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1. **Introduction**
	1. **Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements**

UNOPS wishes to contract an independent international consultant to carry out the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the GEF-UNDP/UNEP-UNOPS/UNEP-DEWA global project “MENARID GEF IW:LEARN: Strengthening IW Portfolio Delivery and Impact” - GEF no. 4219. The IW:LEARN project is funded by the GEF, implemented by UNDP & UNEP and executed by UNOPS & UNEP-DEWA. The evaluation will be carried out in line with the criteria of the project implementing agency – UNDP/GEF.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

1. to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
2. to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
3. to promote accountability for resource use;
4. to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The conduct of the mid-term evaluation will be guided by the M&E policies of the UNDP (<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>), the GEF (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1555>), and the UNEP (<http://www.unep.org/eou/Portals/52/Reports/EvalPolicy.pdf>).

**2. Objectives of the evaluation**

**2.1. Purpose of the evaluation**

This project evaluation is being conducted at the request of the UNDP/GEF regional coordination unit in Bratislava and as per the project document evaluation plan. It ought to provide the information about the status of project implementation to ensure accountability of the expenditures to date and the delivery of outputs and so that managers can make midcourse corrections as appropriate.

The main objective of this Mid-Term Evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective and to produce plausible recommendations on how to improve the project management practices during the remaining duration of the project (scheduled completion in July 2014). The Mid-term Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability.

Its main objectives are:

* to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
* to ensure accountability for the achievement of the project and GEF objectives to strengthen global portfolio experience sharing and learning, dialogue facilitation, targeted knowledge sharing and replication in order to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF IW projects to deliver tangible results in partnership with other IW initiatives.”
* to create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding.

More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

EE should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The EE will revise the relevance of indicators and targets, review work plans, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The EE will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the MTE is to assess the Project Management’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes, and impact

The External Evaluation (EE) will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. MTE should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The EE should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The EE will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

**2.1. Evaluation criteria**

The following evaluation criteria should be regarded in order to focus on the evaluation objectives:

* relevance: extend to which a development initiative and its intended outputs and outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries
* effectiveness: extend to which the initiative’s intended results have been achieved
* efficiency: measure how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results
* sustainability: measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to end. The evaluators may look at factors such as establishment of sustainable financial mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies or community production
* impact: measures changes in human development and people’s well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

**3. Scope of work**

An independent international consultant will conduct the mid-term evaluation. He/she will look at the following aspects:

**3.1. Project concept**

**3.1.1. Project relevance and strategy**

* How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results;
* Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results;
* Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? Consider alternatives;
* Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
* Do the recipient governments maintain their financial commitments to the project?

**3.1.2. Preparation and readiness**

* Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
* Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
* Were lessons from the previous phases of the project properly incorporated in the project design?
* Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
* Were counterpart resources (funding, staff and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at the project entry?

**3.1.3. Stakeholder participation during project preparation**

* Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project design?

**3.1.4. Underlying factors/Assumptions**

* Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project management strategies for these factors;
* Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made;
* Assess the effect of any incorrect assumption made by the project

**3.1.5. Project organization/management arrangements**

* Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
* Are the project roles in line with the UNDP and GEF programme guides?
* Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations
* Were the management arrangements suggested by the project document implemented and how efficient they are?

**3.1.6. Project budget and duration**

* Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way;

**3.1.7. Design of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system**

* Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives;
* Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baselines (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities;
* Examine whether or not the time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specifies;

**3.1.8. Sustainability and replication strategy**

* Assess if project sustainability and replicability strategy was developed during the project design and assess its relevance;

**3.1.9. Gender perspective**

* Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing project interventions;
* How gender considerations are mainstreamed into project interventions.

**3.2. Project implementation**

**3.2.1. Adaptive management in project implementation**

* Monitoring system. Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
* Do they provide the necessary information?
* Do they involve key partners?
* Are they efficient?
* Are additional tools required?
* Reconstruct baseline data if necessary[[1]](#footnote-1);
* Risk Management:
* Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why;
* Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;
* Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems. Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
* Work Planning:
* Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it. Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content;
* Assess the use of routinely updated work plans;
* Are work-planning processes result-based[[2]](#footnote-2)? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
* Financial management:
* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions;
* Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
* Did promised co-financing materialize?
* Reporting:
* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners;
* Delays:
* Assess if there were delays in project implementation, if so, what were the reasons;
* Did the delays affect the achievement of project’s outcomes and/or sustainability and if so, then how?

**3.2.2. UNDP & UNEP Contribution**

* Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. Consider:
* Field visits;
* Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up;
* GEF guidance;
* Operational support;
* Assess contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination) and suggest measures to strengthen UNDP soft assistance to the project management;
* Assess the role of UNEP in the implementation of the project

**3.2.3. UNOPS & UNEP-DEWA Contribution**

* Assess the role of UNOPS in project execution and implementation;
* Assess the UNOPS assistance in day-to-day project operation, guidance in procurement and financial management and monitoring. Suggest measures to strengthen UNOPS efficiency and responsiveness if necessary;
* Assess the role of UNEP-DEWA in project execution and implementation;
* Assess the UNEP-DEWA assistance in day-to-day project operation, guidance in procurement and financial management and monitoring. Suggest measures to strengthen UNEP-DEWA efficiency and responsiveness if necessary;

**3.2.4. Stakeholder Participation, Partnership Strategy**

* Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
* Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms;
* Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships;

**Products expected from the evaluation**

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report. The report, together with the annexes, shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format. The Report of the Final Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The Report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according the table attached in Annex 2 of this TOR.

* Draft mid-term evaluation report. It should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations[[3]](#footnote-3). Prior to submission of the final report the draft version shall be circulated for comments to the UNDP-GEF team, UNEP-DEPI, UNOPS, UNEP-DEWA and the project coordination units of GEF IW:LEARN, beneficiaries and other governmental and non-governmental counterpart (to be specified in the inception report);
* Final mid-term evaluation report. The final report will be submitted upon review and acceptance of the draft report and presented in a way that will make the information accessible and comprehensible in the English language;
* Evaluation executive summary. The evaluation report should include comprehensive and information-rich executive summary. This summary will be used as a stand-alone product to enhance the readership of the evaluation, and should be understandable to non-technical readers
* Evaluation blurb. This is a one-paragraph description designed to increase the visibility of published content and announce the report publication on the webpage and via electronic announcements and list serves.

**Indicative outline of the mid-term evaluation report**

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

* Executive summary (1-2 pages)
* Brief description of the project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
* Introduction (2-3 pages)
* Project background
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues to be addressed
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation
* Project and its development context (3-4 pages)
* Project start and its duration
* Implementation status
* Problems that the project seeks to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected
* Findings and Conclusions (8-9 pages)
* Project concept and formulation
* Project relevance
* Implementation approach
* Countries ownership/Engagement
* Stakeholders participation
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* UNEP comparative advantage
* Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector
* Indicators
* Management arrangements
* Implementation
* Financial management
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Assistance by the UNDP (RCU) and UNEP
* Operational support by UNOPS and UNEP
* Coordination and operational issues by the PCU
* Role and contributions of partners
* Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
* Results
* Attainment of objectives
* Prospects of sustainability
* Recommendations (4-6 pages)
* Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
* Lessons learned (3-5 pages)
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
* Significant lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have notf
* Annexes
* ToR
* Itinerary of evaluator, including summary of field visits
* List and contacts of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaires used and summary of results
* Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (see Table 1 attached)

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

**Evaluation methodology**

The mid-term evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining duration of the project.

The mid-term evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the mid-term evaluator should be provided in detail. It should include information on:

* + Documentation review (desk study)
	+ Field visits (ideally to the 2nd targeted workshop for GEF IW projects in Africa) and
	+ Interviews and questionnaires should be held with but not limited to the following organizations and individuals: UNDP/GEF management unit from Bratislava, UNOPS, UNEP-DEPI, UNEP-DEWA, Project Team, members of Steering Committee, members of governmental ad non-governmental institutions cooperating with the project, educational and research institutions involved in and/or benefitting from the project results etc.
	+ Participatory techniques and other relevant approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

## (a) Document Review

The evaluator(s) shall familiarise themselves with the project through a review of relevant documents prior to the field visits. These documents include inter alia:

* UNDP and UNEP IW:LEARN Project Documents ([online](http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/3900))
* Terminal and mid-term Evaluations of previous phases of IW:LEARN ([online](http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/evaluations-and-impact-of-iw-learn))
* Pertinent information available at the project web site: [www.iwlearn.net/abt\_iwlearn](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn) as well as [limited access] Steering Committee Web page, e.g.,
	+ Quarterly reports and Minutes of meetings of IW:LEARN Steering Committee (in SC Community page) at [www.iwlearn.net/community](http://www.iwlearn.net/community)
* [UNDP Handbook for Programme Managers](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/mae-toc.htm): Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation and UNDP [Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/HandBook/ME-HandBook.pdf).

Selected documents which are not available through the webpage shall be provided by email to the evaluator(s) in advance of the mission or upon request from evaluator.

## (b) Field visits

The evaluator(s) will visit an IW:LEARN Africa Regional Targeted Workshop in November 2012.

**(c) Questionnaire**

The evaluator should circulate a general survey of reasonable length to the entire GEF IW portfolio, but primarily agency and project manager (with list to be provided by IW:LEARN PCU).

## (d) Interviews

The evaluator(s) will carry out interviews with:

* Project Staff (Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), Bratislava, Nairobi and Bangkok based PCU teams).
* Selected members of the IW:LEARN Steering Committee and IW Task Force.
* IW:LEARN executing partners (UNESCO, UNU, IUCN, GWP-Med, IUCN, CEP, Rhodes University)
* Representatives of the project beneficiaries: GEF IW project managers and other project stakeholders
* Other constituencies and stakeholders not directly involved in the project who may have experienced, or may be expected to experience, its impacts.

Suggested interviewees are noted in Annex III.

The Mid Term Evaluator would also provide ratings of Project achievements according to the GEF Project Review Criteria.

**Management arrangements**

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by the international independent Evaluation Expert (EE). The logistical support to the EE will be provided by the Project Coordination Unit (Bratislava) and UNOPS.

Although the independent evaluators should feel free to discuss with authorities concerned all matters relevant to their assignment, they are not authorised to make any commitment on behalf of UNOPS, UNDP, UNEP or GEF.

**Duration of the mid-term evaluation**

The assignment is expected to commence in November 2012 and be completed by mid January 2012. The MTE shall not exceed 28 consultancy days.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities**  | **Deliveries** | **Timeframe****(not to exceed)** |
|  **1** | Inception report preparation | **7 days** |
|  **2**  | Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, draft MTE report submitted and comments received  | **14 days** |
|  **3** | Final report submitted and accepted by supervisor | **7 days** |

**Duties, skills and qualifications of the Evaluation Expert**

* Duties and responsibilities
* Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTE outline (5 days homework)
* Debriefing project team and implementing partners (2 days)
* Interviews with project implementing and executing partners, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, donor representatives (3 days, Skype conferences)
* Interviews with the relevant Government representatives (4 days)
* Field visits to project sites and interviews with the key experts in the breakdown of project components (7 days)
* Development and submission of the first draft MTE report (4 days homework)
* Finalization and submission of the final MTE report (3 day homework)
* Qualifications and competencies
* 15 year of technical knowledge and experience in the thematic areas related to water resource management, environmental management, international waters, climate change, transboundary monitoring, and other environmental issues; (with at least one year of demonstrated senior management of a GEF International Waters project), and strongly preferred, familiarity with regulations and procedures of the UN System and execution of UN-implemented projects and in particular experience in GEF, UNDP, UNEP, UNOPS procedures and projects;
* An advanced degree in knowledge management, international relations, natural resource management, development studies or related fields, or equivalent demonstrated experience.
* Experience with knowledge management (KM) approaches and methodologies at a multi-institutional scale, with basic-level understanding of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) to support KM.
* Proven expertise and experience in conducting evaluations (including evaluations on international level)
* Notable experience with transboundary waters management in GEF IW project regions, particularly where pertinent to Monitoring and Evaluation and/or documenting TWM lessons.
* Sound RBM expertise (especially result-orientated monitoring and evaluation); Demonstrated ability to reliably contribute to output and outcome-based evaluations, both assessment and learning aspects; Familiarity with MTE process, UN and/or World Bank M&E procedures preferred.
* Excellent command of technical English related to water resources management language. Knowledge of one of the languages spoken in the region would be an asset.

*Also desireable:*

* Familiarity with or, ideally, work experience in GEF International Waters recipient countries and/or with donors or related NGOs;
* Proficiency in at least one other UN language (Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish or Russian).

The evaluation will be performed by an internationally recruited consultant. The consultant will have considerable knowledge and experience regarding (&/or assessing) the GEF IW operational programme, peer-to-peer facilitated learning and knowledge management. Preferably, the consultants will possess a good knowledge of TWM issues and relevant scientific understanding and in-depth experience of project evaluation techniques, particularly of those projects which are funded by GEF.

The consultants shall not have been directly involved in the design or implementation of the project.

**Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality**

The Evaluator will report on substantive & technical issues to the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and on financial matters, to UNOPS. The PCU will also receive direction from the IW:LEARN Steering Committee (SC) and Inter-Agency Forum (IAF) and, as needed, solicit progress reports, monitoring and evaluation data, etc. The Evaluator will keep the SC appraised of all project activities. UNDP and/or UNOPS shall be considered as the legal representative of the IW:LEARN project. At no point should the Evaluator make representations or act on behalf of UNDP, UNOPS or the IW:LEARN project without coordination with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor.

The international independent Evaluation Expert will be hired for maximum 28 days under Individual Consultant Agreement contract by UNOPS. He/she will be paid daily consultancy fee and travel costs (economy class ticket, and DSA). DSA and other travel related expenses will be calculated according to the UN official rates.

Every month throughout the duration of this contract, the Evaluator will provide a brief progress report (status of tasks and/or deliverables submitted). Financial summaries will be provided quarterly in line with regular reporting to UNOPS and UNDP. UNOPS payment will follow within 4 weeks of receipt and approval of all deliverables for the period.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Description** | **Indicative Due Date** | **Payment** |
| 1 | Inception report/Work plan approval | Two weeks after contract signature | 20% |
| 2 | Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report acceptance | 10 Dec 2012 | 40% |
| 3 | Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report acceptance | 21 Dec 2012 | 40% |

**Working Place**

Works taking place under this ToR will be executed from the consultants’s home location, as well as on official missions and telecommuting. There will be an in-country missions to an IW:LEARN Project Steering Committee meeting and IW:LEARN Regional Workshop in Addis Ababa. The Evaluator will make its own travel arrangements unless otherwise agreed in advance by the PCU on behalf of UNOPS.

A complete application package should consist of a CV and a letter of motivation.

**List of documents to be reviewed**

* Project document and its annexes
* Project Inception Report
* Project Annual Work Plans
* Annual/quarterly operational and progress reports
* 2012 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (APR/PIR)
* Technical reports prepared by the experts and consultants in the breakdown of the project components
* Minutes of the Steering Committee meetings

**Annex 1. Field Visit Report Format**

Date of visit: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Subject and venue of visit:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Purpose of the field visit:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes** | **Update on outcomes** | **Outputs** | **Update on outputs** | **Reasons of progress below target** | **Update on partnership strategies** | **Recommendations and proposed actions** |
|  | A brief analysis on any relevant changes pertaining to the outcome  | State output from project document or work plan | Achievements of the project in outputs  | If applicable  |  | Actions on any matter related to outcome, progress of outputs, and/or partnerships. Corrective measures. Responsibilities/time |

Project performance – implementation issues

(List the main challenges experienced during implementation and propose a way forward)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Progress towards results

Lessons learned

(Describe briefly key lessons learned during the project)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Participants in the field visit:

Prepared by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annexes:

List of persons met

Other annexes

**Annex 2. Table 1. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources**

(For projects that have undergone a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation)

A. Co-financing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing(Type/****Source)** | **IA own Financing(mill US$)** | **Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF)****(mill US$)**  |  **Bi-laterals****Donors (mill US$)** | **Central Government(mill US$)** | **Local Government(mill US$)** | **Private Sector(mill US$)** | **NGOs(mill US$)** | **Other Sources\*****(mill US$)** | **TotalFinancing(mill US$)** | **Total****Disbursement(mill US$)** |
|  | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed**  | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** |
| Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-grant Instruments**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
* Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.

**ANNEX III: Recommended Interviewees**

Contact information for all interviewees below should be posted on [http://www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net/), either in publicly accessible “Contacts” section.

This list should not be considered final. A full interview plan shall be arranged during

**Demand-Side:** *IW:LEARN Beneficiaries*

* Primary Project Beneficiaries (4-8): Managers of at least 4 GEF IW projects, from varied regions, and project types, including (but not limited to):
	+ Bay of Bengal LME (FAO)
	+ Kura-Aras River (UNDP)
	+ Humboldt Current LME (UNDP)
	+ Agulhas and Somali Current LME (UNDP)
	+ Lake Victoria (IBRD)
	+ Benguela Current LME (UNDP)
	+ CTI Sulu-Celebes Sea LME (UNDP)
	+ Coastal Tourism project (UNIDO)
	+ Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries project (SWIOFP) (IBRD)
	+ Guinea Current LME (UNDP/UNEP)
	+ More/less TBD
* Learning Participants (4-8): Participants from recent or concurrent IW:LEARN workshops (see <http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events> for schedule, with participant lists available from PCU)
* Web site developers (2-4): Personnel of other GEF IW projects charged with development of their project’s Web sites, particularly those opting to use the IW:LEARN toolbox solution (contacts from PCU).
* Other beneficiaries (0-4):
	+ National and/or NGO partners for other GEF IW projects.
	+ GEF agency and executing agency officials responsible for GEF IW projects (e.g., IW Task Force Members; agency line managers (e.g., World Bank Team Task Leaders (TTLs)); IW program managers at regional development banks, FAO IMO, OAS, UNIDO, and UNOPS);

**Supply-Side:** *IW:LEARN Project Coordination Team*

* Inter-Agency Group (all): All representatives of the inter-agency group (GEF, UNDP, UNEP-DEPI)
* Steering Committee Members/Project Executing Partners (cooperating international agencies and NGOs; 3-6): UNOPS, UNEP-DEWA, UNESCO, IUCN, UNU, GWP-Med, Rhodes University, Caribbean Environment Programme, GETF, other partners at Evaluator’s discretion.
* Project Coordination Unit (4): Mish Hamid, Khristine Custodio, Christian Ledermann, Patrick Weiler, Damaris Waigwa, Taya Santives, Montakan Chimmuang

Annex 2 – Distributed Questionnaires

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**GEF IW LEARN: “Strengthening IW Portfolio Delivery and Impact”**

My name is Andrew Menz and I have been asked to conduct a mid-term evaluation (MTE) of this project.

As per the TOR for the evaluation the MTE is intended “… *to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.”*

It’s main objective *“.. is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective and to produce plausible recommendations on how to improve the project management practices during the remaining duration of the project (scheduled completion in July 2014). The Mid-term Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability.”*

In order for me to do this and for the recommendations in my report to be as relevant and as useful to the project as possible I shall require the views of as broad a range of key stakeholders as possible. Because of your past and/or present association with all or some of the various project components you have been selected to answer this questionnaire. It is intended that for some respondents I will follow up on your comments with a direct interview by phone, skype or in person.

The current project builds on the legacy of three previous IW:LEARN projects (1998-2009) and has as its objective – “To strengthen global portfolio experience sharing and learning, dialogue facilitation, targeted knowledge sharing and replication in order to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF IW projects to deliver tangible results in partnership with other IW initiatives”

It is intended that this will be achieved through 5 substantive Components comprised of a total of 15 subcomponents, plus an additional component that includes the overall project management and monitoring and evaluation.

The project is being jointly implemented by UNDP, components 1, 2, 3 (sub-components a,b & d) and UNEP, sub-component 3c and component 4.

Most recipients will have involvement or knowledge of only a particular component(s) or sub-component (s) and should therefore only answer the questions relevant to those components.

 Your participation in this questionnaire is very much appreciated and please note comments received will not be attributed to individuals nor will the completed questionnaires be shared with third parties.

**Please return the completed questionnaire to me at the email address below before 7 January 2012 but if that is not possible as soon as possible thereafter.**

Thank you!

**Andrew Menz**

**Nijmegen, Netherlands.**

**Telephone : +31 6 53364961**

**Email :** **amenz115@gmail.com**

**Skype : andrewm212**

**A. PERSONAL DETAILS**

* Your Name: ……..
* Your Email address: ……..
* Your Organization / Affiliation: ……..
* Your Position: ……..
* Your Country: ……..
* Your Telephone Number: ……..
* Your SKYPE ID: ……..

**B. Your relationship to IWLEARN (very brief description of your role)**

* GEF: ………
* Implementing agency: ……..
* Partner/Co-sponsor: ……..
* Provider/Consultant: ……..
* Administrator: ……..
* Beneficiary: ……..
* Other stakeholder: ……..

**C. Your Relationship with IWLEARN has been or is:**

* Continuous: ……..
* Intermittent/regular: ……..
* Sporadic/occasional: ……..
* Slight: ……..

**D. Particular Aspects of IW:LEARN you are Involved with: (briefly indicate which sub-component (s) you are involved with and your role)**

* Policy/Guidance
* ………………
* Administration/Management
* ………………
* Component 1. MENARID Programme – Support via Land/Ground Water Integrated Management and Regional Portfolio Learning and Dialogue (sub-components a–c)
* ………………
* Component 2. Learning and Replication of Good Practices in Transboundary Surface and Groundwater Management (sub-components a-b)
* ………………
* Component 3. Global and GEF IW Portfolio Learning and Dialogue to Enhance Project Delivery and Impact (sub-components a-d)
* ………………
* Component 4. Information Management and Communications Platform to Support GEF IW Projects Learning and Dialogue
* ………………
* Component 5 Programmatic Management Tools and Innovative Approaches related to Climate / Water and Private Sector Participation to Enhance GEF IW Portfolio Project Performance (sub-components a-e)
* ………………
* Monitoring, Learning, Adaptive Feedback and Evaluation, and Project Management under UNDP’s coordination .
* ………………
* Other …………..

**-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**E. Whether in your opinion IWLEARN is on track to meet it’s programmed activities and outputs by the end of the project. Please respond to all components with which you are directly involved or have personal knowledge of. Please rate each component using the scale below and follow with some comment and if possible specific examples. You may wish to comment on topics such as: was the component well designed, are there significant delays in implementation or overruns in budget, should the component or related activities be modified or dropped? What more could be done to meet project objectives, and what are the prospects for sustainability? Etc.**

Please use a scale from 1 to 6 where:

1 means “highly satisfactory”

2 means “satisfactory”

3 means “moderately satisfactory”

4 means “moderately unsatisfactory”

5 means “unsatisfactory”

6 means “highly unsatisfactory”

**COMPONENT 1.** . **MENARID Programme**

Subcomponent 1a: Support to MENARID Integrated Land / Water Management

Expected **output** is: Mechanism for integration of groundwater dimensions within the MENARID programme projects

Expected **outcome** is: Improved effectiveness in combating land degradation in MENARID through and enhanced role of groundwater and improved subsurface space management

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-component 1b: Dialogue in South Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean

The expected **output** is: Regional approaches to transboundary co-operation advanced in South Eastern Europe and Mediterranean region

The expected **outcome** is: Enabling regional inter-basin co-ordination to enhance management capacity of institutions and project partners

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-component 1c: Delivering IW:LEARN Services in the GEF Regions

The expected **output** is: Three regionally-defined technical groups (Asia-Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan Africa) of GEF IW project stakeholders and partners, managed by regional institutions and conducting twinning/learning exchanges

The expected **outcome** is: Enabling regional inter-basin co-ordination to enhance management capacity of institutions and project partners

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPONENT 2 Learning and replication**

**Sub-component 2a**: **Groundwater Community of Practices**

The expected **outputs** are:

* Functioning and facilitated global Community of Practice (CoP) for GEF IW groundwater project stakeholders and partners, and regional dialogues linking GEF groundwater projects with surface and coastal environment.
* Dialogue with regional focus (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and SIDS) facilitated between GEF groundwater projects and ongoing relevant efforts
* Experience notes, policy briefs, special articles and case studies on good practices for groundwater management

The expected **outcomes** are:

* Increased capacity of GEF groundwater and freshwater basin projects to exchange experiences and replicate successful groundwater management approaches and practices to address adaptive management
* Lessons and science from GEF groundwater portfolio incorporated into and disseminated through networks, partners and processes, strengthening the GEF IW GW portfolio

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-component 2b: Surface Freshwater Community of Practice**

The expected **output** is: Functioning and facilitated global Community of Practice (CoP) for GEF IW surface freshwater project stakeholders and partners, and regional dialogues linking GEF surface freshwater projects with groundwater and coastal environment.

The expected **outcome** is: Increased capacity of GEF groundwater and freshwater basin projects to exchange experiences and replicate successful groundwater management approaches and practices to address adaptive management

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Component 3. Global and GEF IW portfolio**

Sub-component 3a: 6th Biennial International Waters Conference

The expected **outputs** are:

1. 6th Biennial GEF International Waters Conference in the Mediterranean region

2 .Project results presented at IWC-6 collated, analyzed and disseminated in proceedings (an in journal articles, Experience Notes)

3. IWC6 Host Mediterranean Region dedicated session at IWC6

The expected **outcome** is: Global GEF IW portfolio performance and capacities strengthened, in particular among project managers of GEF IW projects.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-component 3b: Global Dialogue Participation**

The expected **output** is: Facilitated dissemination of best practices from GEF IW projects and partners in approved global dialogues processes to transfer experiences and know-how.

The expected **outcome** 3b is: Increased awareness of GEF IW experiences, achievements and partnerships with non-GEF supported interventions.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-component 3c: IW Science Partnership

The expected **outputs** are:

1. Completion of the first GEF IW Science Conference

2. Functional scientific network integrating IW project experts and the wider scientific community

The expected **outcome** is: Improved technical implementation of projects through strengthening the science base of IW projects and improved integration of the wider science community into these projects.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-Component 3d: IW Focal Area Portfolio Results Dissemination

The expected **outputs** are:

1. GEF IW project results and achievements captured in peer-reviewed journal.

2. The achievements of the GEF IW Focal Area presented in two publications focusing on marine and freshwater systems.

3. The achievements of the GEF IW Focal Area presented in a 20 minute film.

The expected **outcomes** from sub-component 3d are:

Increased awareness of GEF IW experiences and achievements and partnership with non- GEF supported Interventions

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPONENT 4. Information Management and Communication Platform**

Component 4: Information Management and Communications Platform to Support GEF IW Projects Learning and Dialogue

The expected **outputs** from component 4 are:

* IW Resource Center with user driven and user-friendly functionality for regional and thematic communities of practice (CoPs) and individual project websites
* Training and technical assistance for individual project website and links to UN-Water family platforms, to support targeted knowledge sharing and dialogues.
* Portfolio visualization tools (utilizing e.g. Google Earth and video), applications and regular dissemination including e-updates.
* Workspaces for specific portfolio subgroups such as COPs, project managers and governments and IWFT.
* A comprehensive searchable catalogue of GEF IW project experiences and results.

The **outcomes** from component 4:

* Improved web-based and knowledge management and utilisation of the IW Resource center and project communication platforms.
* Enhanced visibility and visualization of project activities and results facilitates cooperation and replication.
* Enhanced stakeholder access to data and results from IW projects.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPONENT 5 Programmatic Management tools**

Sub-Component 5a: TDA- SAP Methodology and Course

The expected **output is**: A revised, and GEF IWTF endorsed, TDA/SAP on-line training course that incorporates emerging issues of gender mainstreaming, financial sustainability, and supports new approaches to adaptive management for climatic variability & change

The **outcome** is: Improved standardization and harmonization of new GEF methodological approaches as well as results-based management in IW projects to help address new global issues & improve performance, including vulnerability to climatic variability & change in transboundary basins.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-Component 5b: Focal Area/ Project Manager Manual and Course

The expected **outputs** are:

Leadership training for IW project managers, based on an IW Focal Area on-line manual and capacity building to support skills required including understanding RBM and train in utilisation of GEF IW tracking tool, including:

* Finalised concept utilised in DVDs, web and printed
* Training course material demonstrated at IWC6

The expected **outcomes** are: Improved standardization and harmonization of new GEF methodological approaches as well as results-based management in IW projects to help address new global issues & improve performance, including vulnerability to climatic variability & change in transboundary basins.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-component 5c: Index-Insurance Pilot**

The expected **outputs** are: Testing of 2-3 risk insurance mechanisms and other economic instruments on the basis of vetted climate risk methodology

The expected **outcomes** are: Improved standardization and harmonization of new GEF methodological approaches as well as results-based management in IW projects to help address new global issues & improve performance, including vulnerability to climatic variability & change in transboundary basins.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-component 5d: Private Sector Engagement**

The expected **outputs** are: GEF IW and other experiences with public-private partnerships codified and demonstrated in 2-3 new projects.

The expected **outcomes** are: Public-private partnerships promoted and facilitate sustainability of GEF IW interventions

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sub-component 5e: Mainstreaming Climate Impacts in IW

The expected **output** is: Methodology to address climatic variability & change impacts in shared water bodies

The expected **outcomes** are: Improved standardization and harmonization of new GEF methodological approaches as well as results-based management in IW projects to help address new global issues & improve performance, including vulnerability to climatic variability & change in transboundary basins.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**F. Monitoring, Learning, Adaptive Feedback and Evaluation.**

For the purposes of the MTE the elements have been separated as follows

1. Implementation arrangements including support from UNDP and UNEP

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Project management oversight and direction – please comment on the following:

* Interagency Forum

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Project Steering Committee

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Technical Advisory Group

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Project Coordination Unit

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Financial management and reporting

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Administrative support from Execution agencies, procurement, HR, etc.

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

k

**G. Regarding the online services related to various project activities provided via IW.LEARN. net.**

Please indicate under each activity service below (links provided) how frequently you use this service using a scale of a to d where

a. Frequently

b. Sometimes

c. Rarely

d. Never

How do you rate this service? Use the previously described 1 to 6 scale and give any other ocomments you might have.

Activity 1a: Support to MENARID Integrated Land / Water Management (UNESCO)

[**https://menarid.icarda.org/Pages/default.aspx**](https://menarid.icarda.org/Pages/default.aspx)

Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 1c: Delivering IW:LEARN Services in the GEF Regions

**[www.iwlearn.net/abt\_iwlearn/events](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events)**

[Frequency ……](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events)

[Rating ……..](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events)

[Comments ……..](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events)

Activity 2a:       Groundwater Community of Practice

**<https://community.iwlearn.net/communities/groundwater-cop/>**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 2b:       Surface Freshwater Community of Practice

**<https://community.iwlearn.net/communities/surface-freshwater-cop/view.html>**

 Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 3a:       6th Biennial International Waters Conference

 **[www.iwlearn.net/iwc2011](http://www.iwlearn.net/iwc2011)**

 Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 3c.i:     GEF IW Science Conference

[**www.iwlearn.net/iwsc2012**](http://www.iwlearn.net/iwsc2012) **& <https://community.iwlearn.net/communities/international-waters-science-conference-2012/view.html>**

Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 3d.ii:    20 years of the GEF IW – Publications

[**http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/3900/outreach/from-community-to-cabinet-two-decades-of-gef-action-to-secure-transboundary-river-basins-and-aquifers**](http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/3900/outreach/from-community-to-cabinet-two-decades-of-gef-action-to-secure-transboundary-river-basins-and-aquifers)

Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 4a.i:     IW:LEARN Web Platform

 **[www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net/)**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 4a.ii:    Training and technical assistance for the development of individual IW:LEARN project websites

 [**www.iwlearn.net/abt\_iwlearn/events**](http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events) **& <http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit>**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 4a.iv:   Portfolio Visualization

[**http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/@@project-map-view.html**](http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/%40%40project-map-view.html) **(portfolio level visualization) and** [**geonode.iwlearn.org**](http://geonode.iwlearn.org/) **(project-level spatial data)**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Ebulletin

[http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/e-bulletin/newsletter](http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/e-bulletin/newsletterFrequency%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6Rating%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..Comments%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..)

[Frequency ……](http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/e-bulletin/newsletterFrequency%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6Rating%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..Comments%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..)

[Rating ……..](http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/e-bulletin/newsletterFrequency%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6Rating%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..Comments%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..)

[Comments ……..](http://iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/e-bulletin/newsletterFrequency%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6Rating%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..Comments%20%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6..)

Activity 4a.v:    Online workspaces for project activities (UNEP)

[community.iwlearn.net](http://community.iwlearn.net/)

Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 5a: TDA – SAP Methodology and Course (UNDP)

**<http://manuals.iwlearn.net/tda-sap-methodology>**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 5b: Focal Area/ Project Manager Manual and Course (UNDP)

**<http://manuals.iwlearn.net/project-management-manual>**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

Activity 5d: Private Sector Engagement (UNDP)

[**http://manuals.iwlearn.net/public-private-partnerships-guidebook**](http://manuals.iwlearn.net/public-private-partnerships-guidebook) **(not launched yet)**

  Frequency ……

Rating ……..

Comments ……..

**H.** Briefly what are the main benefits you and/or your organisation receive from IW:LEARN?

………………

**I.** What benefits do you believe IW:LEARN brings to the GEF IW Portfolio?

………………

**J.** What would be your vision for a self sustaining IW:LEARN?

…………………

**K.** If you have sufficient information to judge how would you rate the current overall success rate of the project?

Your rating and opinion \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**L.** Please write below any additional comments or suggestions that might assist with this evaluation

**………….**

------------------‘’’’--------------------

Single question sent separately:

It is acknowledged by all that Project Managers have a challenging and often onerous task  to achieve their project objectives in the time available.  This is one reason often cited for lack of participation in the IW:LEARN online CoP platforms.

Do you agree with this statement and if not what changes to the online CoPs would encourage you to participate more?

Annex 3 – Minutes of SCM meeting held 15-16 January 2013

GEF International Waters: Learning Exchange and

Resource Network (IW:LEARN)

**IW:LEARN3 Steering Committee Meeting:**

**Action/Decision Items & Discussion Notes**

**IW:LEARN III Steering Committee Meeting**

**15-16 January 2013 – IUCN Office in Gland, Switzerland**

# IWLEARN3 PSC - Action/Decision Items & Discussion Notes – 15-16 January 2013

Underline indicates who is responsible, **bold** indicates by when

## Action/Decision Items

### Workplan

Communities of Practice

1. DECISION: Link participation in twinnings & global dialogues to participation in the communities of practice.

2. UNEP IWL PCU to complete improvements to the Community space by **22 Feb**. DECISION: If improvements are not sufficiently completed, UNESCO will move the Groundwater CoP to the AKVO platform and work with UN IGRAC.

4. Khristine to get clear schedule from the Sixfeetup consultants regarding when the changes will be implemented.

5. IUCN to prepare a schedule of content to be showcased on the Community platform. This will include a monthly topic of conversation, led by an expert on a specific topic to catalyze participation.

Website

6. UNEP IWL PCU to give media gallery a more slideshow format.

7. UNEP IWL to hire a consultant to have an independent review of the website and the different platforms of which it is composed by **15 Feb**.

8. IWL to hire a student/intern to do quality control on the website and ensure that the information is accurate and up to date.

9. IWL will organize a technical design (knowledge management strategy) concept note to guide the website enhancements.

Visualization

10. IWL team to update outline for the Visualization and share with PSC on how to proceed.

11. IWL Work with specific projects from each region (IWCAM, BCLME/Orange River, PEMSEA/South China Sea, Danube/Black Sea) to mine for information to pilot the visualization, particularly from TDA datasets. Acquire datasets, maps, videos and photos.

TDA-SAP

12. COPs and WGs to be asked for comments on the ecosystem specific guidance for the TDA/SAP Methodology. Martin to prepare questions to ask. IWL to organize by **31 Jan**.

13. DECISION: 5000$ to be set aside to hire a consultant to look at the TDA for Groundwater.

Journal

14. DECISION: PSC agrees to fund the 2-3,000$ necessary to fund the supplementary journal issue from existing funds.

15. IWL to contact (Bill Parr – Black Sea Project, Dr. Ken Sherman, John Pernetta, Lucy Scott) and transboundary bodies (Black Sea Commission, Caspian convention) many of whom run science conferences (this will be for the supplemental issue).

Index-Insurance

16. DECISION: Cancel the index insurance activity.

MENARID

17. IWL PCU to post MENARID outputs and workshop agendas to IWLEARN.net. UNESCO to consolidate learning materials associated with MENARID activity into the Groundwater CoP.

Regional Workshops/Twinning

18. IWL to pursue the use of more visual reporting, such as video experience notes.

### Other areas: Sustainability, Cofinance, IWC7, Collaboration with partners

19. All partners to complete a one page document with a preliminary indication of how their respective activities will be sustained after June 2014 by **15 Feb**, with full plans by **15 Oct.**

20. DECISION: IWL to look into further collaboration with NOAA including sharing their blog, working on visualization, sending projects to existing NOAA trainings.

21. IWL PSC to conduct a teleconference meeting in **mid-Feburary** to review MTE findings. A face-to-face PSC meeting will be conducted to review progress in **6 to 7 months** (likely as a one-day meeting after the IWC7 but ideally elsewhere).

22. IWL PSC should prepare a “what is” IW:LEARN publication and also include it in PM manual (including how projects might allocate their 1% and other related issues)

## Changes to Budget Allocations

* $85000 taken away from index-insurance activity and will be either reprogrammed or saved to replenish existing activities
* $5000 to be spent on groundwater-specific TDA aspects
* $3000 (approximately) to be spent on second issue of IW Journal

## Changes to Results Framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Targets  | Change? |
| % MENARID projects incorporating GW management planning | 100% of MENARID projects incorporate 5 new management planning activities of GW use/protection in their activities. | 100% of MENARID projects incorporate new management planning activities of GW use/protection in their activities. |
| Number of IW projects referenced in scientific literature  | 10 IW projects are ‘cited’ in the Science Citation Index | [Now associated with IW Journal] |
| % of IW projects submitting papers to journal | 40% of IW portfolio submit papers for consideration in Journal | 24 GEF IW projects submit articles for consideration in journal |
| % readers satisfied | Reader surveys indicate 75% satisfied and willing to contribute / read future editions | ~~Reader surveys indicate 75% satisfied and willing to contribute / read future editions~~ |
| IW project start up time reduced | Start-up phase of projects take 50% less time | ~~Start-up phase of projects take 50% less time~~ |
| Majority of project stakeholders accept index-insurance methodology | Acceptance by stakeholders of approach | ~~Acceptance by stakeholders of approach~~ |
| Number of IW projects using approach | At least one IW projects utilize methodology | ~~At least one IW projects utilize methodology~~ |
| Number of IW projects using approach to climatic variability & change | Agreed methodology developed and piloted in 5 GEF5 IW projects; Acceptance of approach by IWTF for use in all IW projects | Agreed methodology developed and piloted in 5 GEF5 IW projects; ~~Acceptance of approach by IWTF for use in all IW projects~~ |
| Number of IW projects with sustainable private sector finances | 10 projects have developed/promoted public-private sector engagement  | 10 projects have been assisted with the development/promotion public-private sector engagement |

## Discussion Notes

### 0. Partner Welcome Comments

GEF: Chris S.

* Streamlining the IW:LEARN into the daily work of the GEF?
* What is the sustainability? New institutions to contribute? UNECE? Ads through the website? Explore some new ways to get funding, how to access a new set of viewers?
* Stronger links to other website?
* Finish some of the activities? What to take to the next phase?
* We need a roadmap for the next phase.

UNDP: Vladimir M.

* A great degree of change from an academic first phase. Other focal areas trying to choose the best practices from the program.
* How to help us sustain the programmatic approach, move some of the activities out to them. Hard to know if there is going to be another phase. Maybe incremental funding to support, but it is not much. At this stage to help our partners absorb the activities within their mandate.
* Global LME Governance Project – No longer a COP, looking for the organization to host and sustain it.

UNEP-DEPI: Isabelle v. D

* Unique in the PCU all over the world. It is a dynamic process that leads to unique challenges.
* Mid-term evaluation is an important time, to continue as is, or change.
* The GEF not interested in continually funding the same project in different phases.
* At the time of the formulation of GEF6, it is an ideal time to think of how IW:LEARN fits in.
* Visualization – difficulty of acquiring the data for it. Need projects to send the info from their TDA/SAPs, etc. TWAP gets the results of the assessment, tailor it into an interesting manner to reach a wider audience. This approach is something we should consider for IW:LEARN. How to get the data sets from the projects?

UNOPS: Katrin L.

* Relevant for UNOPS as they both serve a portfolio of projects. Need the tools to deliver the quality services and have a sustainable impact, and have high objectives.
* Because of the timeframe to IW:LEARN, how to make sure activities are delivered within it.

Tweak the agenda, limit the MTE discussion on points that are already in the agenda, add time to the discussion on the Progress Report.

UNESCO: Lucilla M.

* Important time, reflect in three ways, actions and achievements, lessons learned, and to plan ahead what to do in the 18 months.
	+ Celebrate and take a critical look
* Groundwater plays major role
* Message -> important document, analysis of the GEF GW portfolio
	+ A Good variety of projects, to include in the GW COP, integration dialogue and exchanges with the other COP
* Good News – Through reaching out to the GW community, we see that the shared vision is there and there is a need to have a hub for GW to share the vision on the global agenda.
	+ Reliability of tools – saying this since the beginning to have a good tool to do the work
	+ Sustainability – thought about how to sustain the initiative, concrete proposals for this.
	+ Benefit and advocacy – b give something to members, who have a stake in it (ie. TDA/SAP on aquifers), advocacy to take the exercise to a higher level to influence higher levels policy
	+ Urgency and momentum – half through, need to deliver and be effective.

GWP-MED Dimitris:

* It is working in the region – dialogue is now happening, exchange of information and knowledge is stimulating new cooperation on the ground, on specific basins (Drin for example), pursuing other basin level cooperation. Hoping to replicate this in other areas of the med
* IW:LEARN is bringing people together, inter-commission discussions without the necessity of GWP Med mediating or facilitating. The Prespa Lake can now pick up the phone and call the Sava directly.
* Into a dialogue in specific areas. But, some areas not progressing as fast as others.
* Different view than Chris, taking core money around which more institutions can come in to do the job. GWP Med in SE Europe, convening power has a say. Institutions gathering around a line of activities and contributing.

UNEP-DEWA TWAP Kaisa U:

* D&I management part of the project.
* TWAP to produce global assessment of all the systems, D&I key part of this to produce a harmonized way of visualizing the results.
* Finalize the specifications

UNU: Dansie A

* 3 Activities, Upcoming journal, marine publication, and film

IUCN: Mark S.

* Need to identify how to overcome some of the hurdles that have been experienced
* What worked – prioritizing working topics with the projects, being clear about what people want to be hearing about, and providing guidance in these areas through good engagement with the regional activities, and mobilizing into the face-to-face events.
	+ Some success in getting focal points in helping to be proactive.
* Challenge – how to catalyze the participation of the project network outside of the face to face events. How to make it intense and focused enough to make positive results. We still don’t have the formula for this. Review and dialogue for this. That is the crux of the issue. More specificity on what to focus on for the rest of the program.

### 1. Progress report against Workplan to date, Review of Remaining Activities 2012 (discussion of any delays, corrections) and Achievements Against Results Framework

*Note that one should refer to both the progress against the results framework and the workplan to fully understand progress to date. These discussion notes do not contain nearly all of that.*

1a MENARID Programme Support (UNESCO)

Progress: ICARDA leading the way, platform is ready to use for us to use, get major stakeholder participation. Strong relationships with the projects, UNESCO has held two workshops (8 in Jordan), traditional hydraulic structures (Iran). Strong relationship with ICARDA working in the MENARID region (was working in Aleppo), project to coordinate the MENARID projects (M&E Project) run by IFAD. Another platform has been made. 4 planning activities, and one was the facilitation of the multi-framework meeting.

Discussion:

Isabelle – we should make the learning materials available to the wider portfolio. Is available in the GW COP as well as the ICARDA platform, upload the presentations on the iwlearn.net website. Need to send notification and include in the e-bulletin.

Lucilla – GW not addressed clearly in the LD projects, needs to be made more explicitly. It would not need external help to address it if it was changed. Not a common sense of identity.

Chris – the programme was built on a strong political interest. GW will be much more explicit in the GEF6 strategy.

Target:

Andy – unclear about what was meant by the indicator. 5 is an arbitrary #. They have done this through the activities of UNESCO and MENARID. BOTTOM LINE – it will achieve its outcomes. Anything that comes out of this meeting will be supported in the report. But observations are preliminary at this point.

1b Mediterranean Regional Dialogues (GWP-Med)

Progress: Workshops have been good, diversion to the Middle East region, haven’t done the roundtable for that activity. 5 Workshops have been held. A number of partnerships have been made and up kept. 2 of 3 international roundtables (one in the Western Balkans and one in Rome) have been held. Revision to the website and everything from the region has been completed. There will be a capacity building workshop, likely in partnership with UNEP ROA and Cornell.

Discussion:

Dimitris – 3rd international roundtable to be this year (Hydropower in TB basins), 0.5 new process/initiative started. Working with the Sava Commission, assisted in the preparation of the stakeholder analysis. Several other initiatives that cannot be claimed as part of IW:LEARN, but are in fact brainchildren of it (Catalytic impacts).

Target:

Andy – Can maybe tweak a little bit, but nothing major to change in the prodoc other than some of the language.

1c Regional Workshops

Progress: Four targeted workshops completed (2 Afr., 1 LAC, 1 Asia). Project twinning exchanges in LAC, Africa and Asia catalogued. West Africa workshop in Ethiopia, in cooperation e with UNECE. Difficulties working with SEASTART, so we are putting together relationship with PEMSEA. Two twinning’s in LAC, Two twinning’s in Asia (Baikal and BOBLME), some coming in Africa.

Discussion:

Isabelle – Dec. twinning in Brasilia on TDA/SAP leading to better management approaches in the participating projects. Needs to be thought of more in the catalytic impacts it can have. Through twinning, CLME project and Amazon working together on scope of projects. IW:LEARN needs to record this.

Mish – Catalytic impact of BCLME and Orange River.

Mark – Catalytic impact of environmental flows in LAC region because of IWL2. We need to think of why these impacts happened, and how to replicate it. We shouldn’t leave the stories from the previous phases behind. We could do a small exercise.

Mish – The proposition of a study of the follow up actions of promises made.

Lucilla – In the Asia-Pacific regional workshop, due to a presentation from Pacific IWRM, UNESCO thought to invite them to the GW presentation in Asia, where exchanges were made. They came with a delegation of 5, interacted with other projects in Asia as well as having a surface and groundwater exchange and interaction.

Mark – missing link to the COP with the twinning’s, as they are prime opportunities to galvanize communication on the COPs, both in the preparation and the sharing of outputs if we had in the proposal, how to engage with the COP and what do you need from the COP. These kinds of opportunities to grasp cooperation are important to consider getting an articulation with the COPs.

Lucilla – different form of reporting on these stages, different forms of interaction could be considered in the twinning exchanges. It could be in the form of videos instead of written material.

Andy – one of the few projects that can track long term impacts and evaluation.

Target:

Andy – importance of gathering the information to show this. Indicator on new projects being started as a result of IWLEARN. Mish to propose new language for this activity.

2a Groundwater CoP and Dialogues & 2b Surface Water Community of Practice (IUCN)

Discussion:

Lucilla – A wishlist was prepared that was simple: googledocs, photo galleries/videos, etc., but the delivery failed to meet expectations. Want to have meetings that can’t happen face to face. It needs to be as similar as possible to face to face meetings, so visuals are important. Suggestion of akvo as an alternative platform. Not to reproduce iwlearn.net, but instead be an interactive center.

Lucilla – Issues around: the adequacy and reliability of tools, sustainability, content benefits advocacy urgency and momentum. There is a desire to have structured public dialogues, with an expert in that area to facilitate with a forum instead of a blog to promote peer to peer discussion. Too many clicks to access the media center. You have to download the file before being able to view it. A better platform won’t ensure that things will work, but at least it won’t be an obstacle. Proposal to move things to IGRAC.

Mark – wants to focus on the experiences outside of the platform. Surface water side deliberately wanted to build engagement outside the bounds of the platform. Experience in building engagement of the constituencies, where the face to face elements work quite well.

Assessed the needs of the projects and delivered events that were well received on those topics. Task was to build exchanges beyond those meetings. Tried a few avenues to do so, including interviews, small group discussions, using the learning briefings to see if there is something that they can get out of it. The limitations of the platform have caused some issues.

Overarching issue – people are motivated for (for example) the worldwewant site, and people are motivated at the face to face level for services, but then it falls flat. We don’t have the right formula to solve that. The Question of how to orient what we are doing to overcome the hurdles. Believes it’s more about focusing the activities around face to face meetings, all the events from yesterday. Also taking advantage of the platform.

Stefano – Addis workshop engagement in a good way, following up with a selection of projects that indicated their learning needs in practice and what could be done to help them in the shorter term. Underestimation of the amount of time to make it relevant to them. 3-4 projects have been able to formulate requests to the community. The challenge for the person to post on the blog, and the learning briefs. Agreement in BKK about trying to have some sort of hybrid version public/private platform. There has been difficulty in getting feedback from projects on the learning briefs that have been produced. Good exchange in the LAC (Amazon/IWCAM), string of COP type events would be interesting to organize.

Chris – what expectations to get out of it, why go there? Not sure if he would go there to debate

Mark – getting at knowledge sets and expertise that would be available on the community.

Mark – asking people to comment on the materials on the platform, because it’s not really easy, they lose interest. From Addis workshop, some concrete needs were identified, wanted to move it to the platform. An individual wanted comments on a TOR. Problem of people to do it when they leave. Issues around indigenous communities and engagement – Stefano had to post questions himself because he couldn’t post the question himself.

Andy – It will be interesting to see if new platform works for UNESCO and how it stays with the iwlearn COPs.

Vladimir – wanted it to be an active dialogue, brought in partners to have word of outside word to GEF projects and vice versa. We wanted active provocateurs, to provide for an active exchange and blogging.

Very little in the way of discussions have been initiated, wanted a monthly topic of conversation, ask them to contribute to the discussion, and then post a note in from the discussions. Bring in an external discussant, have a learning note to share within and outside the portfolio. Want more proactive discussion. Example, ask Phil Weller, how did you prepare the Roof Report for EU? maybe write a learning note. First of April we need a well functioning platform. Sustainability – how to sustain the activities that are being run now?

Isabelle – e-fora experience with Deltamerica was similar, needs to have proper moderation. Water Issues announcements list, you get prompted.

Mish – IUCN has own organizational blog, postings every 2 weeks. Have a webinar every month. Have a bulletin for each COP to describe what’s on the platform. On the demand side, maybe the community is overloaded.

Lucilla – GW Portfolio analysis from before the platform was created, phone interviews and email.

Tine – Chose KARL because they can interact through their email. Best way to communicate is still through email. KARL can do that, and is serving its purpose as a place to download from. Consultants didn’t deliver. IW:LEARN doesn’t have a video server, so we need to use youtube. For that we need to upgrade the system.

Andy – the need to have a link to reach both from the iwlearn site.

Mark – how to move forward? Continue to build around the face to face program. Work as v says in putting in place a scheduled program of interactive dialogues with partners. Include within that blogs. It is important to emphasize the word proactive, everybody needs to be proactive in pushing it, and engage in it. Get them signed up, use that as a way of engaging people. A network being formed for IRBM network, opportunity to galvanize their input into the pro-activeness. Detects lack of clarity of the goals. Need to have the means of contacting members, or is it about mobilizing discussions about surface water.

We want the WGs on the platform, we want the comments on ecosystem specific type guidance to be discussed on the workspace

Andy – Need to make formal contractual arrangement and absorb it into a new TOR for the payment agreements.

Evaluate Feb. 22, deadline for the platform. Talk with the team and then let the SC know in the report of the date that the platform will be ready by. We need to get ahold of sixfeetup and get schedule, need to know within their team when they can get it done.

Targets:

Targets for surface – keeping them

Targets for GW – keeping them

3a IWC6 (UNDP)

Progress:

Completed in Oct. 2011, released evaluation report. Didn’t want to write another conference report, so we are instead doing combo-super document. Many projects don’t submit TTs. Projects submitted far different documents for their results notes (lack of UNDP, but those are being submitted now).

Report giving guidance on the different indicators is being prepared that will give examples by means of the results notes that were compiled and categorized.

Discussion:

Isabelle – Obligation to submit the PIR at midterm and at the end. UNEP asks for it yearly. Because the TT is not part of the same mechanism.

The Tracking Tool to work with the Results Archive.

Dansie – The possibility of writing an article on the importance of IWC.

Targets: Targets met.

3b Global Dialogues (UNDP)

Global dialogue participation, need to send 4 per year, we can escalate this by effectively having a calendar. IW:LEARN needs to prepare a calendar of events, to ensure timely involvement or projects in global dialogues. Need from the IWTF which projects should go where.

Discussion:

UNECE Climate Change and Adaptation in transboundary basins on 25-27 June, Seminar on joint bodies (river basin commissions) on 34-24 Sept. Apr. thematic assessment on water-energy-food-ecosystems nexus will start . Post 2015 consultation on the water theme to formulate the recommendations Groundwater day in the Hague, to go to the UN SG, good time to get input from the projects. Oct. Hungarian government is organizing a GW summit.

3c IW Science Partnership (UNEP)

Progress:

IWSC related work is pretty much done. Event has been held, the materials have been uploaded to the community platform, the only outstanding work is the evaluation form (UNEP to do?).

Discussion:

Possibility of holding a session at IWC7 about the results of the IWSC. Hold a follow up meeting in March/April 2014 to recap the findings of the science conference. They know that we would not have a science conference every year, but would be imbedded as part of the IWC, look at the questionnaires to see what came out of it.

Dansie – instead of the preworkshop sessions, use the sessions to design what is covered in those sessions.

Targets:

Some of the targets (30% of conference on groundwater) may not be reachable.

Andy – how was it envisaged that projects in the science conference would make it into the science citation index. This indicator will be moved and reassigned to the IW Journal activity.

3c IW Science Partnership (UNDP)

Progress: WGs submitting key findings and recommendations for policy makers.

Discussion:

Getting the final outputs from the WGs to be the final output of the Scientific Network

Part of the sustainability would be to bring everyone together and host it in one spot in the COPs. Can the STAP be part of this? Possibly, but unlikely.

Existing task and 4 left to come to be turned into a policy document to be launched.

3d IW Focal Area Portfolio Results Dissemination (UNU) – Publications, Film and Journal

Progress: Freshwater Publication is revision has been finished. Marine publication should have been finished by now, delayed until this year by the GEFSEC, didn’t want to compete with the catalyzing ocean financing of the UNDP. About celebrating the achievements of the marine portfolio, content map has been finished, expected to be finished at the end of Feb. IW Journal to be published in July 2013, articles being submitted with the ultimate deadline being Feb. 1st.

Discussion:

Suggestions made for authors to contact (Bill Parr – Black Sea Project, Dr. Ken Sherman, John Pernetta, Lucy Scott) and transboundary bodies (Black Sea Commission, Caspian convention) many of whom run science conferences.

Policy Maker commentaries are being sought.

PSC decides to devote the necessary $2,000-3,000 necessary to publish the supplementary issue.

There are 2 risks

 -people don’t submit

 -papers submitted bad

Targets:

Dansie – to tweak the target of 40% of projects submitting articles for the issue, with the best published (i.e.). Instead, we are changing the indicator to 24 projects submitting articles for consideration.

Reader surveys indicate 75% satisfied. how to measure? It is decided to get rid of satisfaction indicator.

Scrap the final indicator (50% of GEF IW projects indicate at least one example of sharing practices.)

3d IW Focal Area Portfolio Results Dissemination (UNDP)

Progress: IW Film – supposed to be done for Rio, video version of the two books, didn’t have the marine the content until a couple months ago, discussion about how much it should cost. 40,000$ in the budget, need to find a way to co-finance it. UNDP has a professional media team who can do filming for much cheaper. Need to get a scriptwriter and someone to get the footage. We have the right to use the footage.

4a IWLEARN Web Platform (UNEP)

Discussion:

Media Gallery Issues, 3 click rule. Questionnaire revealing that people are not fully content with the site, but difficulty of conveying what is missing.

Independent Review of the website? Lots of information but we cannot effectively deliver the information to the public. Needs to be someone that is external, analysis of the website, presentation, etc.

Needs to be a technical design concept note to guide the PCU, and then come in to get a designer to advise on what. We need to know exactly what we NEED. Knowledge management concept note needs to be integrated

Quality Control – Student to help us to look at the data for all the projects. Maybe we could send out request for updates.

What would happen in 18 months at the time of the IW:LEARNs end? UNEP to take over hosting duty.

Target: satisfaction, hits and downloads are somewhat un-ambitious

4b Training and technical assistance for project website development (UNEP)

Progress:

5 ICT workshops, 2 more, well attended (~20 projects in each) covering a variety of topics (1 during IWC, and 1 at another point)

Project Websites, difficulties in inducing projects to make a website, particularly WB projects.

4bb Links to UN-Water Family Platform (UNEP)

Progress:

Linked to all the UN-Water Websites, when we had the meeting with the AIS

4cc Regular news dissemination including e-updates (UNEP)

Progress:

Had gotten behind on our bulletins, but we caught up with them in December with three issues.

Discussion:

Include important events from the COPs in the e-bulletin

Perhaps make ecosystem-specific e-bulletins

4c Portfolio Visualization (UNEP)

Progress:

Visualization Tool should be ready at Q 1or 2. We are in dire need of more data for the visualization – noted in the IWTF meeting in Nov. but we not received more data since.

Comments:

Need to collaborate with the TWAP to ensure that we are at least compatible.

What data to get? Location of project, demonstration sites and hotspots.

The data from the TDA should be part of the visualization. Issues relating to the TDAs lacking the data behind them.

Solution: Start with the projects that have the most advanced data, speak with the IT person and take the data that they have and start uploading it to the system. Pilot Projects from each major region to be chosen. LAC – IWCAM, Afr. – Orange River and/or BCLME, Asia – PEMSEA or South China Sea.

What to do with the data? Chris – Expectations to be able to show basin trends.

Request is to work project by project with the IT persons to get as much as possible and information from there. Provide a link that is easily accessible, and that can be used for building maps, photos and videos. Too big a task to work with all the projects, but big enough to create a couple of test cases (preferably one from each region, including a representation from the different ecosystems) that may induce more cooperation from the rest of the projects (Using processed data).

Jointly agree on an outline on how to proceed with the visualization

-What happened to agreed outcomes at a 2011 meeting of Vladimir, Johannes and Christian?

4d On-line workspaces for project activities (UNEP)

Progress: Some are being used for different portfolio subsets

4e IW Project Results Archive (UNEP)

Progress:

We have gathered data from the results notes and tracking tools that will serve as the data and content to show for the results archive. We expect to have a prototype ready in the Q1.

Target: Target is 90% of projects have information on IWLearn…which will be challenging especially for older projects.

5a TDA-SAP Methodology and Course (UNDP)

Progress:

Course has been prepared, but is currently being updated to be in line with the expected changes desired by the GEF and other PSC members. Martin to respond to the comments from the GEF, and to the comments made by the aforementioned groups

Discussion:

The COPs to get comments from the WGs and the two communities on ecosystem specific guidance. Need to look at the areas that are missing for a specific body to make recommendations for the SAP.**$5000 will be devoted to hiring a consultant to compile information necessary for a groundwater TDA.**

Martin will formulate the question draft to the WGs (with Furqan and Jennifer to get the info from the WGs). Comments will be two week by the time of sending it.

Review through Scientific Network and then try to set it up on **the WVLC. The platform is almost done.**

5b Focal Area / Project Manager Manual (UNDP)

Progress:

Manual is uploaded onto manuals.iwlearn.net. Ongoing harvesting of information from the other projects by Peter. There is a need to market the Manual. The accompanying course to be done this quarter.

Discussion:

Have the consultant review the manuals platform. Change the home to iwlearn.net on the manuals platform instead of the landing page. More videos to be uploaded with each project talking about a specific theme.

The GEF should make this mandatory as part of the inception phase

Certification like the security in the field course? Indicator target could be how many project managers obtain certification. Could also be part of the PIR or TT.

Target: Targets difficult to meet (satisfaction, startup time)

5c Index – Insurance Pilot (UNDP)

Progress:

Co-finance never materialized, thus **this activity will need to be scrapped.**

Comments:

There is a necessity to write a report why it is not needed and will not be implemented in the MTE.

5d Private Sector Engagement (GETF)

Progress:

Manual has been produced and comments just received from the GEFSEC, which will be incorporated and added into the content that is already uploaded and ready to be published on the online manuals platform.

Discussion:

ASCLME partnerships? How all the different entities are working with the private sector. Proposal from Dimitris regarding a financing transboundary waters management with a wide spectrum of stakeholders to have at the IWC7, and roundtable with the EU presidency. Patrick proposal to engage with a wider group of private sector partners in hopes of forming an ongoing advisory council based off of sustainable leaders recognized in the Global compact or similar body.

Suggestions to engage a wider set of partