Nile Basin with a wide range of stakeholders;
- c) Enhance basin-wide cooperation and environmental awareness; and
- d) Enhance environmental management capacities of the basin-wide institutions and the Nile-SEC.

Consequently, the project was designed to be implemented under the following five components:

- a) Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation;
- b) Community-Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation;
- c) Environmental Education and Public Awareness;
- d) Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation; and
- e) Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring.

¹ The SVP project portfolio includes: 1) Nile Trans-boundary Environmental Action; 2) Nile Basin Regional Power Trade; 3) Efficient Water Use for Agricultural Production; 4) Water Resources Planning and Management; 5) Confidence Building and Stakeholder Involvement; 6) Applied Training; 7) Socio-Economic Development and Benefit Sharing; and 8) SVP Coordination Project.

The NTEAP design took into account two assumptions or principles namely: a) Mutual understanding, solid relationships and collaborative partnerships between governments, NGOs, researchers, educators, and private sector are essential to collective problem-solving; and b) Broad participation ensures greater mutual understanding and dialogue. These assumptions led to the NTEAP implementation approach that emphasized, among others: trans-boundary collaborations, participation, capacity building, demonstration, development of tools and frameworks for collaboration, knowledge generation as well as lesson learning and sharing.

As the client agreement between UNOPS and Nile Basin Initiative, a fixed fee for all SVP projects combined (six other projects next to NTEAP) was made. The fixed fee was negotiated over direct and direct support costs to support the entire SVP portfolio delivery. The breakdown for NTEAP project is by estimation. For example, NTEAP prorated delivery in 2009 as seen against the SVP portfolio was 15% for World Bank funded components and 20% for UNDP funded components for a total 35%, hence approximately US\$ 494,140 (15%) of total fee to date could in theory be attributed to NTEAP whilst of course adding the income UNOPS earned from UNDP. However, at times transactions in some projects took more resources than NTEAP based on the complexity of the activity, so the exact NTEAP cost share shall be determined after closure of all SVP projects. The NTEAP prorated delivery share was fairly constant over the years so the closest approximation would be 15 % out of the total SVP fee earned by UNOPS.

UNDP GEF implementation costs were borne by UNDP as per interagency agreement. The fee set up was 8% over delivery against the UNDP GEF programmed funds. The UNOPS fee earned out of UNDP GEF was deducted from direct and direct support costs before computing the fee to the NBI/WB as to reflect the cost synergies of delivering SVP and UNDP GEF together under the same portfolio.

The design was made in such a way that the immediate operational, financial and reporting capacity from the first day of funds programming onwards for the time that the NBI was to build capacity to eventually take over and implement NTEAP themselves. More concretely, with UNOPS implementation, NTEAP had immediate disbursement capacities in all Nile Basin countries which was imperative to being operational as project, had diplomatic tax exempt and travel document status even though the NBI was not recognized as legal entity in any of the Nile Basin countries but Uganda, had a sound internal control system for recruitment, procurement and funds administration in place, had an online financial management system that allowed for decentralized budget authority, i.e. the RPMs having budget and disbursement authority over their own projects, and NTEAP had immediate reporting capacity custom tailored to the requirements of the World Bank in order to ensure continuity of funds disbursement as the World Bank required quarterly reporting in order to release additional funds. This implementation partnership was to the advantage of NTEAP to launch as an operational project, considering that critical organizational policies and pertaining executive structures that were put in place at the NBI in the course of last year 2009.

2.1.2 NTEAP goal

The over-all Goal of the NTEAP was to strengthen riparian cooperation and coordination on environmental management in the Nile Basin.

2.2.3 Objectives, outcomes and outputs

The original objectives of the NTEAP project were:

- a) Provision of a forum to discuss development paths for the Nile;
- b) Improvement in the understanding of the relationship between water resources management and the environment; and
- c) Enhancement of basin-wide cooperation among NBI countries.

In 2006, the above objectives was revised and new key results areas (impact, outcomes) and outputs proposed as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: NTEAP revised Objectives, Outputs and Outcomes

Goal: Improved quality of the environment in the Nile Basin		
Objective	Outcome	Outputs
To protect critical Nile Basin ecosystems from trans-boundary threats through the provision of a strategic environmental framework [of actions] and the engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM)	Institutions strengthened to facilitate regional collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Institutional set up for project implementation established b) Knowledge management and communication tools produced c) River basin model system developed d) Strategic Environment Framework provided e) Transboundary desk studies of macro -sectoral policies & environment completed f) M&E system in place
	Improved capacity of Nile Basin Communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across the GEF focal areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Viable options for community level actions to address Nile environmental threats identified b) Soil erosion micro grants studies completed c) Regional & national workshops in technical and organizational skills conducted in 9 countries
	Environmental education improved and public awareness enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Public awareness on Nile environmental threats enhanced in Nile basin countries b) Networks of secondary schools for projects based learning established and functioning in NB countries. c) Networking established among universities and other research institutions
	Enhanced capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Regional cooperation is enhanced and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity improved. b) Understanding and awareness of the roles of wetlands in supporting sustainable development is improved. c) Training on wetlands management according to needs conducted. d) Pilot initiatives in support of capacity building and wetlands management plans implemented.
	Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the Nile Basin countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Regional working group established b) Awareness on Water Quality issues increased in Nile Basin countries at all levels c) Data exchange mechanism developed. d) Capacity of selected labs in each country improved. e) Study on biological diversity indices conducted and pilot tested. f) Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow up action formulated

Source: Project Completion Report Vol I (December 2009)

2.2.4 Coordination and Supervision

a) Coordination

The NTEAP implementation was coordinated by a Project Management Unit based in Khartoum, Sudan. The project had representatives at level of Environment Lead Specialists based at East Nile Subsidiary Action Plan (ENSAP) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and at Nile Equatorial Subsidiary Action Plan (NELSAP) in Kigali, Rwanda; and at National Coordinators levels (National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and Local Microgrant Coordinator (LMC) located in the National Environmental Agencies of each of the 9 member countries.

Since January 2010, the former Lead Specialist of component #4 (Wetlands and Biodiversity) has continued to operate from Nile-SEC as NTEAP Coordinator until the Evaluation time.

b) Supervision

NTEAP implementation was supervised through the following entities (Table 2):

Table 2: NTEAP supervision entities and their responsibilities

Institution	Responsibility
Project Steering Committee	Work plan and budget approval and strategic guidance
Nile-SEC	a) Delivery of project outputs b) Overall supervision and monitoring of project implementation
Nile-TAC	Technical Advisory
UNOPS	Administration and finance issues

NTEAP benefitted from joint bi-annual supervision missions commissioned by NTEAP partners and composed of the Nile-SEC, the World Bank and UNDP GEF. These missions were organized to follow up on project progress, budget utilization and overall direction of the project in implementing project activities.

2.2.5 Mid-Term Review recommendations

As part of Lesson learning and adaptive management principle, the NTEAP underwent a mid-term review in 2006 and made the following recommendations (Table 3):

Table 3: NTEAP Mid-Term Review Recommendations

Mid Term Review Recommendations
a) More focus and resources to demonstrate the practical effects of NTEAP and the impact of its outputs.
b) The project in consultation with the UNOPS and the World Bank, organize each year an independent financial audit.
c) In the first phase, most of the microgrants were implemented within individual countries and addressed community concerns. The NTEAP should address these deficiencies and increase the number of the trans-boundary projects.
d) It is expected that from the microgrants program will emerge good practices on mitigation of trans-boundary environmental threats. It is recommended that NTEAP fosters emergence of good practice and use them as models for other microgrants. It may also request countries to give them academic and professional recognition as Nile-basin specific practices.
e) Enhanced linkage across components and reinforce the cooperative network with SVPs and support to SAPs.
f) Taking into account the one year delay in commencement of many of the project activities, and seeing the promising implementation and accomplishment of project activities, the MTR, PSC and Supervision missions agreed on the extension of the project duration until the end of 2009. A no

cost extension up to June 2010 was also agreed by the Supervision missions and the PSC and was approved by the TAC.

- g) NTEAP should focus on the development of the Strategic Environmental Framework (SEF) for the Nile Countries.
- h) Specifically, NTEAP should identify what key environmental functions a permanent River Basin Organization (RBO) should undertake.
- i) Conduct TDA study and prepare the State of the Environment regional report
- j) NTEAP will need a clear exit strategy so that any activities being carried out by the project that do not fall under an RBO's mandate are either phased out or taken up by the riparian countries.

In general terms, the mid-term review recommendations emphasised effectiveness and value for money approaches and impact creation, relevance as a regional programme, lesson learning and scaling up or replicability, building on synergies and, strengthening frameworks for regional collaboration in environmental management. The Terminal Evaluation evaluates the extent to which these recommendations have been addressed (Section. 3.2).

3. KEY FINDINGS FROM THE EVALUATION OF COMPONENTS

The following sections present the Evaluation findings and recommendations based on each NTEAP Component. The Section also presents findings and recommendations on progress made towards addressing mid-term review recommendations as well as Gender issues of the NTEAP. For each component, the findings are presented in three contexts: achievements, constraints and conclusion. Over-all, the Evaluation agrees with the NTEAP achievements stated in Annex 2 of the NTEAP Project Completion Report (December 2009). Therefore, the following are additional findings per project component.

3.1 Component findings and assessment

3.1.1 Component One: Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation

This component aimed at enabling improving trans-boundary cooperation on environmental management among and between Nile basin Countries through improved communication, knowledge exchange and enhanced tools for environmental management. The component focused on establishing and maintaining implementation and coordination structures and capacities at regional and national levels (PMU, NPC, and Steering Committee), improved knowledge management, establishing and supporting a Decision support system and river basin modelling, and, macro-economic and sectoral policies. Therefore success under this component would be seen through strengthened institutional capacity to facilitate regional cooperation. The availability of the strengthened capacity was evaluated in terms of the availability of trained national staff, of management tools & frameworks and networks of professionals and advisors actively involved in NTEAP oversight of activities.

The Evaluation reports the following achievements:

- a) Regional and National institutions stronger to address Transboundary threats: The project intended to develop Transboundary EIA guidelines for use by Nile Basin Initiative Investment Programmes, develop policy recommendations on Basin environmental management as well as define an institutional framework for environmental management under the NBI. The Evaluation notes that the project assisted to develop Terms of reference for developing the environmental guidelines, undertaking policy review and for defining institutional home for environmental management under the NBI. The Evaluation concludes that the intended outcome of the NTEAP project was affected by this level of progress and suggests that efforts be made by NBI to complete this important task.
- b) Institutional set up for project implementation established: The NTEAP intended to establish and operationalize Project Steering Committee, PMU, National Offices as well as support or facilitate efforts geared towards defining the environmental function of the NBI. This output was largely realized, although as noted in part (a) above, the support to defining the environmental function did not perform as expected. However, the Evaluation notes that the parallel reporting relationship between the NPC and LMC was not the best arrangement as it denied the NPC opportunity to assume full responsibility for the NTEAP investment in respective countries.
- c) Developing and applying an M&E system for NTEAP implementation: the NTEAP designed and applied a Monitoring and Evaluation system that comprised of M&E indicators, coordination

platforms (National Coordination Committees); reporting requirements, supervision structures (Project Steering Committee, Donor Supervision missions) oversee project implementation. These tools were instrumental in implementation. However, they remained largely project based and may not continue to function without facilitation and incentives. The Evaluation finds the indicators to have been more “performance” oriented and less applicable to measuring changes (impacts, outcomes) arising out of the NTEAP project.

- d) Institutional capacities to collaborate in regional level actions: the project enabled putting in place capacities through training, developing implementation tools and processes such as Thematic Working Groups for enabling regional collaboration. Indeed, Implementing institutions in all countries acknowledge that through the NTEAP, they fully appreciate the need for collaboration, especially, in management of Transboundary environmental issues and resources. Most of former NTEAP staff has been absorbed in competitive employments which reflect their competencies. Personnel from implementing institutions and beneficiaries appreciate that their understanding of regional issues of the Nile Basin has indeed been uplifted. Former project equipment (vehicles, computers) are expected to continue to be used for environment management related activities by host institutions. The Evaluation predicts a need for sustaining institutional capacities so as to be able to continue engaged in regional collaboration and sustains NTEAP activities.
- e) Processes for regional cooperation: the Evaluation confirms that processes involving Working Groups and NTEAP Steering Committees were indeed stepping stones towards regional cooperation. They offered opportunities for information sharing, networking and establishing mutual recognition of expertise and mandates among institutions and experts who were involved in working groups. However, these networks seem to have functioned only when there was facilitation by NTEAP. The likelihood of their continued function on their own is unlikely in absence of conveners or facilitation to their activities, including funding.
- f) NTEAP Coordination: The PMU office in Khartoum did a commendable job coordinating the implementation of the NTEAP. By working through national offices, the NTEAP brought services near to the field and offered Nile Basin countries opportunity to closely interact with the issues and priorities of regional nature. The presence of NBI/NTEAP was felt and credibility of the NBI as a vehicle for fostering regional cooperation was indeed boosted by these offices. The PIM was a very useful tool for guiding implementation by all actors. However, the assumption that implementing institutions would continue to oversee/coordinate implementation or scaling up NTEAP activities can only be assured there is funding for these activities through these institutions. Likewise, the assumption that the Environment Desk at Nile-SEC will continue to coordinate environmental management in the Nile Basin is valid, but requires to be supported with commensurate capacities and mandate.
- g) Information management, sharing and awareness raising: the project facilitated sharing and dissemination of information about sustainable development issues of the Nile basin. Technical publications and other information publications are visible on the ground and indeed NBI is extensively referred to as “source of information” on the Nile Basin. This is an important resource that should be managed well for future use and reference. By time of Evaluation, it could not be confirmed whether the Nile-SEC has stored all the NTEAP information or whether some is still in Khartoum. The celebration events such as the annual “Nile Day” raised the profile of the Nile basin development issues within public domain.

- h) Tools or strategies for guiding regional cooperation on environmental management: the project facilitated development of strategies and tools for environmental management. Notable among these is the Nile Basin Wetlands Strategy, Management Plans for Sio- Siteko Wetland, Diender – Alatish Protected Areas management Plan, Strategy for integrating Environmental Education into Curriculum, Regional Water Quality Monitoring Framework, among others. These tools or strategies have been widely disseminated and acknowledged. The Evaluation notes that there is concern from Francophone countries regarding the capability to use these tools in English Language.
- i) Appropriateness of the project design: as strategy, the NTEAP was designed and implemented with the objective to strengthen institutions for regional collaboration on environmental management in the Nile basin. As such, the project design contributed greatly to the attainment of this objective and indeed, efforts were made to ensure that the project has regional character and addresses regional issues. The Evaluation is of the opinion that the following aspects of the project design did not satisfactory address this strategy.
- i. Participation in project design: the evaluation notes that there was limited participation in the project formulation stages of project formulation and where done, participation was limited to higher government levels. This rendered NTEAP project alien to the grassroots and other actors in the region, save for the design of MGPs.
 - ii. Language Barriers: Nile Basin Nile basin countries and communities are diverse and use different languages. This creates serious barrier to communication and engagement on issues of Nile Basin development and indeed project implementation. For instance, the Evaluation has captured the fact that languages impeded effective participation from Francophone countries. In recognition that such barriers exist, the Evaluation did not find sufficient evidence (other than translating English information to French and vice-versa) that NTEAP design made provisions for addressing them.
 - iii. Quality of Indicators: The 2007 log-frame was an improvement of the pre-2007 one. However, its indicators are largely targeting Project performance. For instance, they do not clearly distinguish long-term and medium term strategies and targets (i.e., impacts and outcomes). In this case therefore, the design missed the opportunity to strategically engage implementation towards long-term basin level objective and impacts.
 - iv. Participation in Monitoring NTEAP: the NTEAP M&E System emphasized participatory approach and involved the PSC, PMU and NPCs in monitoring the project implementation progress. However, the interaction between PMU and Nile-SEC with field activities was insufficient as both relied on reports submitted by the NPCs and LMCs. was not strong enough to ensure that both stations participate effectively as envisaged.
 - v. Synergies: Where as there existed synergies between the SVP projects and NTEAP on one hand and among NTEAP Components. For example, numerous opportunities for linking the MGP with other NTEAP activities where MGP could have leveraged actions existed abundantly. The Evaluation finds that these synergies were not optimally utilized and this could have contributed towards achieving less project impact in such situations.
 - vi. Establishing networks of experts: Representation and participation in working groups aimed at ensuring that Nile basin countries participate equally. However, this was not fully realized due to differences in capacities and interests in respective themes. More so, expertise from non-state actors wasn't represented in the groups.
 - vii. Lessons learning and replication: The NTEAP was designed to pioneer approaches that were expected to inform other SVP and demonstrate good practice that could be

replicated basin wide. The Evaluation found out that the mechanism for capturing and replicating success stories were insufficient to trigger scaling up and or replication of the project supported activities. Whilst each country reported on success stories, there was no evidence of how these stories were processed to inform country work plans of other countries.

- viii. Sustainability: The NTEAP design provided for a sustainability plan. The Evaluation found out the plans did not gain required support and implementation emphasis. The NTEAP closure process failed to guide logical phasing out of NTEAP support and several activities were abruptly concluded irrespective of their need for gradual phase out of support. This has contributed to likelihood of rendering such activities short-lived.
- ix. Delivering project support through MGPs: The approach of using MGPs to deliver Project support and catalyze /demonstrate action benefited Local action more than Transboundary actions. As noted in mid-term Review, MGPs approach may not have been a suitable model for Transboundary resources action because selection criteria and process as well as sovereignty over resources. This was also affected by the fact NPCs and LMC worked within the sovereignty of their countries and yet there were no mechanism for cross-border collaboration in the MGPs.

The Evaluation reports the following constraints that may have affected the implementation of this component.

- a) Availing project resources: the Evaluation has established that project implementation suffered due to delays in disbursement of funds, financial management and procurement of and delivery of project goods and services. Further, the Evaluation has established that financial management systems and procedures were cumbersome to most implementing institutions and beneficiaries, in some instances, were not consistent with national fiscal and development funds management policies. However, the Evaluation recognizes that there were attempts to improve financial management through training, issuance of new financial accounting systems and permitting some of the transactions (e.g., workshop expenses) to operate through NPCs personal bank accounts. This problem is attributed to UNOPs/UNDP and the Evaluation has noted that there is negative attitude towards the role/contribution of UNOPs in this project.
- b) Workload for the NPCs: there are concerns that NPC were overloaded, specially, towards the later years of the project when NEPs were added into the work plans, and this could have resulted in low performance and low motivation. The Evaluation has not been able to assess the validity of this concern but would wish to observe that the anticipated managerial support from implementing may not have been fully realized due to NTEAP implementation procedures and requirements that emphasised actions by NPC only.
- c) Reporting procedures: the Evaluation observed that the NPCs were not accountable for the entire portfolio of NTEAP activities in each country. For example, the LMC reported directly to the PMU. This created a situation whereby the communication about the achievements and impacts of NTEAP were somehow undermined by parallel reporting and accountability.
- d) Observing Hierarchy: the NBI put in place procedures for empowering Nile Basin countries to take charge of NBI programmes and activities. Such procedures involve the Nile-COM, Nile-TAC, and individual SAP Projects Steering or Coordination committees with full representation from all the 9 member states. However, in the case of NTEAP, there was a structural problem whereby members of the PSC were Senior to representatives to the Nile-TAC and yet the former

organ was required to report on technical issues through the Nile-TAC. This situation impeded information flow or led to some of the countries (Kenya, Tanzania) to designate “junior” officers to serve on the PSC. Ultimately, this effected leveraging political support of the NTEAP in most countries.

- e) Voluntary services versus efficiency: the Evaluation Team agrees with the strategy to use non-paid working groups. However, the intended long term benefit of these groups may not be realized in the long run due to the fact that there is no clear strategy for long term engagement of these groups. In the absence of this strategy, the recruitment to the groups was dominated by experts from government institutions and expectations from groups members varied greatly. Secondly, there are no clear modalities for continued engagement of these groups. A combination of these factors lead to conclusion that the sustainability of these groups if left on their own, is not guaranteed.
- f) Language barriers: The Evaluation recognises the language barrier, efforts that were put to overcome this barrier and its implications on Nile Basin participation. The dominant use of English in official communication, reporting and meetings were a disadvantage to Francophone countries. The Evaluation is unable to commit any additional opinion on how to address this barrier to those efforts that were applied by NTEAP.

The Evaluation is of the opinion that the above constraints notwithstanding, this Component enabled establishment of a solid foundation for regional collaboration on environmental management due to the following achievements:

- a) Institutions structures, procedures and facilities for engagement in regional collaboration
- b) NTEAP has succeeded in improving the capacity of NB communities to demonstrate and adapt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management in the focal areas identified
- c) NTEAP has contributed to improved environmental education and enhanced public awareness in the Nile Basin
- d) NTEAP has or is likely to contribute to increased capacity and awareness on Water Quality Monitoring (WQM) in the Nile Basin countries.
- e) The project has contribute to enhanced capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity

Table 4 shows the performance of Component #1 against set targets.

Result	Performance Indicators	Actual Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
<p>Outcome 1. Regional and national institutions strengthened in addressing trans-boundary threats to Nile ecosystem resources</p>	<p>Transboundary EIA guidelines for use by NBI investment programs developed</p>	<p>TORs for developing Transboundary EIA developed and development of Guidelines initiated</p>	<p>Indicator not realized. Follow up by Nile-SEC is recommended</p>
	<p>Policy recommendations on Basin environment protection formulated and submitted for consideration in at least two countries</p>	<p>Carried assessment of environmental polices</p>	<p>Indicator not realized. Follow up by Nile-SEC is recommended</p>
	<p>Environment function of the NB permanent institution defined through a consultative process</p>	<p>Concept note on the environment functions of NBI for future engagements and programmes internally discussed within NBI</p>	<p>Indicator not realized. Follow up by Nile-SEC is recommended</p>
<p>Output 1.1. Institutional setup for project implementation established.</p>	<p>PSC, PMU & 9 national offices managed & functioning</p>	<p>a) PMU and 19 national coordination offices established and functioning in all NB countries b) PSC established and to date six PSC meetings held. c) 37 National eligible projects to support countries at national level approved (USD 1,400,097) and under implementation (USD 1,022,268 disbursed as of October</p>	<p>NTEAP implementation set up was put in place as envisaged, albeit, with delays in some cases especially the establishment of some national offices. For instance, the Rwanda office was</p>

Result	Performance Indicators	Actual Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
		10 2009)	not in place until 2005.
	Process for the definition of the environment function of the NBI facilitated	Initial reviews and discussions completed and a draft paper on environment function of the Nile basin permanent organization prepared and discussed at the NBI. The proposed functions were included in the NBDF 2008 declaration that was endorsed by minister and representatives of seven NBI countries	Process initiated /indicator partially realized
	Functioning inter-ministerial committees arise out of the working groups in each of the riparian's.	4 national networks established and efforts to sustain some of them in progress.. It is expected that PSC will continue as environmental advisory body for the ISP/RBO	Committees set up but Non-ministry experts not involved
Output 1.6. M&E system in place	<p>a) Monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, annual, field visits, surveys and review reports produced and disseminated to respective partners.</p> <p>b) M&E strategy updated as per Results Based System.</p>	<p>a) M&E strategy and Action Plan developed, including revised log frame and implementation tracking system.</p> <p>b) M&E manual developed and TOT regional training conducted. More than 15 CB workshops on M&E conducted for NGOs and CBOs at national level.</p> <p>c) Result Based System adopted and 28 counterpart and network member trained</p> <p>d) Monthly, semi Annual and Annual Reports prepared as specified and circulated in a timely manner.</p> <p>e) Compilation and Documentation of best practice completed. Over 70 projects were documented. DRAFTS OF Nine national best practice reports, 9 booklets, and one thematic regional report were all ready for final</p>	Reporting requirements met.

Result	Performance Indicators	Actual Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
		editing, printing and dissemination f) Training manual on best practice compilation and documentation prepared and training provided to NPCs and MGCs. Two regional workshops on best practices conducted. g) Over 50 monitoring missions conducted by the LSs and RPM and reports circulated. Over 60 missions by the NPCs, MGCs and other stakeholders conducted. h) Mid Term Review of the project conducted and report produced and disseminated i) 5 donors supervision missions conducted j) Draft TOR of the Terminal evaluation prepared and circulated.	

According to the NTEAP Terminal Report (2009) in circumstances where progress was made, degree of delivery varied between 50%-142% on all the 22 outputs except one – developing the River Basin Model (RBM), which was transferred to WRMP for development and integration in the Decision Support System (DSS). Overall, the project achieved a fairly high level of completion. The shortfall in some outputs was a result of time constraint e.g. by the close of project 19 NEPs were still under implementation.

3.1.2 Component Two: Community – Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation

The NTEAP activities under this component were implemented either as MGP, NEPs or school based projects in form of pilot activities to demonstrate local action towards soil and water conservation as well as provide alternative sustainable livelihoods opportunities. These activities were complimented with training and information sharing, carrying out rapid assessment studies on soil erosion in Rwanda and Ethiopia.

The Evaluation reports the following achievements:

- a) Promotion of IWRM approaches. There is evidence that site projects e.g., by Nyandera Green Conservation Group in Kenya, implemented integrated management of natural resources in catchments in management strategies for Nile basin water resources. However, it was not possible to establish the progress of this approach at trans-boundary or shared ecosystem levels.
- b) Good performance of MGP at community level actions. A variety of activities including afforestation, ecotourism, soil and land management, wetlands conservation, water utilization and conservation were implemented. The Evaluation has been able to establish that these activities contributed to SVP and GEF focal areas and moved towards enhancing livelihoods. However the design and scope of single MGP was found insufficient to enhance Transboundary collaboration and create impact at ecosystem/basin level. As noted in section 3.1.2 above, the selection criteria and NTEAP implementation model of country based mandates limited the opportunity to apply MGP on cross-border sites.
- c) Co-financing: MGPs and NEPS project activities show evidence of co-financing or leverage with other programmes, especially those under the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programmes or UNEP in all countries. Activities under this component benefited immensely from the UNDP/GEF Small Grants programme credibility. By working through the UNDP/GEF Small Grants programmes, NTEAP activities exploited the available synergies at field level as well as national decisions making process of processing MGP grants. In some projects, NTEAP contribution complimented work of former UNDP/GEF Small Grants programme grantees. The NEPs project that supported the development of Sio-Siteko wetland management plans also benefitted from the Co-financing from SAP project under the NELSAP. This has resulted into enhanced impact.

In addition, some of the activities attracted additional funding from sources outside during or after the NTEAP closed e.g., the Sassa Fishing in Entebbe Uganda that has attracted co-financing from Government of Uganda to establish an additional fish pond to experiment breeding of Nile Parch and, activities aimed at restoration of the degraded environment activities around Nyagatare in Rwanda.

- d) Ownership of MGPs: There is a good level of community ownership of the MGPs which is attributed to the fact that communities were involved in implementation and also, these activities addressed the livelihoods needs of the beneficiary communities. This implied therefore, that majority of the MGPs that were logically concluded stand a high chance of being sustainable. This is good lesson for the NBI regarding the link between securing ownership and community/stakeholder participation in planning and implementation of local activities. At national scale, this lesson reveals that integration of NTEAP supported project is possible when stronger partnerships are forged through national institutions involvement in implementation of such activities.

The Evaluation notes that this component faced a number of constraints including the following:

- a) Ensuring sustainability: Some of NEPs project do not seem to have evidence of being sustainable after the NTEAP partly due to size of the investments, duration of intervention, nature of the activities and the manner of NTEAP closure. For example, levels of NEPS investments into activities around Virunga areas were too little to achieve impact on a vast and complex ecosystem such as virunga. The abrupt closure of support to activities in Ukerewe Tanzania and Nyamata Technical School in Rwanda left the implementers somewhat stranded and unable to continue with some of the activities. Schools based programmes continue to suffer from staff transfers or not utilizing the Education and awareness tools because of funding. The key constraints attributed to this state of affairs are related to financial management procedures and delays associated with disbursements and accountability. However, it remains unclear how to attribute NTEAP support to sustainability of these interventions considering that NTEAP contribution is part of the over-all investments.
- b) Impact: a significant number of NEPs (e.g. arboretum in Burundi) MGP projects (e.g. in Beni in DRC, Ecotourism camping in Sudan) suffered abrupt termination because the NTEAP came to end before the intended interventions were accomplished. This has a bearing on the intended results/impacts for these projects. Furthermore, whereas there are visible impacts on the ground for most of the NEPS and MGPs activities, networking among the beneficiaries and respective government lead agencies seems to have vanished soon after NTEAP closure.
- c) Synergies: the NTEAP design and implementation approaches envisaged that synergies with SVPs, among NTEAP components and with other government or non-government programmes would be utilized to enhance NTEAP investments and impacts. The performance of this approach was noted below expected levels. This is attributed to weaknesses in enforcement of this strategy as there were no sanctions or other strong measures to compel synergies in design and implementation. It is also possible that reporting requirements that did not accurately capture synergies contributed to this performance levels. More so, the requirement for synergies was emphasised by NTEAP later in implementation when most of the activities were already denied or under implementation.

The MGPs, NEPs and School project has built capacity among the grantees through practical demonstrations and actions as well as through the various training sessions conducted as part of project implementations.

Although it's early to conclude on the livelihood benefits, there is clear evidence that benefits have started to accrue or will accrue in due course save, for those projects that were terminated prematurely.

Table 5 shows the levels of performance component#2 against set targets.

Result	Performance indicator	Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
Outcome 2: Improved capacity of the Nile Basin communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across GEF focal areas	Best practices addressing Nile environmental threats at community level documented and replicated	234 MGPs, 37 NEPs and 76 school projects Lessons documented and disseminated. Pilot projects for up-scaling and replications were selected	The success of this component is evident. However, the replication or scaling up of success stories has not been possible; this rate of adoption has been low.
Output 2.1. Capacities of NGOs and CBOs on addressing environmental threats enhanced	No. of professional women and men trained on the Nile environmental threats across the basin.	a) Eight regional CB workshops conducted and over 250 professionals from NGOs, CBOs and Government trained b) Over 80 national CB Workshops for NGO, CBOs, NGO Networks conducted	Women were targeted and involve in trainings.
Output 2.2. Viable options for community level actions to address Nile environmental threats (in accordance to the relevant GEF focal areas)	A minimum of 200 projects, of which 10% targeting women groups, implemented by communities across the basin.	a) Soil erosion studies completed in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Sudan. b) Regional Micro grant Strategy and Operational Manual developed c) Institutional arrangement for MG implementation completed in all NB countries d) National Action plans developed and approved in all countries e) A total 234 MG project amounting to \$ 5,433,482 approved in all countries f) A total of \$5,116,581 (95.5%) in MG funds disbursed to date	Women target exceeded targeted numbers. Performance of this portfolio demonstrates capacity that has been built among beneficiaries.
Output 2.3 Soil erosion micro grants studies completed	Number of MG Projects addressing soil erosion issues approved in all NB countries	a) Soil erosion studies completed in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Sudan and reports produced b) 44 MG soil erosion mitigation projects approved in all the NB countries	Information generated from these studies has been applied.

Over-all, the Evaluation concludes that this component registered achievements on the ground although more could have been registered at shared/trans-boundary resources management level. According to the NTEAP Terminal Report (2009), over 347 community level projects including 234 MGPs, 37 NEPs and 76 school projects were implemented with an investment amounting to over US\$ 5.2 million.

3.1.3 Component Three: Environmental Education and Awareness

The main activities under this component focused on increasing awareness and understanding of community interests and eco-space provided by the Nile. The project supported public awareness and information dissemination, establishment of school based network sensitization, and University based research and development of tools for integrating EE into Curriculum. Notable among the public awareness campaign was the Nile day celebrations that were carried out in all countries.

The Evaluation noted the following achievements:

- a) Knowledge and awareness: There is evidence of improved knowledge and awareness about the sustainable development issues of the Nile basin issues at policy and implementing partner's levels. Respondents from implementing institutions indicate that higher levels of appreciating the values and threats to the Nile basin. However, the level of understanding of Nile basin issues declines at community level, largely because people at this level appear to be concerned with their immediate surroundings.
- b) Education and Awareness material: The Education and Awareness materials were found impressive and visible at various scales. However, there is concern that tools/modules that were developed for this purpose are presently underutilized. This is partly attributed to lack of policy environment for doing so or purely for having no ongoing curriculum revisions. It was established that the EE Strategy has not been integrated into curriculum of respective countries, save for Rwanda where EE working groups has been institutionalized as Rwanda Environmental Education Forum for Rwanda.
- c) School based networks: School based networks were formed and initially performed well. This involved information exchange, collaboration in development of materials and tools for awareness raising, teach trainings and setting up demonstrations in pilot schools. However, by the time of this evaluation, school demonstration activities were still active but networks were not functioning well because, it was claimed, they require facilitation.
- d) Essay Competitions: The Essay competitions served as motivational tools for interesting "young generation" in Sustainable development issues of the Nile basin. Indeed, those who won awards became source of inspiration for others at school.

The Evaluation notes that the following constraints affected this component.

- a) Sustaining school based networks and demonstrations: Designing implementation approaches that address dynamism of schools system e.g., teacher transfers and new students being recruited into School based Environment Clubs was and remains a challenge. The Evaluation did not find evidence of appropriate strategies for ensuring sustainability of school based programmes. The Evaluation is of the opinion that Training of Trainers (TOT) was not sufficient to ensure sustainability because of teacher transfers.

Table 6 shows the performance of component #3 against targets.

Result	Performance indicator	Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
Outcome 3: Environmental Education Improved and Public awareness enhanced	At least 8 universities in 6 NBI countries approved and adopted the environmental modules based on Nile environmental threats	Environmental course frame and modules based on Nile environmental threats in all NBCs developed and being discussed	There is no evidence that the modules have been adopted by Universities. It is expected that these modules are under consideration by respective Universities
	Environmental campaigns and schools award programs adopted and institutionalized at national levels in at least 6 NBI countries.	Environmental campaigns and schools award programs developed and implemented in all NBCs for the 3 years	Rwanda has institutionalized the EE, with advanced efforts in Burundi and Uganda
Output 3.1 Public awareness on Nile Environmental Threats enhanced in NB countries.	At least 2 environmental awareness programs delivered in at least 5 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 9 working groups, formed and 7 sustained as forums, with more members and performing national functions b) Initial reviews carried out in 2004 and updated 2009. c) 2 trans-boundary programs (awards scheme and environmental campaigns) developed and tested for 3 years in all countries 	Successfully implemented.
	Awareness material on 5 selected Nile Environment threats produced and disseminated across the basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Print materials for land degradation, wetlands, biodiversity and water quality degradation printed and disseminated b) A video documentary covering 7 main Nile threats has been developed and circulated. c) TOT manual on awareness material development prepared and over 70 practitioners trained on the use. 	Awareness materials were produced. However, it is not possible to confirm whether information gained has been translated into action or led to change in behavior.

Result	Performance indicator	Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
Output 3.2. Networks of secondary schools for projects based learning established and functioning in NB countries	At least 60 % of the participating schools adopt project based learning (environmental modules and school projects).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 180 teachers trained on project based learning. b) Environmental modules developed, circulated and 180 teachers trained on utilization. c) Modules for mainstreaming EE in School curriculum developed in Congo and Burundi d) 80 school projects are finalized and utilized for learning [BUR=9, DRC=4, EGY=9, ETH=10, KEN=10, RWA=10, SUD=8, TZA=10, UGA=10] 	There is potential for sustaining these interventions, save for concerns regarding sustainability of school based activities.
Output 3.3. Networking established among universities and other research institutions	At least 2 junior faculty or graduate students exchanged in at least 6 countries.	10 students facilitated to conduct their Masters research in a different country. All reports finalized.	Accomplished
	Training modules developed and adopted in at least 6 universities	A tertiary level teaching framework has been developed together with teaching materials	Accomplished

The Evaluation concludes that this component made good progress toward meeting its targets. Messages were delivered through awareness materials, Nile Day celebrations and demonstrations at schools. As noted above, the sustainability of these programmes remains a concern.

3.1.4 Component Four: Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation

The main activities implemented under this component included: improving understanding of wetlands in supporting sustainable development at selected Transboundary sites and cross border protected areas, wetland management planning, knowledge generation, development of Nile Basin Wetlands Strategy, facilitating Wetlands and Biodiversity Working Group, capacity building for wetland conservation and management actions.

The component supported governments in understanding the institutional mechanisms for management of wetlands from grassroots to national, regional and to international. The project carried out public awareness and information dissemination, developed capacity by training wetlands managers, establishment networks that coordinated wetlands management, prepared demonstrations for school based sensitization, prepared education and awareness materials for wetlands management at various levels targeting primary, secondary and University based research which are tools for integrating EE into Curriculum. The project also carried out in-depth research at two sites and demonstrated the importance of wetlands and biodiversity for sustainable development. Two trans-boundary management plans were prepared at two priority sites and these offer opportunities for others to be prepared at other sites. Notable among the public awareness campaign were the Nile day celebrations that were carried out in all countries and microgrants and National Eligible projects which demonstrated to communities the importance of Wetlands and resources for sustainable development

The Evaluation notes the following achievements:

- a) Institutional strengthening: The component enhanced institutional strengthening through establishment of inter-ministerial networks at National levels and a regional working group. This is important for lesson sharing and regional setting of priorities. The enthusiasm to continue the regional set up for management of the wetlands will provide a standard for their sustainable wise use in the region. In all Nile basin countries there are efforts to strengthen the institutionalisation for wetlands management through discussions for identifying lead institutions.
- b) Capacity built: The component trained selected officers in the management of wetlands. In many cases the officers trained are involved in training others. The training also targeted wetlands policy enhancements in which the basin countries were exposed to.
- c) Site Conservation and management actions: The Evaluation found successful conservation and management activities at specific sites although 2 sites were of cross-border in nature. Notable regional level action includes Management Planning for Sio-Siteko wetland (Kenya and Uganda) and Lake Cyohoha Wetlands (Burundi and Rwanda).
- d) Wetlands knowledge products: Studies were made at two sites and lots of information generated. The studies exhibited the potentials of the kinds of ecological, socio and economic information that could be generated at a particular site and revealed lots of biodiversity information and cultural uses of wetlands and biodiversity resources. There is still room for learning about other sites using replica studies. The component also generated information about each country's wetlands and biodiversity through use of national experts. This wealth of information termed as wetlands and biodiversity baseline for each country was starting point for enriching data bases for wetlands management. Above all, study by GIS and remote sensing in

which the wetlands of the Nile were inventoried and mapped was carried out for the entire basin and this is now being managed by the Nile DSS.

- e) Wetlands management tools: The component developed Wetlands Education materials which are very important tools for enhancing wetlands management in schools and universities. In addition NTEAP succeeded to develop a basin wide Wetland Management Strategy and introduced it to the Nile-TAC for subsequent approval by the Nile-COM. The Evaluation Team strongly recommends this achievement since it provides the much needed tool to guide basin wide action on wetlands. Site management plans provide important tools for ensuring community based wetlands management actions. Other tools developed by communities are included in the best practices for conservation and management of wetlands.
- f) Conflict management: The Component has been instrumental in providing momentum to handle wetland resources – use based conflicts. For example, the Burundi NEPs activities around Kirundo sought to address the conflicts through convening stakeholders and boundary establishment. In other sites, community based wetlands management plans (Sio Siteko and Dinder – Alatish) developed with NTEAP support provide essential tools for managing wetland resources use related conflicts.
- g) Biodiversity Conservation: MGP targeted community who are in high Biodiversity areas e.g., Ecotourism at Griffins Camp in Mabira (Uganda), and income generating activities Virunga, Kibira in Burundi and Nyagatare in Rwanda. These activities demonstrate biodiversity values and for enhancing biodiversity conservation benefits to the stakeholders. The studies carried out show that not much is known and documented about the biodiversity and reveal a lot of fragmented information regarding the biodiversity works in the region.
- h) Global Wetlands Agenda: Through this component, the NBI is now engaged with the Ramsar convention Secretariat seeking to formalize the working relationship between NBI and Ramsar Convention via a MoU. Once concluded, the NBI will have placed wetlands issues high on the agenda for the NBI programmes as well international recognition. Since this will be long term commitment, effort should be made to ensure that all member states participate in the negotiations of the MoU and be able to harmonize the obligations of the MoU with their respective obligations as contracting parties to the Ramsar Convention.
- i) Wise use demonstration: In many areas where the microgrants were implemented, there were aspects of promotion of wise use of wetlands

The Evaluation notes the following constraints:

- a) Size of Grants to support wetlands conservation action: The amounts /size of grants were small to support substantial investments into wetlands conservation activities. Related to this, the Component raised high expectations at community levels but was unable to sustain these expectations due to the size of grants. Further, the component suffered high transaction costs due to diverse region and wetlands.
- b) Policy framework: The performance of this Component in Nile Basin countries varied due to inadequate policy framework to support the wetland actions in some countries such as DRC, Ethiopia and Burundi.

- c) Institutionalisation: Unlike in education and water where fulltime staff would be employed to work on those thematic areas in each country, it was not possible to find staff working fulltime in wetlands and biodiversity management except in Uganda.
- d) The late start of component activities could have an impact on intra-component synergies which would have had impacts beyond what was realised.

Table 7 below shows the performance of component #4 against its targets.

Result	Performance indicator	Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
Outcome 4 : Enhanced Capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity	Strategic approach to wetlands management in the basin with key actions, steps and responsibilities developed.	a) A regional WG on Wetlands and Biodiversity established. b) National level inter-ministerial wetlands management networks established in all NBI member countries.	Foundations for wetlands management have been established
	Management plans for at least three selected wetlands developed and under implementation.	a) Management plans for three sites out of which one Sio-Siteko completed b) 10 MG pilots and NEPs on wetlands were approved and implemented but not fully completed	Management plans completed but not yet implemented
Output 4.1. Regional cooperation is enhanced and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity improved	1 regional network/working group established and functioning	Regional WG on Wetlands and Biodiversity established and conducted its third meeting in Uganda where a review of the previous work plan was done and inputs made into the wetlands strategy and Memorandum of cooperation with the Ramsar secretariat and the Nile-WET.	Regional working group is being used to develop implementation mechanism for the Wetlands Strategy. There is evidence that the group can be supported under the framework of Ramsar called the Nile-WET
	National level wetlands management networks established and functioning in all NBI countries	National level inter ministerial wetlands management networks established in all NB countries	The national inter-ministerial committees / working group expect to be supported by NBI
	Training program on wetlands management developed in 2 languages	Three of the five Training materials targeting five categories of stakeholders have been printed	Training materials have been distributed and their use is being followed up to enhance their effectiveness
Output 4.2. Understanding and awareness of the roles of	Ecological& economic studies on wetland roles in sustainable development conducted	Two consolidated reports have been edited and are ready for review and printing	Reports currently being printed for eventual dissemination for use by the SAPs

Result	Performance indicator	Achievements (December 2009)	Evaluation /Assessment
wetlands in supporting sustainable development is improved	National baseline surveys carried out and regional synthesis report written up	Baselines developed through a network of national experts and have been achieved in 7 countries	Baseline reports provide a baseline for future enrichment of the status of wetlands and biodiversity in each country
Output 4.3 Train in Wetlands management according to needs	Over 50 officers on wetlands management trained across the basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 29 officers were trained on wetlands management in 2007 and 2008 b) 22 staff were training in Wetlands management in Ethiopia in 2008 c) 20 officers have been trained in National Wetlands Policy setting and poverty reduction in 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 71 officers (142%) were trained across the basin on wetlands management and poverty eradication b) Capacity for wetlands management exists in the region.
	Awareness programs conducted in 9 NBI countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The theme for 2009 was upstream and downstream wetlands connect us. Awareness materials were developed and all countries were encouraged to celebrate the World Wetlands Day in which awareness materials are distributed. b) Nile Awareness week of 2009 this year again focused on Wetlands conservation in all countries (T-shirts, posters) were produced. 	A lead from the Centre is still important to ensure that the wetlands awareness continues.
Output 4.4. Pilot initiatives in support of capacity building and wetland management plans implemented	Transboundary wetlands management plans prepared for three selected sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Preparations for Sio-Siteko and the Dinder-Alatish biodiversity TB is completed b) 10 MG pilots and NEPs on wetlands are approved and currently under implementation. 	Implementation of the management plans has attracted attention by some regional bodies like LVBC in the case of Sio- Siteko. A planning guide for cross border sites would be very useful.
	Wetlands inventory carried out and the results mapped on a GIS platform.	The Inventory and Mapping of Wetlands in the Nile Basin is complete.	This is sustainably being managed by the NBI DSS.

The Evaluation concludes that this component achieved great success at policy and planning level, development of management tools and capacity building. However, the programme component potential to achieve more was affected by late start of wetland activities within the NTEAP.

3.1.5 Component Five: Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring

The main activities implemented under this component included: establishing/identifying water quality monitoring points, development of water quality monitoring indicators and framework for the Nile basin, capacity building for monitoring water quality, equipping focal selected laboratories with water quality monitoring equipment and supplies facilitating Water Quality Working Group.

The Evaluation notes the following achievements:

- a) Water Quality Monitoring Points: The NTEAP project facilitated the identification of monitoring points. In Burundi and Rwanda, the project facilitated identification of monitoring points only. Only Ethiopia has used the monitoring station.
- b) Capacity Building: Capacity building among member states for carrying out monitoring of water quality which involved training and equipping Water quality laboratories. The performance of this activity varies among the member states due to language barriers, delays or inappropriate procurement of laboratory equipments and supplies, and level of prioritizing water issues at country levels.
- c) Monitoring Parameters: Through the Water Quality Monitoring Working group, the project facilitated development of Basin-wide monitoring parameters and framework. By time of this Evaluation, it is indicated that these tools have not been satisfactorily utilized due to in country financial constraints or the not sustained due to limited financial support.
- d) Network: The Water Quality Monitoring Working Group facilitated information sharing among the participating water experts in some of the Nile basin countries.

The Evaluation noted the following Constraints:

- a) The Evaluation established that this component suffered considerably from delays associated with disbursement of funds and procurement.
- b) Some of the project support e.g., DRC, Burundi and Rwanda did not address the real needs of the targeted laboratories in these countries.
- c) The Water Quality component did not interact or support other NTEAP component activities. For unknown reasons, the participating institutions did not seem to have identified areas of synergy with other component and therefore minimally supported other activities such as Fish ponds promoted under Component #2.

Table 8 below presents performance of component #5 against set targets.

Result	Indicator	Targets	Achievements	Evaluation/Assessment
Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in NB countries	Regional working group established	Establish and functional regional WQ network	TB network established was functional	The sustainability of this group requires follow up by NBI
	Awareness on WQ issues increased in NBC at all levels	a) Awareness materials produced & disseminated b) Two national awareness workshops conducted in each NB country	a) Key Messages (4 summary reports) prepared and will be disseminated in all NB countries b) Dissemination campaigns including workshops and production of awareness materials held in 6 countries.	The indicator was realised according to the achievements. However it is not possible to measure whether these achievements resulted into increased awareness at all levels.
	Data exchange mechanism developed	Regional WQ manuals and uniform data reporting formats developed and used in at least 4 countries	Four WQM manuals developed, finalized and formally piloted in 5 countries	The manuals need to be used
	Capacity of selected laboratories in each country improved	a) Assess capacities on WQM in the basin and produce a Nile water quality report b) Selected Focal labs and support with lab equipment (testing kits) c) Provide training in WQ measurements to focal laboratories	a) One regional and 9 national assessment reports on capacities produced. b) Focal labs selected and equipment provided to all NB Countries c) Training on WQ measurements held and Lab managers of NBI Focal Labs exposed to TB WQM issues in a regional workshop	NBI to follow up use of the laboratories
	Biological monitoring tools pilot tested in the Nile basin	At least 2 biological monitoring demonstrations implemented	Regional Trainings on Biological WQM held and Tools piloted. Piloting at country level planned as well as procurement of tools materials and Field and identification Manuals	Training done
	Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow up actions formulated	a) Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed b) A phase out and sustainability strategy developed and approved	a) Nile trans-boundary Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed. b) A draft proposal on the role of the Water Quality component in the permanent NBI institution and a proposal on the Component's Phase –out and	Accomplished

Result	Indicator	Targets	Achievements	Evaluation/Assessment
			sustainability plan prepared.	
	Data exchange mechanism developed	Regional WQ manuals and uniform data reporting formats developed and used in at least 4 countries	Four WQM manuals developed, finalized and formally piloted in 5 countries	Accomplished
	Capacity of selected laboratories in each country improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assess capacities on WQM in the basin and produce a Nile water quality report b) Selected Focal labs and support with lab equipment (testing kits) c) Provide training in WQ measurements to focal laboratories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) One regional and 9 national assessment reports on capacities produced. b) Focal labs selected and equipment provided to all NB Countries c) Training on WQ measurements held and Lab managers of NBI Focal Labs exposed to TB WQM issues in a regional workshop 	NBI to follow up use of the laboratories
	Biological monitoring tools pilot tested in the Nile basin	At least 2 biological monitoring demonstrations implemented	Regional Trainings on Biological WQM held and Tools piloted. Piloting at country level planned as well as procurement of tools materials and Field and identification Manuals	Training done
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed b) A phase out and sustainability strategy developed and approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Nile trans boundary Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed. b) A draft proposal on the role of the Water Quality component in the permanent NBI institution and a proposal on the Component's Phase –out and sustainability plan prepared. 	Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow up actions formulated

The Evaluation is of the opinion that this component did not perform well in meeting its targets. The Evaluation is of the opinion that the design of the component did not adequately consider country priorities and needs for water quality monitoring. It would appear that the monitoring points are considered to be targeting regional/basin wide issues. More so, water quality monitoring requires heavy investments that could not be sustained by levels of NTEAP budget.

3.2 Towards addressing Mid-Term recommendations

The Evaluation reviewed the progress in implementing 2006 mid-term review recommendations and notes satisfactory performance in addressing these recommendations as shown in Table 9 below:

Table 9 below presents NTEAP performance in addressing mid-term Review recommendations

Recommendation	Achievements
More focus and resources to demonstrate the practical effects of NTEAP and the impact of its outputs	More allocations to community activities were made through the MG Program and national eligible projects. Overall 6.9 USD million was allocated by the project for on ground activities out of which US\$ 6.3 million was disbursed to communities
The project in consultation with the UNOPS and the World Bank, organize each year an independent financial audit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Internal Audit conducted on yearly basis since 2007 b) One external Financial Audis conducted in 2008 c) One financial and management audit conducted in 2009 d) Comprehensive Micro-grant Program audit conducted in 2007 for all countries and one for three countries in November 2009.
<p>In the first phase, most of the microgrants were implemented within individual countries and addressed community concerns:</p> <p>The NTEAP should address these deficiencies and increase the number of the trans boundary projects.</p>	Following the MTR, 17 cross border Micro grant projects were implemented.
<p>It is expected that from the microgrants program will emerge good practices on mitigation of trans-boundary environmental threats. It is recommended that NTEAP fosters emergence of good practice and use them as models for other microgrants.</p> <p>It may also request countries to give them academic and professional recognition as Nile-basin specific practices</p>	<p>Over 70 MG, NEPs and School projects expected to generate lessons</p> <p>Not done</p>
Enhanced linkage across components and Reinforce the cooperative network with SVPs and support to SAPs	<p>NTEAP has developed a strategy on NTEAP linkages.</p> <p>Linkages were found minimal</p>

<p>Taking into account the one year delay in commencement of many of the project activities, and seeing the promising implementation and accomplishment of project activities, the MTR, PSC and Supervision missions agreed on the extension of the project duration until the end of 2009.</p> <p>A no cost extension up to June 2010 was also agreed by the Supervision missions and the PSC and was approved by the TAC.</p>	<p>The project components were closed systematically as per the recommendations during the SVP midterm review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) WQM was closed on 29th of Feb 2009. b) EE&A was closed on 30th of June 2009 c) Microgrant closed on 31December 2009 d) Institutional strengthening and Wetlands components continued up to June 2010
<p>NTEAP should focus on the development of the Strategic Environmental Framework (SEF) for the Nile Countries.</p> <p>Specifically, NTEAP should identify what key environmental functions a permanent River Basin Organization (RBO) should undertake.</p> <p>Conduct TDA study and prepare the State of the Environment regional report</p>	<p>A study on similar RBOs and regional organization conducted. Recommendation on the RBO functions of the RBO submitted to the Nile SEC</p> <p>Work on TDA Ongoing as at December 2009.</p>
<p>NTEAP will need a clear exit strategy so that any activities being carried out by the project that do not fall under an RBO's mandate are either phased out or taken up by the riparian countries.</p>	<p>NTEAP phase-out and sustainability plan developed and discussed with all parties. It application found unsatisfactory.</p>

The Evaluation concludes that the above performance has greatly contributed towards the success of the project since 2007.

3.3 Gender

This assessment is based on participation of men and women in a variety of NTEAP activities and processes. The Evaluation would have been more systematic if there was an NTEAP gender strategy against which the evaluation would have based itself. Nonetheless, the Evaluation assessed gender issues by considering participation of men and women in the following activities: MGPs, NEPs, Thematic working groups, Trainings, Wetlands Management Planning, School based projects and NTEAP Staffing at PMU, NPCs and LMC levels. The Evaluation found out that both men and women participated. However, with respect to MGP and NEPs and Wetlands management planning, women participation exceeded the targets. Most of the schools based projects were implemented in mixed schools where both girls and boys participated. Much as the representation in the thematic working groups depended on staffing in the respective institutions in Nile Basin countries, there was fair representation of both men and women. In addition, recruitment of NTEAP Staff especially at NPC and LMC levels was fairly balanced in this respect. Training participants were selected with gender considerations.

4. ANALYSIS OF OVER-ALL NTEAP

Over-all, the NTEAP implementation performed well as most targets were met (Annex 7). All components with exception of Water Quality Monitoring comments (Chapter 3) performed above average and are rated successful in contributing to the over-all goal of the NTEAP. Key factors that contributed to the success of the NTEAP included the project design which promoted knowledge generation, piloting collaboration approaches, developing tools and frameworks for facilitating collaboration and ensuring pilot activities in all the nine countries.

The following section presents the over-all analysis of the NTEAP project.

4.1 Design Validity

The design that addressed knowledge generation, piloting approaches, developing tools and frameworks for facilitating collaboration and ensuring pilot activities in all the nine countries demonstrates an appropriate project design that aimed at putting into place foundation for the regional collaboration in environmental management. This design was enhanced in 2007 when the log frame was revised, although, it missed out on impact and outcome monitoring indicators. In addition, some of the implementation approaches did not fully appreciate differences in policy frameworks in Nile Basin countries that included of financial disbursements and accountability procedures.

4.2 Relevance

The evaluation team considered the extent to which the project objectives and results were consistent with country needs including policies and priorities on environmental management as well as poverty alleviation, beneficiaries' requirements and donors' policies as it is the main project relevance criteria.

Over-all, NTEAP's relevance at national and community level was significant through its five different components. Furthermore, the project was also relevant to the donor policies and strategies of the World Bank's and GEF assistance strategies. By considering the extent to which the project objectives and results were consistent with country needs including policies and priorities on environmental management as well as poverty alleviation, beneficiaries' requirements and donors' policies. The findings confirm that NTEAP:

- a) Contributed towards addressing environmental concerns and challenges facing local communities in all the countries as identified during the Transboundary Environment Assessment exercise of 2001.
- b) NTEAP was consistent with the environmental (and poverty alleviation for the case of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) policies, strategies and complemented the ongoing governments' efforts.
- c) NTEAP was consistent to global environmental objectives and GEF focal areas in addressing national and trans-boundary environmental issues to generate public benefits. The NTEAP was instrumental in enabling NBI Shared Vision Programme (SVP) have practical activities on the ground and to develop and test approached towards management of the environment in the

Basin. The impact is visible at specific sites and less at basin levels. However, the level of collaboration in trans-boundary environmental management at field level was hindered by procedural requirements for regional trans-boundary collaboration as well as absence of environmental management framework for trans-boundary collaboration.

- d) With respect to the GEF Focal areas (wetlands, biodiversity, trans-boundary water resources management), the NTEAP contribution was realized. However, this could have been enhanced through synergies with other SVP and other regional programmes in environmental management in the Nile Basin.
- e) With regards to NTEAP relevance to NBI Shared Vision, NTEAP achieved the following outcomes:
 - i. Capacity and willingness on the part of Nile Basin countries to collaborate in management of environment in the Nile Basin. The realization of this outcome was enhanced by the processes and tools applied by NTEAP to facilitate collaboration.
 - ii. Knowledge and understanding of sustainable development issues of the Nile Basin among the Nile Basin member countries.
 - iii. Established foundation for regional cooperation in environmental management.
- f) Nile Basin member countries participated in implementation of all NTEAP components notwithstanding the fact that Francophone countries feel that their participation was partly hindered by language. All Nile Basin member countries participated in monitoring and supervision structures and processes e.g., Nile-TAC and NTEAP Steering Committee, and reporting, although activities were more national than being trans-boundary in nature.

4.3 Efficiency

The project design and implementation approaches aimed at an efficient delivery of the project outputs. Specifically, the following were emphasized:

- a) Linkages and commitment between the project and host-country institutions at national level: Host country implementing institutions demonstrated commitment and support to the NTEAP. They hosted and supervised NTEAP national offices. They instituted coordination and supervision processes and leveraged political support to the NTEAP activities. The level of participation in the Steering Committee sessions further demonstrates the level of commitment. However, continuity of their role in coordinating activities initiated or promoted by NTEAP requires follow up by Nile –SEC in order to achieve integration of NTEAP supported activities into the host institutions and national development plans and programmes.
- b) Integration of Environmental Agenda into NBI: the NTEAP aspired to define an Environmental Agenda for NBI and transfer of responsibility for environmental management to NBI. Whilst the latter has been effected through establishment of an environmental desk at Nile-SEC, the definition of Environmental Agenda is yet to be concluded. Therefore, there is need to complete description of NBI environmental management mandate and Agenda to promote NBI’s coordination role over environmental issues in the Nile Basin.
- c) Implementation approaches: the Evaluation noted that the implementation arrangements for the NTEAP were well thought through save for the financial management and procurement procedures and, representation at the NTEAP PSC in relation to the Nile-TAC. NTEAP offices in host country proved instrumental in project coordination and supervision and reporting.

However, the NBI Focal Points in Water Ministries need to be assisted to open up and consider environment as an equally important resources for the Nile Basin.

- d) Level of Partner country contributions: there is recognition for the positive support Nile Basin member countries provided. The Evaluation confirms that member countries provided the required policy and political support to the NTEAP, in addition to the stated in-kind contributions.
- e) Monitoring systems applied: the monitoring systems applied were strong in tracking progress and performance of individual components and activities. The Monitoring system was weak on basin – wide impact monitoring, feedback mechanisms as well as assessment of trends/changes created by the NTEAP. The NTEAP Management Unit (PMU) and Nile-SEC monitoring level function depended largely on desk reports submitted by National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and Local Micro-grant Coordinators (LMC). The Evaluation finds this approach inadequate considering the complexity of the project. Nonetheless, the NTEAP over-all as a project was able to generate good lessons and practices that have potential to be up scaled or replicated in the basin.
- f) Adaptive management and support provided by lead partners (UNOPS, Nile-SEC and WB): Adaptive management was traced from annual reviews, introduction of National Eligible projects (NEPs) and the modifications in the modalities for financial disbursements. The revision of log frame in 2007 is an excellent example of adaptive management.

4.4 Effectiveness

The Evaluation concludes that project resources were effectively utilized. The project utilized 97.8% of the donor budget. There were no substantial financial audits issues. The Evaluation further notes that:

- a) Capacity for collaboration in regional environmental management: NTEAP implementation and coordination tools or systems such as Project Implementation Manual (PIM), Project Implementation Plan (PIP), Procurement Manual, and Results Based Management Systems, etc., were developed and applied. NTEAP efforts in this aspect at regional level, having been a pioneer project, are commended. The procedures and systems for ensuring participation of Nile Basin countries in identifying in-country priorities through work plans and supervision (Steering Committee) are strong foundations for regional collaboration. In terms of environmental management tools, NTEAP made big strides to develop and test approaches in all NTEAP components. However, these capacities and tools require to be sustained further in order for them to continue to be utilized.
- b) Benefits and satisfaction with project outputs and impacts: at community level, the NTEAP activities are considerably appreciated to have delivered benefits. At Nile Basin member countries level, the benefits vary because of the significance of the Nile basin in each member country. As indicated in Section 3.1.1, benefits to Francophone countries were undermined by language barrier. At regional level, the SVP benefitted immensely from the NTEAP through translating the “political collaboration” into direct investments and activities on the ground. However, this benefit fell short of being fully optimized because most activities were local and national in character and the NTEAP did not fully utilizing synergistic opportunities with other SVP projects.
- c) Participation and ownership: as indicated in section 3.1.1, community participation and ownership of the NTEAP project activities was realized. This level of participation and ownership

declined at national level and eventually at Basin level as the project came to an end. The levels of ownership at national and regional levels could have been boosted by facilitating stakeholder participation in all stages of NTEAP formulation. Further, the integration of NTEAP implementation approaches and modalities into national policy and decision making processes could have improved on the levels of ownership. Lastly, the NTEAP design and decision making left out civil society and private sector which are key development players at national and community levels.

- d) Indicators for measuring performance as well as outcomes: the NTEAP logframe and Monitoring and Evaluation system measured progress but did not adequately capture outcomes and or impacts.
- e) Financial investments: the evaluation notes that the size of budget was not able to translate into significant investments on the ground given the diversity of environmental issues in the wide geographical area. The MGP catalysed action at small scale that has potential for replication or up-scaling. The costs of administration (Consultants, audits, agency fees, operating costs) represent 68.7% of total disbursements as at 31st December 2009. This portrays the picture that there was higher proportion of expenditure on administration and operational costs than field activities. Since the objective of the project was to develop framework for regional collaboration in environmental management, this proportion can be justified to some extent when field activities are regarded as pilot.

4.5 Synergies

The Evaluation is of the opinion that this aspect did not perform well at strategic level thereby denying NTEAP opportunity to gain more impacts on the ground. This is derived from the following:

- a) Collaboration: there was excellent collaboration with the UNDP/GEF Small Grants programmes in all countries. However, the collaboration among the NTEAP components and between NTEAP and other environmental Programmes in the region/member countries was inadequate.
- b) Co-financing: at community level, there are success stories of leveraging action, co-financing and networking with other development processes of governments and non government alike, through MGP. Over-all NTEAP was a co-financed arrangement between GEF and Nile Trust Fund.

4.6 Impacts

Overall, the NTEAP has realized positive impacts at various levels as follows:

- a) Goal: The NTEAP aspired to strengthen regional collaboration and coordination on environmental management in Nile Basin. Recognizing that this goal is influenced by others factors beyond the NTEAP such as the Nile Framework Agreement, the evaluation finds that the momentum generated by NTEAP to work together and implement regional environmental programme is a strong foundation for supporting regional collaboration and coordination. Furthermore, the tools developed by NTEAP, e.g., the Regional Wetlands Strategy contribute towards defining the agenda for regional cooperation in environmental management.

On the other hand, there were missed opportunities for advancing this goal due delayed conclusion of Nile Cooperative Framework which would have facilitated progress in completing

EIA Guidelines, definition of Regional Agenda for Environmental management under NBI and, Policy recommendations for environmental management in the Nile basin.

- b) Objective level: the NTEAP succeeded to pilot and demonstrate local level action of engaging stakeholders in Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) principles. The various pilot activities under the MGPs, NEPs and Wetlands Component contributed to this success. Regarding the frameworks for protecting critical Basin ecosystems, the NTEAP outputs on Transboundary Wetlands Management Plans, Water Quality Monitoring Strategy, Nile Basin Wetlands Strategy, and the information and knowledge generated will go a long way towards protection of critical ecosystems. These frameworks will be complimented by the various capacities established at various levels across all NTEAP components.

The over-all conclusion on NTEAP impacts is that the outputs and some of the intermediate results point to the direction that NTEAP will have a strong impact on the Nile Basin in the long run. NTEAP duration of six years may not have been adequate time to register impacts considering the diverse regional character of the Nile basin. More so, impacts from environmental projects tend to take longer period to become visible on the ground.

4.7 Sustainability

The Evaluation is of the opinion that regional processes will be sustained through the NBI process whereas the national level and community actions risk being unsustainable. Specifically, NTEAP supported the following processes geared towards sustainability:

- a) Integration: The Nile-SEC has established Environment Desk at Centre and within the Subsidiary Action programme levels to follow up the integration of environmental programmes in the Basin. There is need for follow up with integration into national level environmental management processes as well as follow up with identified policy reforms within the NBI to complete description of the environmental function.
- b) Environmental policy reforms: the Evaluation appreciates the fact that policy reform is a slow process and the intended effect on national policies would take its own course. However, the Evaluation finds the tools and framework (e.g., Regional Wetlands Strategy) have potential to influence policy reforms. At Nile basin level, the tools and framework developed by NTEAP have potential to inform basin level development policies and practices. These are good indications that future policy framework could evolve in support environmental management in the Basin.
- c) Capacities, tools and mechanisms: for regional collaboration e.g., Specialist Networks, Working Groups, NTEAP Steering Committee that were facilitated by NTEAP to enhance participation and sustainability of NTEAP supported activities need to be facilitated to continue to perform.

4.8 Replicability

The project has identified good practices to be replicated or scaled up and hence there is potential for replicating these activities, especially at community level.

4.9 Monitoring and Evaluation systems and function

There was an Evaluation framework for the project. The Nile-SEC developed tools for integrating the NTEAP results into the over-all NBI M&E System. The Evaluation is of the opinion that the evaluation system was not strong enough to support implementation of such complex project. The baseline that was used to design the project has since changed and new dimensions such as Climate Change

issues and effects were not captured during monitoring. In evaluating the relationships between NTEAP Logframe the NBI Results Based Management system, the Evaluation notes the following:

- a) There is clear linkages and relationship between the NTEAP log frame and the NBI Results Chain. This assures Evaluation that NTEAP Goals, Objectives and Results contribute to the NBI Shared Vision Programme.
- b) Indicators did not capture intermediate and longer-term impacts. Likewise, indicators for measuring impacts and outcomes of Transboundary issues were not included. The NTEAP applied participatory supervisions and monitoring process at basin, national and site levels in some of the countries.

4.10 Emerging issues

The following issues have emerged during and immediately after NTEAP:

- a) New sustainable development issues in Nile basin including Climate Change, oil discoveries in Albertine Rift and Nile Framework agreement. Future environmental programmes or projects should include these issues.
- b) Transfer of NTEAP activities to be implemented by Nile-SEC. This requires commensurate capacity and mandate at Nile-SEC.

4.11 Challenges

The major challenges faced by NTEAP during implementation included the following:

- a) Budget management and operational procedures which caused delays in disbursements and accountability of funds resulted into slow absorption of the project grants.
- b) Integration of NTEAP implementation procedures and systems into national development policies and procedures.
- c) Diversity in languages and cultures and ensuring full participation of member states in all stages of project formulation and implementation, including information sharing.
- d) Utilizing synergies within the SVP and other programmes in the Nile Basin.
- e) Sustainability and ensuring that the NTEAP investments bear long lasting impacts and achieve replications.
- f) Learning lessons from former NTEAP activities. This should be a continuous process beyond the life span of the NTEAP.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the key conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Conclusions

Over-all, the NTEAP implementation performed well as most targets were met (Annex 7). All components with exception of Water Quality Monitoring comments (Chapter 3) performed above average and are rated successful in contributing to the over-all goal of the NTEAP. Key factors that contributed to the success of the NTEAP included the project design which promoted knowledge generation, piloting collaboration approaches, developing tools and frameworks for facilitating collaboration and ensuring pilot activities in all the nine countries.

The NTEAP was successful in demonstrating the need for regional collaboration in environmental management and initiating description of the environmental function of the NBI. NTEAP developed and promoted tools, frameworks and processes for facilitating the collaboration and mobilizing member countries to collaborate. Further, the implementation structures and procedures made it possible for NTEAP to deliver the intended outputs, although, this was achieved after granting the project a two year no-cost project extension. This is in view of the fact that the project operated in a diverse region in terms of environmental, policy, social- economic, political and cultural diversity which required management of staff and operations in nine countries and coordination with the Nile-SEC centre.

5.2 Recommendations

The Evaluation recommends the following in reference to future environmental programmes of the NBI SVP.

- a) Project design
 - i. Take into account national policies and procedures in the project implementation strategies.
 - ii. Base future projects on up-to-date baseline information.
- b) Monitoring and Evaluation
 - I. Strong M&E framework as part of Project documentation that takes into need for robust baseline, measuring impacts, outcomes and trends in addition to project performance.
 - II. Allocation of adequate resources within the budget to ensure that M&E functions is well facilitated to service the project.
- c) Synergies
 - i. Entrench strategies for synergistic approaches within the SVP. This could in part be achieved if “special” requirement are emphasized in the M&E system.
 - ii. Develop and apply procedures for fostering interactions between the SAP Projects at technical and work planning levels. This would help SAP projects to inform each other and assist to identify areas of collaboration.
 - iii. Strengthen NBI in-house capacity to capture and enforce utilization of opportunities for synergies.

d) Sustainability

The following strategies are recommended:

- i. Develop and apply sustainability strategy from project onset till the end
- ii. Design and apply approaches for learning and sharing lessons and applications of lesson captured to inform implementation and decision making.
- iii. Consider commissioning a Lesson Learning exercise for the NTEAP.
- iv. Entrench requirements for sustainability strategies within the activity designs at thematic and individual activity levels.

6. LESSONS

The Evaluation notes that NTEAP engaged in analysing and documenting lessons. The following lessons are drawn from the Evaluation and are presented to NBI, Nile Basin Countries and NBI Partners.

- a) Multi-faceted environmental issues in a wide and diversified geographical coverage require a long-term commitment and uninterrupted facilitation and engagement.
- b) The success of Basin wide programmes of magnitude of NTEAP requires robust Results Based Management System as well as measures for ensuring partners' and stakeholder's participation at all levels. For Example, The participatory M&E of the NTEAP focused on the MGs and NEPs. The other components (Environmental Education and Awareness (EEA), Water Quality Monitoring (WQM) and Wetlands) depended on reports submitted from the (NPCs).
- c) A multi-pronged institutional approach from the community to basin-wide is very important in realizing significant change in the environment. Equally, it should be mindful of diversity in policies related to environment/water in the NB countries.
- d) Political leverage for such a project such as NTEAP can be enhanced through participation of high level officials in project planning and supervision such as the NTEAP PSC.
- e) Sustainability of project supported activities requires integration of such activities in host institutional mandates and programmes. Project implementation systems and facilities ought to be accommodated into host institutions procedures and policies if they are to be smoothly implemented.
- f) Designing and implementing project sustainability plans and phasing out strategies should distinguish between project activities and institutional process and provide for phase out plans and actions that take into account uniqueness of activity and or process. For example, the closure of NTEAP offices in Nile basin countries could have been left as responsibility of hosting institutions. In this way, choices to close or retain offices and staff would have been at discretion of the host institution.
- g) MGs that were community based are more sustainable than NGOs that got MG funding to implement projects.
- h) Ensuring national ownership and leadership should be a prerequisite from project formulation, inception and implementation. Multi-stakeholder participation, consultation and decision making, through appropriate institutional arrangements is essential.
- i) Using existing coordinating structures and mechanisms at national level may enhance sustainability of project activities rather than establishing new networks and structures.
- j) Building on ongoing/existing work relevant to environmental management, conservation and sustainable utilization especially for MGP would have ensured successful completion of activities.

- k) Adopting a holistic approach to capacity building that addresses capacity needs at the systemic, institutional and individual levels while integrating such capacity building into wider sustainable development efforts, to the extent possible and appropriate.
- l) Adopting a long-term approach to capacity building within the context of sustainable development ensures sustainability rather than project/time bound capacity building.

7. LIST OF ANNEXES

7.1 Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

The Nile Trans-boundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) was one of the seven projects under the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) Shared Vision Program (SVP). The objective of the NTEAP was to support the development of a basin-wide framework for actions to address high priority trans-boundary environmental issues within the context of NBI's Strategic Action Program. The Project supported the nine NBI countries (Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) to develop sound approaches to deal with trans-boundary environmental threats at the regional and national level. The Project also encouraged more effective basin wide stakeholder cooperation on Transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of the actions prioritized by the Transboundary Environmental Analysis Document in the following areas/components:

- a) Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation;
- b) Community-Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation;
- c) Environmental Education and Awareness;
- d) Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation;
- e) Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring.

2. PURPOSE OF TERMINAL EVALUATION:

2.1 Overall Objective / Purpose

The terminal evaluation of NTEAP will provide an in-depth assessment of the extent the objectives and outcomes of the project have been fulfilled. The Terminal evaluation will trace and document progress towards the desired impact and is expected to propose recommendations to the Nile Secretariat as to the actions that should be undertaken to ensure that the outcomes of the project are properly used and to integrate into the NBI activities and future plans. The Terminal Review will also examine overall project management and implementation, as well as the extent to which NTEAP has managed to implement the recommendations of the MTR conducted in 2006. It will also examine the performance indicators and gauge the level of implementation of activities against those indicators.

2.2 Specific Objectives

More specifically the Terminal Evaluation will review and rate the implementation process, the achievement of results and draw lessons highlighting the following dimensions:

- a) **Relevance:** The extent to which the project correctly addresses the identified problems and needs. *Guiding issues include:* i) Appropriateness of the project design to the identified problems and towards supporting the implementation of the GEF areas of focus and the NBI Vision, as well as global environment benefits. ii) Complimentarily and coherence with other related programs and activities at national or local levels. iii) Overall strengths and weakness in design as reflected in the original logical framework. iv) Extent of participation by host country institutions and beneficiaries. (v) Level

of co-financing secured by the project in comparison with the announced co-financing at project approval

- b) **Efficiency: An assessment of how well the various activities transformed the** available resources into intended outputs in terms of quantity, quality, timeliness and where possible unit cost. *Guiding issues include:* i) Linkages and commitment between the project and host-country institutions at national level, ii) Approach used in terms of substance and delivery of work. iii) Level of Partner country contributions in the project; iv) Extent of monitoring systems to assess progress and impact. v) Extent of the project's ability to adapt its program and approach in response to changing assumptions and risks; v) assess the impact and extent of support/guidance provided by UNOPS, UNDP and WB to the project.
- c) **Effectiveness:** To what extent the project outputs were achieved and to what extent they have contributed to achieving the project outcomes. **Guiding issues include:** i) Progress towards targets/milestones defined in the revised indicators to measure the achievements of the project outcomes ii) Appropriateness of the indicators to measure the achievements of the project objective. iii) Validity of the assumptions and risks of the project at the objective level, including discussion of unforeseen benefits or risks.
- d) **Impact:** To what extent the project objectives and intended impact have been achieved and thus contributing to the overall goal, SVP outcomes. **Guiding issues include:** i) To what extent have the overall NBI/SVP regional targets benefited/learned from the achievements of the project. ii) Where might changes that could have been effected by the project based on experience and lessons learned contribute towards achieving a desired wider impact. iii) Have there been unplanned outcomes and impact (negative or positive) resulting from the project and what their consequences as well as any global environmental benefits are as outlined in GEF support. iv) Have there been, or expected to be, gender-related or poverty related impacts rising from the project.
- e) **Synergies and linkages:** Extent to which the project managed to establish synergies and linkages with other stakeholders/partners. **Guiding issues include:** i) Extent of linkages with other SVPs and SAPs; ii) Extent of linkages with other regional and sub-regional projects/programs in the Basin such as the Small Grants Program² iii) Effectiveness of networks developed by the project and networks involving the project, iv) Extent of linkages with existing initiatives at national level.
- f) **Sustainability:** Extent to which the outcomes of the project are likely to continue after the end of the project. **Guiding issues include:** i) Extent of project "ownership" by NBI countries and national institutions and means for ensuring the integration of NTEAP activities into national programs; ii) Extent of the prevailing and expected policy environment in support of the project objectives and achievements; iii) Extent of the institutional capacities of host countries institutions to carry forward project outcomes after the end of the funding support, at all levels; iv) Assess the extent and nature of needs beyond the current project and how these might best be met through future phases, programmes, or institutionalization of work begun under NTEAP.

3. SCOPE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

² During project design, linkages with the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project were considered important; however, that project closed shortly after the launch of the NTEAP.

It is expected that the terminal evaluation will provide feedback and assess the performance of the project in its entirety and suggest clear directions for the NBI to capitalize from the momentum generated by the project and integrate the recommended products and outputs that are to be sustained. The evaluation will cover the entire project with its different components that are operational, covering the following areas.

- a) Review the progress attained on issues relating to regional coordination on environmental issues across the Basin and examine whether the project has been able to generate momentum of behavioral changes towards regional cooperation.
- b) Assess whether the component specific outputs have been attained within the prescribed project time frame and the allocated budget stipulated in the PIP and whether the intended outputs have yielded the desired outcomes.
- c) Assess whether the revised project log frame developed after the MTR in accordance with the new GEF formats and indicators for International Waters Projects was feasible and has helped the project in gauging implementation and focus on the desired outcomes.
- d) Evaluate whether the awareness raising and training undertaken by the project have contributed towards improved understating of the challenges facing the Nile basin's water and environment resources.
- e) Assess whether the gender dimensions were adequately addressed through the project's specific activities and to propose strategies to strengthen those dimensions in the future.
- f) Review the NTEAP Micro-grants program, focusing on the soundness of the process of grant selection to assure quality of micro-grant projects selected, quality of monitoring and support of on-going activities, selection process, and administration of program. The review will reflect on whether the MG program was properly geared towards addressing environmental challenges.
- g) Examine to what extent the project adopted adaptive management approach and was able to respond to the different emerging approaches and options of NBI and other projects
- h) Review the management and operational arrangements, including financial disbursement mechanisms at both regional and national levels of the Project, the working relationships and linkages established within the project, with other NBI programs and projects and between the project and its stakeholders (networks, working groups, line ministries, etc.) and recommend better implementation modalities to NBI in view of the experience of NTEAP.
- i) Asses the quality, effectiveness and extent of operational and technical relevant linkages and collaboration with other SVP/SAP projects and other relevant partners.
- j) Asses the communication and information sharing strategies/materials adopted by the project in terms of their effectiveness to reach the desired stakeholders.
- k) Analyze and collate lessons learned to date and draw conclusions regarding activities, outputs, outcomes of the Project, as well as any progress towards the overall project impact.
- l) Review whether the project life-span/duration was adequate in view of the progress made and the budget implementation rate.
- m) Review the M&E system/strategy of NTEAP in relation to the NBI M&E system that has been adopted.
- n) Review the suitability of the sustainability plan proposed by NTEAP and its relevance to the NBI and the NB countries
- o) Assess whether the knowledge products produced by the project are adequate in terms in creating knowledge bases in the Nile Basin countries.
- p) Analyze the Best Practices documentation efforts and the review the potential outcomes that will result from them;
- q) Review the outcome of the specific capacity building activities that were undertaken for national and local micro-grants steering committees, national and regional networks and working groups. Document how well the project has contributed to building capacities within the Basin.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT

4.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation exercise will, wherever possible adopt the ROTI methodology, which should include the GEF rating scale of the key evaluation criteria described under specific objectives. Overall the process will consist of:

- a) An overview of the project's intended long-term impacts.
- b) A review of project's outcomes and their relevance in achieving the desired impacts.
- c) The identification and assessment of the logical steps, conditions and associated factors (i.e. theory of change) necessary to overcome the barriers to realizing impacts, which provide an indirect measure of impact.

The final evaluation methodology will be determined during the Inception meeting. From the date of issue of contracts to successful candidates for the consultancy to the start of the evaluation, relevant documents including the TORs of the evaluation are being sent to the consultants. It is expected that at the Inception meeting the consultancy team shall present to NBI a clear, thorough and robust methodology of how the evaluation will be conducted. The Inception meeting will ensure that this requirement is fulfilled before the field level work commences.

The inception Meeting will also be an opportunity for agreement on other general but critical matters pertaining to the implementation of the evaluation. Therefore, it will involve the participation of staff from the Nile-SEC that will not go to the field. These same staff will participate in the review of evaluation findings after the field work is concluded. This stakeholder involvement is crucial to ensuring quality control in the evaluation.

7.2 Annex 2: Documents and Literature Reviewed

NBI (2001)	Transboundary Environmental Analysis Report
Nile Sec (2010);	Concept for the terminal Evaluation of NTEAP
Nile Sec (2010);	Internal Evaluation of NTEAP (draft Report)
Nile-SeC	NBI Results based System: Core Planning and M&E Tools
Nile-Sec (2007);	Executive Summary: SVP Midterm Review Aide Memoir
Nile-SEc (2007);	Mid Term Review Report: Shared Vision Programme of the Nile Basin Initiative
NTEAP	Brochures about NTEAP and Project Components
NTEAP (2009);	Project Completion Report (Vol. I Main Report)
NTEAP (2009);	Project Completion Report (Vol. II Annexes)
NTEAP	Annual reports (LMGC, NPC,PMU) 2004- 2009
NTEAP	Component Reports (2004-2009)
NTEAP	Component Work Plans (2004-2009)
NTEAP	Cumulative Results Report (2004-2009)
NTEAP	Mission Reports (2005-2009)
NTEAP	Newsletters (2004-2009)
NTEAP	Transboundary Environmental Analysis Reports (all Countries)
UNDP	Annual Review Reports (2004-2005)
UNDP/GEF/NBI(2002)	NTEAP Appraisal Report
UNDP-GEF	Terminal Evaluation Review Form

7.3 Annex 3: People/Institutions Interviewed

7.3.1 Consultations

The following people/institutions were consulted:

UGANDA	
Name	Institution
Stephen Kigolo	Former, NPC
Mr. Paul Mafabi	Commissioner, Wetlands Department, Ministry of Water and Environment
Ms. Lucy Inyango	Assistant Commissioner, Wetlands Department
Ms. Beatrice Adimola	National Environment Management Authority
Ms. Immaculate Kyagubwe	Urban Environment Association
Ms. Jane Kisakye	Former Coordinator. Micro-grant programme in Uganda
Ms. Florence Adong	Commissioner, Water Quality and Monitoring
Dr. Callist Tindimugaya	Commissioner, Water Resources Assessment and Planning/NileTAC member
Mr. Ben Mbazira	Ssisa Fish Group
Mr. Robert Kungujje	Mabira Forest Community Integrated Organization - MAFICO
Mr. Ibrahim Senfuma	Mabira Forest Community Integrated Organization - MAFICO
Ms. Lydia Nambi	Mabira Forest Community Integrated Organization - MAFICO
Mr. Hussein Kato	Mabira Forest Community Integrated Organization - MAFICO
Mr. Nelson Kanyike	Kanjuki Senior Secondary School
Mr. Hilary Mwambusya	Kanjuki Senior Secondary School
KENYA	
Mr. Duncan Majani	Former, Administrative Officer, NTEAP Project Office
Mr. Benjamin Langwen	National Environment Management Authority (PSC member)
Mr. Martin Madala	Former Coordinator, Micro grant Programme, Kenya
Ms. Lilian Kisaka	Former, NPC Kenya
Mr. Dan Ong'or	Coordinator, UHAI Women's Group
Ms. Mildred Mboya	UHAI Women's Group
Mr. Tom Onyango	UHAI Women's Group

Mr. Samuel Otieno	Secretary, Nyandera Green Conservation Group
Mr. Edward Ogita	Chairman, Nyandera Green Conservation Group
Mr. Peter Oyolo	Member, Nyandera Green Conservation Group
TANZANIA	
Ms. Rehema Fidelis	Former, NPC
Ms. Madam Choma	Teacher, Nganze Secondary School
Mr. Rayson Muhabuki	Lake Victoria Basin Water Office/ NileTAC member
Mr. Palapala	Group Coordinator, FAPOEL
UNDP/UNOPs (NAIROBI)	
Patrick Warui	Finance Specialist
Jan Phillip Klever	UNDP UNOPS
Mirey Atallah	UNDP
NileSEC	
Dr. Henry Busulwa	
Mr. John Ogwang	
Ms. Pamela Lakidi	
Ms. Rose Sirali Antipa	
Eng. Tom Waako	
ETHIOPIA	
Mrs. Kibra Alemseged	Process Owner
Mr. Haftay Abreha	Ecosystem Expert
Mr. Hadush Berihe	Environment Education and Project coordinator
Mr. Haileabe Girmaye	Project follow up expert
Professor Sebesebe Demessew	Wetlands & Biodiversity Regional Working Group member
Mr. Messele Fisseha	Wetlands & Biodiversity Regional Working Group member
Mr. Tefera Beyene	TAC member for Ethiopia
Mr. Gedion Asfaw	Former Project Regional manger
Mr. Yonas Alemu	NGO, MG project
Gelana Terafa	Project beneficiary
Bertukan Tafa	Project beneficiary

Aster Magersa	Project beneficiary
Werkitu Woyacha	Project beneficiary
Lomi Terfa	Project beneficiary
Lalisa Adugha	Project beneficiary
Atsdu Bekele	Project beneficiary
Nigmatwa Mamo	Project beneficiary
Lomi Wedago	Project beneficiary
Zenabach Hunda	Project beneficiary
Abebech Tafasa	Project beneficiary
Gadisa Dibaba	Project beneficiary
Ayelach Gadisa	Project beneficiary
Ababo Abide	Project beneficiary
Shwaya Beru	Project beneficiary
Orgo Beru	Project beneficiary
Berka Tefera	Project beneficiary
Desta Hunda	Project beneficiary
Ayelu Gemachu	Project beneficiary
Ababa Mendeya	Project beneficiary
KebabuJima	Project beneficiary
Bayisa Dinku	Project beneficiary
Shasha Dekba	Project beneficiary
Beizu Deriba	Project beneficiary
Gata Chko	Project beneficiary
Kebu Gormu	Project beneficiary
Berka Gormu	Project beneficiary
Beletu Ababa	Project beneficiary
Werka Gemachu	Project beneficiary
Almaz Dabla	Project beneficiary
Mr. Gdefa Muleta	School Director
Mr.Tefera Kebede	Environmental Club coordinator

Student	Environmental Club Member
Student	Environmental Club Member
Student	Environmental Club Member
Dr. Ahmed Ahmed Khalid Eldaw	ENTRO, ED
Dr. Abdulkhair H. Seid	Regional Specialsit, WRPM PMU
Mr. Seyoum Mengistu	PSC member delegate, EPA
EGYPT	
Ms. Mai El Shafie	member of the EEA national working group and the regional network for environmental journalists
Dr. Solafa Goueli	member of the regional University professors network
Dr. Ahmed Zaki	Chairman of the MG host NGO and member of the national EEA working group
Eng. Abdel Hameed Taha	Awadalab NGO chairperson and member of the Awadalab community
Mr. Hossam Ali	Treasurer of Wadi Abadi CDA
Mr. Khaled Bayoumi	LMGC
Mrs. Azza Mohamed	Gharb Sohial CDA
Mr. Ahmed Meki	Gharb Sohial CDA
Mrs. Shaima Ali	Gharb Sohial villager
Mrs. Hayat Kamel	Gharb Sohial CDA
SUDAN	
Eng. Ibrahim Salih	Ministry of Irrigation & Water Resources
Mr. Osman Yousif	
Mr. Amir Baker	Former NTEAP MG lead Specialist
Ms. Hanaa Hamadnalla	Higher Council for Environment & Natural Resources
Dr. Khitma Elawad	
Dr. Muwaia H. Shaddad	MGP Host NGO
Mr. Abdelhafiz Elobeid	
Mr. Mohamed I. Elfahal	
Ms. Nazik Salaheldeen	
Ms. Intisar M. Nour	Wad Medani Girls High School
Ms. Samia E. Ahmed	Sudan National Discourse Forum (Kosti Branch)

Dr. Daw Elbait Abdelaal Mr. Abdelfattah Nouri Mr. Adel Abdelrahim	
Mr. Adel A. Elsiddig Mr. Elhadi Abdelgadir Mr. Ahmed S. Mohamed	Jecbel Awliaa
RWANDA	
Mr. Medard Kasavubu Gisinghe	Former MG Coordinator
Bizima Joseph Anania	Former NTEAP NPC/FAO-Kigali
Mr. Theobald Mashinga	C/O REMA (EE)/Former Director EIA & Compliance(Representing PSC)
Stephanie Mukanyabyenda	AVODI - a MG
Samuel Ruzindana Dan Rwabika	Nyamata High School (SP) Chairperson Nyamata High School Environmental Club
James Gafurama	National Coordinator, National Youth Council (NEP) Nyagatare District
Bosco Habyarimana	National University of Rwanda (EE)
Ms. Agathe Kamagwere	Jari (MG), Beneficiary
Mzee Apolinaire Nyabuzenda	Jari (MG), Beneficiary
BURUNDI	
Mr Adelin NTUNGUMBURANYE,	Director General of the INECN , former Regional Working Group Member, WQM
Ms Aline IRIMBERE	INECN laboratory
Mr Alois MICOMIBI, Conseiller à la	Ministry of Education
Ms MASUNZU Rénilde,	AFEB (MG)
Mr Joseph NIMPAGARITSE	
Mr BIGIRINDAVYI Charles,	Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus
Mr Philibert MUNDANDA	Former MG Coordinator , SGP/GEF National Coordinator, UNDP-Bujumbura
Ms Ariane KIGEME, KAYANZA	ADENAK Matongo, Burundi
Minami Balthazar	ADENAK Kyarumanga, Matongo

Pr. Gaspard NTAKIMAZI	University of Burundi
Mr Benoît NZIGIDAMERA,	INECN
Jean Marie BUKURU.	NELTAC-Burundi
Ms Marie NDUWIMANA	Dukingire Ikibira (ADENAK)
Mr Baltazar MINANI	ADENAK
Fr. Aloys Nikondeha	Gatara Secondary School
Fr. Deodatus Manirakiza	Gatara Secondary School
Mr. Rénovat Niyonkuru	Gatara Secondary School
Salvator RUZIMA	
DRC	
Mr Augustin Mawalala,	PSC
Mr Joseph Ngom	UNOPS CDOC, Kinshasa
Mr Jean Paul Tubuku Kimanda	UNOPS CDOC, Kinshasa
Mr Mongolu Mathieu	Water Resources Division
Mr. Etienne Nyamiriri Ms Yvonne Ibebeke Saila	REGIDESO – Goma
Mr. Dieudonne Juakali Kambale	NBD/NBI
Mr Richard Lesa Nseka	EPSP/Prog Scol/ MINEDUC
Mr Baniakina Kanda Adolphe	EPSP/Prog Scol/ MINEDUC
Mr Masila Don-Gaston	EPSP/Prog Scol/ MINEDUC
Mr Mumba Kitenge Valentin	EPSP/Prog Scol/ MINEDUC
Mr Celestin Koko Nzeza	NPC/NTEAP
Mr Guillaume Tulinabo Mr Olivier Byamungu Nzitukuze	Institut Maendeleo/Goma
Mr Jean Paul Kandeve Mr Mtangala	AGRED
Mr Kambale Lwatumba	APRONUT
Mr Matinge Kalekya	ACPDI

7.3.2 Regional Workshop

Name	Title & Organization/Country
1) Mr. Adelin Ntungumburanye	Directorur Generale National Institute for Environment and Conservation (INECN)
2) Ms. Diana Nenz	GTZ
3) Mohamed Elmuntarir	Environment Specialist ENTRO
4) Ms Berina Uwimbabazi	WorldBank
5) Dr. Nicholas Aza	NileSec
6) Mr. Stephen Kigolo	Former NPC (Uganda)
7) Eng. Tom Waako	Nile-SEC
8) Mr. John Ogwang	Nile-SEC
9) Ms. Beatrice Adongakulu	Nile-SEC
10) Ms. Rose Sirali Antipa	Nile- SEC
11) Ms. Pamela Lakidi	Nile-SEC
12) Dr. Henry Busulwa	Nile-SEC
13) Mr. Alex B. Muhweezi	Team Leader, Future Dialogues International
14) Ms. Hawa Sekela Msham	Team Member
15) Mr. Samir Mourshed	Team Member

7.4 Annex 4: Record of Regional Workshop

WORKSHOP REPORT

NTEAP TERMINAL EVALUATION REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP TO REVIEW DRAFT TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT.

(28-29th June 2010 Grand Imperial Hotel, Kampala)

1. Participation

The Regional Workshop was convened by Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat (Nile-SEC). Workshop was attended by 15 participants representing Nile-SEC, World Bank, GTZ, Ethiopia, Burundi, Uganda and former NTEAP Staff.

2. Workshop Objectives

The Workshop was convened with the objective to provide input into the Draft Terminal Report. The workshop aimed at reviewing and validating the findings and recommendation in the draft report.

3. Workshop Process and Programme

The workshop involved participants reviewing the draft Terminal Evaluation Report, presentation of the draft report by Evaluation Team and plenary discussions and feedback, according to the Workshop Programme (Annex 1).

4. Workshop recommendations

The workshop noted the progress by the Evaluation Team and made the following observation and recommendations

4.1 General

The workshop made the following General observations and or recommendations

- a) Workshop recommended that flow of report and language should be enhanced by ensuring that there are no redundant and or unsubstantiated statements.
- b) Participants observed that claims related to language barrier are unwarranted as the business of the NTEAP was conducted in accordance with agreed NBI procedures involving translations in meetings and for official documents.

- c) The Report should provide concise message on the Outcomes of the NTEAP and their implications to NBI.
- d) Report should provide clear statements on the impacts of the NTEAP at regional and country levels
- e) Report should be clear on the role of National Implementing Institutions in NTEAP

4.2 Section 1.3 Limitations

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) The Evaluation exercise did not cover all field activities in all the 9 countries due to time constraints.
- b) Workshop recommended that the Constraints stated under this section should be strengthening to include technical/policy type of constraints, if any.

4.3 Section 3.1.1 (Component One)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Mention that former Environmental Specialists who worked under NTEAP were taken over by SAPs
- b) Clarify the purpose for the NTEAP which as to define an Environmental Agenda for the NBI.
- c) Comment whether the NTEAP model was suitable for achieving the NTEAP Objectives (Defining Environmental Agenda), including whether MGP were suitable models for delivering project support.
- d) Elaborate on the NTEAP design in context of Regional level action as well as national and local implementation levels.
- e) Mention the role of national Institutions in implementing the M&E Strategy.
- f) Provide opinion on utilization of the former NTEAP Staff by host institutions
- g) Clarify the changes in the workload for the NPC over time.
- h) Substantiate issues raised under “Voluntary” services of Working Group members to explain basis for the observations in the draft report. Elaborate on what NTEAP expected of the Working Groups and how this role can be sustained.
- i) Present rational/justification for the reported deviations under part (f) on page 20 of the draft report.
- j) Presents impacts arising out of this component.

4.4 Section 3.1.2 (Component Two)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Comment on the selection criteria for the MGPs and how the MGP have (or did not) supported trans-boundary issues.
- b) Comment on how the MGP could have been mobilized/implemented to build capacity and how they ought to be mainstreamed in national programmes and priorities.

- c) Include more example son co-financing aspect.
- d) Indicate what MGP activities can be sustained and clarify on how to attribute sustainability to NTEAP.
- e) Make complete account of MGP achievement at both local and trans-boundary scales.

4.5 Section 3.1.3 (Component Three)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendation

- a) Comment on the approach used by NTEAP to build capacity and why the outputs of this effort are not uniform in all countries, i.e., why did some countries utilized the Teachers Working Group and others did not.
- b) Comment on the Outcome of this component, including likely influence or benefits on indigenous knowledge.
- c) Justify /substantiate conclusion on “improved knowledge and awareness”.
- d) Justify observation that new students joining school clubs is a constraint.
- e) Comment on extent to which the NTEAP CD-NRAK has been useful in raising awareness.

4.6 Section 3.1.4 (Component Four)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Clarify the level of the success of this component in reference to the late start of this component. To what extent does the late start influence the level of success?
- b) Comment on the suitability of the implementation approach and arrangements for this component.
- c) Justify observation that the Component focused on Policy and planning.

4.7 Section 3.1.5 (Component Five)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Comment on the suitability or feasibility of the component activities and implementation approach.
- b) Comment on the relevance of the component targets and objectives to members countries.
- c) Comments on budget efficiency of this component.
- d) Confirm the status of the 44 Monitoring stations....do they belong to members countries or they belong to NBI?
- e) Clarify whether the monitoring parameters were implemented.

4.8 Section 3.3 (Gender)

The workshop made the following observation and or recommendation

Make reference to the Logframe and expand the information under this section

4.9 Section 4 (Over-all Analysis)

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Comment on the suitability and application of the NTEAP M&E system at PMU, NBI and NPC Offices.
- b) Include recommendations on: integration of NTEAP supported activities into national plans; incorporating Environmental Agenda into NBI,
- c) Draw conclusion on sustainability from the Sustainability matrix.
- d) Comments on the institutional arrangement between Water ministries who are Focal Ministries for NBI and environmental management in each country.

4.10 Section 6: Lesson learnt

The workshop made the following observations and or recommendations

- a) Present lessons under the following categories: technical, policy, administration.
- b) Include the following into the lesson learnt section:
 - I. A multi-pronged institutional approach from the community to basin-wide is very important in realizing significant change in the environment
 - II. NTEAP was advantaged with high level officials on the PSC that were also committed to the project (compared to other SVP projects like SDBS)
 - III. The closure of the NBI offices should have been left to the host institutions
 - IV. Need to be mindful of diversity in policies related to environment/water in the NB countries
 - V. Countries said they would monitor but did not-difference between theory and practice
 - VI. MGs that were community based are more sustainable than NGOs that got MG funding to implement projects
 - VII. The participatory M&E of the NTEAP focused on the MGs and NEPs. The other components (EEA, WQM and Wetlands) depended on reports submitted from the (NPCs).
 - VIII. Clustering the MGs would have yielded greater impacts.

5. Way forward

The Workshop recommended/agreed as follows:

- a) Evaluation Team was requested to incorporate feedback from the workshop and submit draft report by/on 9th July
- b) Workshop recommended that NBI provides feedback on the report by/on 23rd July
- c) Evaluation Team submits final Report by/on 30th July 2010

7.5 Annex 5: Evaluation Itinerary

Terminal Evaluation Itinerary

1. Phase I and Phase II (Inception and Field work)

Date	Schedule	Activity												
Meetings at NBI Entebbe (6 days for each Consultant)														
26 th -31 st May	Commissioning Evaluation Exercise	Inception, Documents, Methodology development, Logistics, etc												
Ethiopia/Sudan and Egypt Leg (approx 14 days)														
1 st June	Uganda Joint Evaluation	Ssisa Integrated Fish Farming Project, Wakiso District. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Institution</th> <th>Time</th> <th>Person</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Wetlands Management Department</td> <td>10.00 a.m</td> <td>Lucy Inyango</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEMA</td> <td>12.00 - Noon</td> <td>Beatrice Admola Immaculate Kijjagulwe</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Courtesy Call</td> <td>Executive Director/Steering Committee Member</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Institution	Time	Person	Wetlands Management Department	10.00 a.m	Lucy Inyango	NEMA	12.00 - Noon	Beatrice Admola Immaculate Kijjagulwe		Courtesy Call	Executive Director/Steering Committee Member
Institution	Time	Person												
Wetlands Management Department	10.00 a.m	Lucy Inyango												
NEMA	12.00 - Noon	Beatrice Admola Immaculate Kijjagulwe												
	Courtesy Call	Executive Director/Steering Committee Member												
2 nd June	Depart Ebb; Arrival in Addis	Work at NBI/Ebb + departure												
3 rd , 4 th , 5 th	Field work and meetings in Ethiopia	Hold discussion with the Coordinator Interview with WGM and ENTRO in Addis June 3, Travel to Mekele by air to discuss with NEP proponents June 4, Travel to Ambo to visit school and MGP by car June 5 interview in Addis and Wrap-up												
6 th June	Depart Addis/Arrival Khartoum	Travel												
7 th , 8 th , 9 th	Field work and meetings in Sudan	Schedule of activities for Sudan awaited... <i>expect both car/air travel</i>												
10 th June	Depart Khartoum ; Arrive Cairo	Travel												
12 th , 13 th , 14 th , 15 th	Field work and meetings in Egypt	12 th June: Meeting the Coordinator and Interviews in Cairo 13 th June: Visit Qena (Sat over night, air travel Cairo to Luxor + Train Luxour -Qena on evening of 12th) 14 th June: Visit Luxour (travel from Qena – Luxour by train on 13 th) 15 th June: Visit Aswan (air travel from Luxour – Aswan on evening of 14 th) Depart by air from Aswan to Cairo on 15 th June.												
DRC/Rwanda/Burundi Leg (approximately 16 days)														
2 nd June	Depart Entebbe ; Arrive Kigali	Travel												

Date	Schedule	Activity
2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 5 th	Fieldwork and meetings in Rwanda	Meetings with PSC representative, former NPC and MGC. Visit to Jari hills (MGs), Nyamata district (SP), Butare at the National University of Rwanda (EE), and Nyagatare district (NEP)
6 th June	Travel by road to Goma	
7 th , 8 th , 9 th	Fieldwork and meetings in DRC	Goma (UNDP/UNOPs, Governor, Ministers) Rushuru (Partner CBOs; MGP; NEP) Goma (School Programme and MGP)
9 th June (afternoon/evening)	Drive by road to Kigali	
10 th June	Travel by air from Kigali to Bujumbura	
11 th , 12 th , 13 th	Fieldwork and meetings in Burundi	Meetings with PSC, EE WG, WQM WG, Wetlands and Biodiversity WG and partner institutions (CBOs) Visit two MGP and one School project in the province of KAYANZA (100 Km from Bujumbura) ➤ Project of Marachoudja cultivation integrated to the environment protection ➤ Project of radical terraces arrangement integrated to sustainable agriculture and livestock ➤ Lycée de GATARA School Project, biogas and piggery
14 th June	Depart Bujumbura to Kinshasa Via Nairobi	
14 th & 15 th June	Meetings in Kinshasa	Meetings with NPC, EE WG, WQM WG, UNOPS , UNDP, NBI Focal Officer, PSC & TAC
16 th	Depart Kinshasa for Dar	Meetings in Dar with Implementing Institutions and Collaborating Institutions
Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania (approximately 17 days)		
3 rd , 4 th , 5 th ,	Meetings in Kila/Entebbe	Nile-SEC
7 th June (Morning)	Travel Ebb - NBO	Meetings in NBO (UNOPs, Nairobi based Institutions) details awaited
8 th June	Air travel NBI-Kisumu	Travel Meeting former Kenya NPC
9 th June	Field work and Meetings in Kisumu area	Field work around Kisumu
10 th June	Kisumu - Mwanza	Travel Meeting Tanzania NPC
11 th June	Field work in Mwanza	Field visit PAFOEL micro-grant project
12 th June	Field work in Mwanza	Travel to Ukerewe island
13 th June	Depart Mwanza for Ebb	
14 th June	Field work and meetings	Sissa Fish Pond Entebbe
15 th June	Field work and Meetings in Uganda	Kayunga School Project Field visit to Mabira Community Ecotourism Project
16 th -18 th	In Country Consultations	Nile-TAC member Local Micro-Grant Coordinator Water Quality Focal Point Former Uganda NPC

2. Phase III (Reporting)

Date	Schedule	Activity
23rd June	Arrival in Entebbe (Hawa and Samir)	Report writing
24th -27 th June	Report preparation and briefings	24 rd & 27 th Draft Sub-Regional Report Harmonization/synthesis
28 th - 29 th June	Regional Workshop	Presentation and defence of Report
30 th June	Reporting	Submission of Draft Reports

7.6 Annex 6: Inception Report



Inception Report and Methodology

for undertaking

Terminal Evaluation

Of

Nile Trans-boundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP)

Submitted by:

Alex B. Muhweezi (Team Leader & Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania)

Samir Mourshed (Team member – Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt)

Hawa Sekele Msham (Team member- DRC, Rwanda, Burundi)

Date: 31st May 2010

1. INTRODUCTION

The Nile Trans-boundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) was one of the seven projects under the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) Shared Vision Program (SVP). The objective of the NTEAP was to support the development of a basin-wide framework for actions to address high priority trans-boundary environmental issues within the context of NBI's Strategic Action Program. The Project supported the nine NBI countries (Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) to develop sound approaches to deal with trans-boundary environmental threats at the regional and national level. The Project also encouraged more effective basin wide stakeholder cooperation on trans-boundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of the actions prioritized by the Transboundary Environmental Analysis Document in the following areas/components:

- a) Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation;
- b) Community-Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation;
- c) Environmental Education and Awareness;
- d) Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation; and
- e) Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring.

The overall **objectives** of the Transboundary Environmental Action Project aimed to develop a framework for basin-wide environmental action linked to trans-boundary issues within the context of the Nile Basin Initiative's (NBI's) Shared Vision Program under the GEF's International Waters Program.

The original NTEAP project aimed at creating more effective basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on trans-boundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the trans-boundary analysis including: Enhancing the analytical capacity for a basin-wide perspective to support the sustainable development, management, and protection of the Nile Basin Water Resources; and Engaging the full spectrum of stakeholders, from local communities to national policy makers, from elementary schools to universities, from non-governmental organizations to line ministries, in management and protection of the basin's shared resources.

In 2007, the project objective a new project objective was adopted as follows: *"To protect critical Nile Basin ecosystems from trans-boundary threats through the provision of a strategic environmental framework and the engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of*

Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM)". The NTEAP was expected to achieve the following **results or outcomes**:

Component	Outcomes	Outcome indicators
Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation	Institutions strengthened to facilitate regional collaboration	<p>Transboundary EIA guidelines for use by NBI investment programs developed</p> <p>Policy recommendations on Basin environment protection formulated and submitted for consideration in at least two countries</p> <p>Environment function of the NB permanent institution defined through a consultative process</p> <p>Nile Basin Development Forum in 2008 defines the environmental issues and priorities for the Basin</p> <p>Nile Cooperative Framework ratified with specific references to wetlands conservation (co-financed catalytic outcome)</p>
Community-Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation;	Improved capacity of the Nile Basin communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across GEF focal areas	3 pilots identified for up scaling and 10 identified for replication during the project lifetime.
Environmental Education and Public Awareness	Environmental Education Improved and Public awareness enhanced	<p>At least 8 universities in 6 NBI countries approved and adopted the environmental modules based on Nile environmental threats</p> <p>Environmental campaigns and schools award programs adopted and institutionalized at national levels in at least 6 NBI countries.</p>
Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation	Enhanced Capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity	<p>Strategic approach to wetlands management in the basin with key actions, steps and responsibilities developed.</p> <p>Management plans for at least three selected wetlands developed and under implementation</p>
Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring	Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the NB	<p>Transboundary water quality monitoring network established and operational</p> <p>Water quality monitoring data exchange agreement to be</p>

	countries	annexed to the NBI information sharing protocol formulated approved by the WQM WG.
--	-----------	--

Source: NTEAP Project Completion Report (Main Report Vol.1) 2009

To realize the above results/outcomes, the project supported the following components.

- a) Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation;
- b) Community-Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation;
- c) Environmental Education and Public Awareness;
- d) Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation; and
- e) Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring.

2. INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION TASKS

2.1 Scope

The Terminal evaluation will cover the NTEAP period of seven years, from October 2003 to December 2009. The evaluation will involve both desk work and interviews and in-depth analysis of information from literature and responses provided by representatives of governments from the nine states, Universities, NGOs and beneficiaries that participated in the project. Further, the Evaluation will involve presentation of draft findings and recommendations to a stakeholders meeting in Entebbe, Uganda and submission of final Evaluation Report.

2.2 Objective and Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation

Objective: The Evaluation Team understands that the general objective is to conduct a Terminal evaluation of the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP). To achieve the objectives of the assignment, the Evaluation Team shall aim at evaluating the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness of the project, impact, synergies and linkages and sustainability of the project supported activities.

Purpose: The purpose of the Terminal Evaluation is to provide an in-depth assessment of the appropriateness of the project design in addressing the identified problems as enumerated in the Project Document and towards supporting the implementation of GEF areas of focus as well as the NBI Vision and priorities. The Evaluation will assess extent to which the objectives and outcomes of the project have been fulfilled. In this regards, the Terminal evaluation will trace and document progress towards the desired impact and is expected to propose recommendations to the Nile Secretariat as to the actions that should be undertaken to ensure that the outcomes of the project are properly used and integrated into the NBI activities and future plans. The Terminal Evaluation will also examine overall project management and implementation, as well as the extent to which

NTEAP has managed to implement the recommendations of the MTR conducted in 2006. It will also examine the performance indicators and gauge the level of implementation of activities against those indicators.

2.3 Tasks for the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team understands that the Terminal Evaluation will involve desk work, interviews and in-depth analysis of information obtained from NBI Secretariat, UNOPs, Country personnel involved in the project, government implementing agencies and collaborating Universities and NGOs and, beneficiaries. The Evaluation will visit selected sites and make field observations. Lastly, the Evaluation Team will analyse data and report on the task. The Evaluation exercise will focus on investigating relevance of the project interventions and outputs, efficiency of project implementation, effectiveness of the project interventions, impact, synergies and linkages and sustainability of the project supported activities. The Terminal evaluation will provide responses to the following areas of concern:

Based on the progress attained on issues relating to regional coordination on environmental issues across the Basin, was the project able to generate momentum of behavioral changes towards regional cooperation?.

- i. Given the component specific outputs that were achieved within the prescribed project time frame and the allocated budget, did the intended outputs yield the desired outcomes?.
- ii. Was the revised project log frame developed after the MTR and indicators for International Waters Projects feasible and did it help the project in gauging implementation and focus on the desired outcomes?.
- iii. Did the awareness raising and training undertaken by the project contribute towards improved understating of the challenges facing the Nile basin's water and environment resources?.
- iv. Were gender dimensions adequately addressed through the project's specific activities and also, were the proposed strategies to strengthen those dimensions in the future adequate?.
- v. Was the NTEAP Micro-grants program implemented based on sound process of grant selection to assure quality of micro-grant projects selected, quality of monitoring and support of activities, good selection process and administration of program. Did the MG program address environmental challenges in the basin?.
- vi. Did the project adopt adaptive management approach and was the project able to respond to the different emerging approaches and options of NBI and other projects.
- vii. Were management and operational arrangements, including financial disbursement mechanisms at both regional and national levels of the Project, the working relationships and linkages established within the project, with other NBI programs and projects and between the project and its stakeholders (networks, working groups, line ministries, etc.)

effective? . How better could these implementation modalities inform NBI in view of the experience of NTEAP?.

- viii. Were the quality, effectiveness and extent of operational and technical relevant linkages and collaboration with other SVP/SAP projects and other relevant partners effective?.
- ix. How effective were the communication and information sharing strategies/materials adopted by the project to reach the desired stakeholders.
- x. What are the key lessons learned to date and conclusions regarding activities, outputs, outcomes of the Project, as well as any progress towards the overall project impact.
- xi. Was the project life-span/duration adequate in view of the progress made and the budget implementation rate?.
- xii. How effective was the M&E system/strategy of NTEAP in relation to the NBI M&E system that had been adopted.
- xiii. Is the sustainability plan proposed by NTEAP suitable and relevance to the NBI and the NB countries?.
- xiv. Were the knowledge products produced by the project adequate in terms in creating knowledge bases in the Nile Basin countries?
- xv. Did the documented Best Practices accurately reveal the potential outcomes that will result from them;
- xvi. How well did the outcome of the specific capacity building activities that were undertaken for national and local micro-grants steering committees, national and regional networks and working groups contribute to building capacities within the Basin.

In addition, the Evaluation Team has identified the following concerns:

- i. Were the project interventions and activities appropriate to enable the project realize its objectives?
- ii. What is the relationship between the intended and unintended project outcomes and realised outputs.

2.4 Evaluation Outputs

The Evaluation Team interprets the TORs that the output from this exercise is the Terminal Evaluation report. The Evaluation report will contain an in-depth assessment of the extent to which the objectives and outcomes of the project were fulfilled and the likely impacts and sustainability of the NTEAP supported activities. Further the report will contain recommendations to the Nile Secretariat on actions that should be undertaken to ensure that the outcomes of the project are properly used and integrated into the NBI activities and future plans.

2.5 Comments on the Terms of Reference

The Evaluation Team makes the following comments for consideration by the NBI.

2.5.1 Scope of work versus time

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the Scope of work is not commensurate with the time allocated to carry out this Evaluation. Since the time frame is inflexible, the Evaluation Team wishes to indicate the methodology to be applied in this exercise will largely rely on interviews with NBI Staff, national representatives, literature review and limited field observations. The implication of this approach is that conclusions made by the Evaluation team will most likely be extrapolated to portray the over-all picture.

2.5.2 Facilitating the Evaluation Team

This Inception report is finalized when the logistical issues relating to itinerary and country level support are still being confirmed. This poses a constraint to the Evaluation Team and could result in changes in the itinerary during the field work. In the event that this observation persists, the Evaluation Team proposes an extension of time and resources for completing the task.

3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology proposed in subsequent sections does acknowledge the fact the response to the above comments on the TORs is yet to be made. Therefore, the methodology assumes that the Evaluation Team will proceed as per original TORs.

3.1 Scope of Evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation will cover the project for the period 2003 to October 2009. The Terminal Evaluation will have a broad outlook, including performance of the project against set objectives, indicators and benchmarks. The evaluation will look at the project as a whole (regional level) as well as Country specific performances. The primary basis for the Terminal evaluation is the project document and Log frame.

3.2 Evaluation criteria and the evaluation frame

In structuring the work and Evaluation report the Evaluation Team will use the 5 key criteria for evaluations as follows:

- a) **Relevance:** The extent to which the project correctly addresses the identified problems and needs. *Guiding issues include:* i) Appropriateness of the project design to the identified problems and towards supporting the implementation of the GEF areas of focus and the NBI Vision, as well as global environment benefits. ii) Complimentarily and coherence with other related programs and activities at national or local levels. iii) Overall strengths and weakness in design as reflected in the original logical framework. iv) Extent of participation by host country institutions and beneficiaries. (v) Level of co-financing secured by the project in comparison with the announced co-financing at project approval
- b) **Efficiency: An assessment of how well the various activities transformed the** available resources into intended outputs in terms of quantity, quality, timeliness and where possible

unit cost. *Guiding issues include:* i) Linkages and commitment between the project and host-country institutions at national level, ii) Approach used in terms of substance and delivery of work. iii) Level of Partner country contributions in the project; iv) Extent of monitoring systems to assess progress and impact. v) Extent of the project's ability to adapt its program and approach in response to changing assumptions and risks; v) assess the impact and extent of support/guidance provided by UNOPS, UNDP and WB to the project.

- c) **Effectiveness:** To what extent the project outputs were achieved and to what extent they have contributed to achieving the project outcomes. **Guiding issues include:** i) Progress towards targets/milestones defined in the revised indicators to measure the achievements of the project outcomes ii) Appropriateness of the indicators to measure the achievements of the project objective. iii) Validity of the assumptions and risks of the project at the objective level, including discussion of unforeseen benefits or risks.
- d) **Impact:** To what extent the project objectives and intended impact have been achieved and thus contributing to the overall goal, SVP outcomes. **Guiding issues include:** i) To what extent have the overall NBI/SVP regional targets benefited/learned from the achievements of the project. ii) Where might changes that could have been effected by the project based on experience and lessons learned contribute towards achieving a desired wider impact. iii) Have there been unplanned outcomes and impact (negative or positive) resulting from the project and what their consequences as well as any global environmental benefits are as outlined in GEF support. iv) Have there been, or expected to be, gender-related or poverty related impacts rising from the project.
- e) **Synergies and linkages:** Extent to which the project managed to establish synergies and linkages with other stakeholders/partners. **Guiding issues include:** i) Extent of linkages with other SVPs and SAPs; ii) Extent of linkages with other regional and sub-regional projects/programs in the Basin such as the Small Grants Program¹³ iii) Effectiveness of networks developed by the project and networks involving the project, iv) Extent of linkages with existing initiatives at national level.
- f) **Sustainability:** Extent to which the outcomes of the project are likely to continue after the end of the project. **Guiding issues include:** i) Extent of project "ownership" by NBI countries and national institutions and means for ensuring the integration of NTEAP activities into national programs; ii) Extent of the prevailing and expected policy environment in support of the project objectives and achievements; iii) Extent of the institutional capacities of host countries institutions to carry forward project outcomes after the end of the funding support, at all levels; iv) Assess the extent and nature of needs beyond the current project and how these might best be met through future phases, programmes, or institutionalization of work begun under NTEAP.

³ During project design, linkages with the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project were considered important; however, that project closed shortly after the launch of the NTEAP.

It is expected that the terminal evaluation will provide feedback and assess the performance of the project in its entirety and suggest clear directions for the NBI to capitalize from the momentum generated by the project and integrate the recommended products and outputs that are to be sustained.

The evaluation will cover the entire project with its different components that are operational, covering the following areas.

a) Attainment of outputs

- ✓ Assess whether the component specific outputs have been attained within the prescribed project time frame and the allocated budget stipulated in the PIP and whether the intended outputs have yielded the desired outcomes.

b) Soundness of Micro Grant in addressing environmental challenges.

- ✓ Review the NTEAP Micro-grants program, focusing on the soundness of the process of grant selection to assure quality of micro-grant projects selected, quality of monitoring and support of on-going activities, selection process, and administration of program. The review will reflect on whether the MG program was properly geared towards addressing environmental challenges.

c) Gender

- ✓ Assess whether the gender dimensions were adequately addressed through the project's specific activities and to propose strategies to strengthen those dimensions in the future.

d) Synergies and linkages

- ✓ Asses the quality, effectiveness and extent of operational and technical relevant linkages and collaboration with other SVP/SAP projects and other relevant partners.

e) Communication and information sharing strategies

- ✓ Asses the communication and information sharing strategies/materials adopted by the project in terms of their effectiveness to reach the desired stakeholders.

f) Implementation

- ✓ Review the management and operational arrangements, including financial disbursement mechanisms at both regional and national levels of the Project, the working relationships and linkages established within the project, with other NBI programs and projects and between the project and its stakeholders (networks, working groups, line ministries, etc.) and recommend better implementation modalities to NBI in view of the experience of NTEAP .
- ✓ Review whether the project life-span/duration was adequate in view of the progress made and the budget implementation rate.

g) Adaptive management

Examine to what extent the project adopted adaptive management approach and was able to respond to the different emerging approaches and options of NBI and other projects

h) Monitoring and Evaluation

- ✓ Review the M&E system/strategy of NTEAP in relation to the NBI M&E system that has been adopted.
- ✓ Assess whether the revised project log frame developed after the MTR in accordance with the new GEF formats and indicators for International Waters Projects was feasible and has helped the project in gauging implementation and focus on the desired outcomes.

i) Suitability & relevance of the sustainability plan

- ✓ Review the suitability of the sustainability plan proposed by NTEAP and its relevance to the NBI and the NB countries
- ✓ Assess whether the knowledge products produced by the project are adequate in terms in creating knowledge bases in the Nile Basin countries.
- ✓ Analyze the Best Practices documentation efforts and the review the potential outcomes that will result from them;
- ✓ Review the outcome of the specific capacity building activities that were undertaken for national and local micro-grants steering committees, national and regional networks and working groups.
- ✓ Document how well the project has contributed to building capacities within the Basin.

j) Effect on attaining regional cooperation

- ✓ Review the progress attained on issues relating to regional coordination on environmental issues across the Basin and examine whether the project has been able to generate momentum of behavioral changes towards regional cooperation.

k) Effect of awareness raising and training

- ✓ Evaluate whether the awareness raising and training undertaken by the project have contributed towards improved understating of the challenges facing the Nile basin's water and environment resources.

l) Lessons learned

- ✓ Analyze and collate lessons learned to date and draw conclusions regarding activities, outputs, outcomes of the Project, as well as any progress towards the overall project impact.

o) Project formulation

- ✓ How were the stakeholders were engaged in the design, formulation of the project

p) Implementation plan

- ✓ Was the plan realistic, practical and achievable?
- ✓ How were the stakeholders were engaged in the design, formulation & implementation of the plan
- ✓ Was the project implemented as specified and, if not, how do the operations differ from those initially planned? And how adapted?
- ✓ What were the Key driving factors influencing the achievements of outputs as well as results of the project
- ✓ Which components were contributed most to the success of the project?
- ✓ Did the project reaches its intended results

q) Project Implementation

- ✓ How core activities were implemented?
- ✓ Which initial strategies / activities of the project were being implemented? Which one were/ are not met? Why/why not?
- ✓ Which activities work / do not work well? Why / why not?
- ✓ What problems & challenges (decision making, approvals, financial management, procurement etc,) were encountered in implementing the project? How were they resolved?
- ✓ How effective were management coordination & supervision structures to the success of the project?
- ✓ What is the view of the project in relation to fostering regional cooperation in environmental management from the perspectives of the project's staff, participants and other stakeholders?
- ✓ What experiences & lessons might be gained/learned from the implementation of the project that might be useful for its future modification?
- ✓ What were the strategies for sustainability and to what extent were realized?

r) Monitoring and evaluation

- ✓ Adequacy of the M&E system in timely tracking of progress towards achieving projects results by collecting, analyzing information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period
- ✓ Adequacy of reporting system (annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings)
- ✓ Use of the information provided by the M&E system to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs
- ✓ Training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure
- ✓ Facilitating M&E processes (Whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; & was adequately and timely funded during implementation)

s) Stakeholder participation

- ✓ The mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation
- ✓ The extent of stakeholder participation in management (involvement in the production and dissemination of information generated by the project; implementation and decision making and an analysis of effectiveness of the participation mechanisms applied by the project;
- ✓ How was the project introduced to stakeholders (implementing partners & beneficiaries)? And how it engaged stakeholders in implementation.
- ✓ partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and/or international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation; cooperation with similar projects in the region;
- ✓ Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.
- ✓ Gender mainstreaming in project design, management and activity implementation

t) *Relevance*

- ✓ Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?

u) *Effectiveness in achieving project objectives, outcomes & outputs*

- ✓ Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
- ✓ In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such a project.

- ✓ How well has the project performed in terms of producing the expected outcomes?
- ✓ Have the objectives formulated been achieved? What are the successes and difficulties?
- ✓ Could more beneficial effects be produced by adopting other implementation measures in the scope of the project?
- ✓ What is the influence of confounding factors outside the project?

v) *Efficiency*

- ✓ Was the project cost effective?
- ✓ Was the project the least cost option?
- ✓ Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness?
- ✓ Compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

w) **Assess project contributions (to impact / changes, sustainability & capacity building)**

- ✓ intended/unintended (short term/long term - positive/negative) impacts on targeted beneficiaries
- ✓ Soundness of project approach in terms of economic, social, cultural sustainability
- ✓ Cultural sustainability (appropriateness & cultural diversity)
- ✓ Financial sustainability (mechanisms for (re)covering costs and replacing equipment (two separate issues & evidence of continued funding, expansion/replication if any)
- ✓ the extent to which the benefits (at the level of outcomes) of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end (Commitment of the government to support the initiative beyond the project, development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.)
- ✓ Risks affecting sustainability & the persistence of project outcomes (other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project) will affect sustainability. Including the following risks:
 - ✓ Financial resources: Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

- ✓ Socio-political: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- ✓ Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- ✓ Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

x) *Replicability of the project investments*

- ✓ Project contribution to capacity building

3.3 General approach

The TORs subscribe to the principle of “participation” and the Evaluation Team will at all stages of the evaluation be transparent about the methodology used, and how the findings are interpreted. The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the evaluation will have to be constructive and forward looking so as to be able to inform the NBI and its future programmes. In his approach the Evaluation Team will apply basic principles of fairness and allow the NBI and Stakeholders to respond to the Evaluation findings and clarify emerging issues.

The Evaluation Team findings will be based on collected evidence, which will be available to the NBI for scrutiny, during and after the assignment. Collected evidence, where possible, will indicate the source by category of stakeholders and gender, while maintaining confidentiality at an individual level.

In the interviews the Evaluation Team will ensure the participation of selected beneficiaries, and, where relevant, encourage equal participation of women and men in group interviews. In addition, special attention of the intended and unintended impact of the project on women is built in the methodology, and gender separated interviews will be conducted if needed for that purpose.

3.4 Data collection methods

The following methods will be applied:

Document study: documents relevant to the project will have to be made available to the Evaluation Team in time and either in soft or hard copy as per request. Basic documents required are: Project document, work plans and reports, including financial reports; the logical framework and related documents, like the monitoring framework, targets and milestones and indicators.

Interviews: the Evaluation Team will hold interviews with selected stakeholders, either orally or through email. In exceptional cases, telephonic interviews may need to be held. The categories of stakeholders are: NBI secretariat and field staff; Government Implementing partners, Collaborating Universities and NGOs and direct beneficiaries at the community and household levels⁴.

Site visits: the Terminal Evaluation Team will carry out site visits in all nine countries of the basin. The aim of the field visits will be to provide evidence of progress and performance at field level against targets and reports, and get the perspective of the primary beneficiaries of NTEAP project. The Evaluation Team will hold interviews with direct beneficiaries and make field observations.

Interviews and field visits will be done against checklists, based on the evaluation framework. Oral interviews and field visit observations will be summarised and kept for reference. Written interviews responses will be kept for reference. To maintain confidentiality, references to individual respondents will be removed from the publicised copies.

3.5 Data analysis

Data will be analysed against the benchmarks set in section 3.2. These benchmarks are set according to the original work plans and logical framework of the project, taking into account updates, and recorded strategic changes.

3.6 Reporting

The Evaluation Team will produce a concise report with annexes. The table of content will follow the one described in the TORs as much as possible. The analytical section will follow the 6 main criteria outlined in section 3.2 (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Outcome/Impact, Synergies and Sustainability). Subheadings will be developed accordingly. Annexes will include the TORs, Composition of Evaluation team, methodology and evaluation frame, detailed work schedule, list of documents, respondents and other annexes where relevant.

⁴ NBI shall be expected to introduce the Evaluation exercise and Evaluation to targeted respondents NBI shall also be expected to coordinate scheduling of appointments and field itinerary.

4. WORK PLAN

This undertaking will be carried out in 25 days spanning over 5 weeks effective 24th May 2010.

Activity	Wk1	Wk2	Wk3	Wk4	Wk5
Mobilizing to start and contractual process	Green				
Literature review and Consultations with NBI	Green				
Interviews and Consultations		Blue	Blue		
Drafting report				Blue	
Draft Report presentation					Purple
Final Draft					Red

7.7 Annex 7: Over-all NTEAP Performance Matrix

Outputs	Target	Actual (%)
Outcome 1: Regional and national institutions strengthened in addressing transboundary threats to Nile ecosystem resources		
1.1 Institutional setup for project implementation established	Establish PSC, PMU and national coordination offices in all NB countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSC, PMU and 9 national coordination offices and 10 MGs coordination offices established <p><i>Percentage achievement (100%)</i></p>
1.2 Knowledge management and communication tools produced	1. Quarterly newsletters published in 5 languages, 2. Website established and updated regularly (No. of hits per year) 3. IT infrastructure at the PMU and 9 countries established and functioning. 4. library established, equipped and connected to the NBI cyber library 5. multimedia communication tools developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The newsletter were published and distributed in five languages of the basin, English, French, Arabic, Swahili and Amharic. The NTEAP website was first launched in 2005 and redesigned in August 2006. A French version was added later became an integral part of NBI website. IT infrastructure at the PMU and 9 countries established An interactive CD ROM, Nile Basin Awareness Kit, was developed in 2006 <p><i>Percentage achievement (100%)</i></p>
1.3 River basin model system developed	RBM developed integrated in the DSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This output was transferred to WRMP <p><i>Percentage achievement (0%)</i></p>
1.4 Strategic Environment Framework provided	Guidelines for EIA for the SAPs produced and approved	Two environment advisors to support the two SAPs on environmental issues and develop the TB EIA recruited. <p><i>Percentage achievement (60%)</i></p>
1.5 Transboundary desk studies of macro & sector policies & environment completed	Policy recommendations formulated and submitted to PSC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy recommendations for each country and aggregate regional report on Macro Polices and country reports were finalized. <p><i>Percentage achievement (90%)</i></p>
1.6 M&E system in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E strategy and Action Plan prepared and operationalised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E strategy and Action Plan developed, including revised log frame and implementation tracking system and implemented. <p><i>Percentage achievement (80%)</i></p>
Outcome 2. Improved capacity of the Nile Basin communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across GEF focal areas		

Outputs	Target	Actual (%)
2.1. Capacities of NGOs and CBOs on addressing environmental threats enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct 8 regional CB workshops Conduct 50 national CB workshops for NGOs and NGO networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eight regional CB workshops conducted and over 250 professionals from NGOs, CBOs and Government trained Over 80 national CB Workshops for NGO, CBOs, NGO Networks conducted . <i>Percentage achievement (over 100%)</i>
2.2. Viable options for community level actions to address Nile environmental threats (in accordance to the relevant GEF focal areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disbursing \$5.2 Million in grants in 9 countries for a minimum of 200 micro projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A total 234 MG project amounting to \$ 5,433,482 approved in all countries A total of \$5,116,581 (95.5%) in MG funds disbursed to date <i>Percentage achievement (100%)</i>
2.3 Soil erosion micro grants studies completed	<p>Soil erosion studies conducted in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Sudan</p> <p>At least 10 MG Projects approved in all NB countries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soil erosion studies completed in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Sudan and reports produced 44 MG soil erosion mitigation projects approved in all the NB countries <i>Percentage achievement (100%)</i>
Outcome 3. Environmental Education Improved and Public awareness enhanced		
3.1 Public awareness on Nile Environmental Threats enhanced in NB countries	At least 2 environmental awareness programs delivered in at least 5 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Transboundary programs developed and tested for 3 years in all NBI countries <i>Percentage achievement (100%)</i>
3.2. Networks of secondary schools for projects based learning established and functioning in NB countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train 180 teachers in project based learning and use of electronic materials for daily teaching Develop and adopt Environmental modules in all NB countries. Implement 10 school projects per country to be utilized for project based learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 180 teachers trained on project based learning. Environmental modules developed, circulated and 180 teachers trained on utilization. Modules for mainstreaming EE in School curriculum developed in Congo and Burundi 80 school projects are finalized and utilized for learning <i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i>
3.3. Networking established among universities and other research institutions	Exchange at least two students per country	<p>10 students facilitated to conduct their Masters research in a different country. All reports finalized.</p> <p><i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i></p>
Outcome 4. Enhanced Capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity		
4.1. Regional cooperation is enhanced and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established a regional Wetland Working Group Establish National level wetlands management networks in all NB countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A regional WG on Wetlands and Biodiversity established. <i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i> National level inter ministerial wetlands management networks established in all NB countries

Outputs	Target	Actual (%)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop training materials targeting five categories of stakeholders 	<p><i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three of the five Training materials targeting five categories of stakeholders have been printed <p><i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i></p>
4.2. Understanding and awareness of the roles of wetlands in supporting sustainable development is improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct, finalize and disseminate Ecological & economic studies on wetland roles in sustainable development in the two SAPs Conduct national baselines to document information on wetlands and biodiversity in all Nile Basin countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two consolidated reports have been edited and are ready for review and printing <p><i>Percentage achievement (90%)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baselines were developed through a network of national experts and in 7 countries <p><i>Percentage achievement (80%)</i></p>
4.3 Train in Wetlands management according to needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train 50 officers across the basin on wetlands management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71 officers (142%) were trained across the basin on wetlands management and poverty eradication
4.4. Pilot initiatives in support of capacity building and wetland management plans implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transboundary wetlands management plans prepared for three selected sites Wetlands inventory carried out and the results mapped on a GIS platform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management plans for three sites out of which one Sio-Siteko completed. <i>Percentage achievement (80%)</i> 10 MG pilots and NEPs on wetlands were approved and implemented but not fully completed. The Inventory and Mapping of Wetlands in the Nile Basin is complete <p><i>Percentage achievement 90%</i></p>
Outcome 5. Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the NB countries		
5.1 Regional working group established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish and functional regional WQ network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TB network established was functional <p><i>Percentage achievement (50%)</i></p>
5.2. Awareness on WQ issues increased in NBC at all levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness materials produced & disseminated Two national awareness workshops conducted in each NB country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key Messages (4 summary reports) prepared and will be disseminated in all NB countries Dissemination campaigns including workshops and production of awareness materials held in 6 countries. <p><i>Percentage achievement (70%)</i></p>
5.3. Data exchange mechanism developed	Regional WQ manuals and uniform data reporting formats developed and used in at least 4 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four WQM manuals developed, finalized and formally piloted in 5 countries <p><i>Percentage achievement 85%</i></p>
5.4 Capacity of selected laboratories in each country improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess capacities on WQM in the basin and produce a Nile water quality report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One regional and 9 national assessment reports on capacities produced. Focal labs selected and equipment

Outputs	Target	Actual (%)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected Focal labs and support with lab equipment (testing kits) • Provide training in WQ measurements to focal laboratories 	<p>provided to all NB Countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on WQ measurements held and Lab managers of NBI Focal Labs exposed to TB WQM issues in a regional workshop <i>Percentage achievement 100%</i>
5.5 Biological monitoring tools pilot tested in the Nile basin	At least 2 biological monitoring demonstrations implemented	<p>Regional Trainings on Biological WQM held and Tools piloted. Piloting at country level planned as well as procurement of tools materials and Field and identification Manuals</p> <p><i>Percentage achievement 50%</i></p>
5.6 Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow up actions formulated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed • A phase out and sustainability strategy developed and approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nile transboundary Water quality Monitoring Strategy developed. • A draft proposal on the role of the Water Quality component in the permanent NBI institution and a proposal on the Component's Phase –out and sustainability plan prepared. <p><i>Percentage achievement (80%)</i></p>

Source: PMU and NTEAP Implementation Completion Report, December 2009

8. APPENDICES

8.1 In Country Report (Burundi, Rwanda and DRC)

8.2 In country Reports (Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania)

8.3 In country Reports (Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia)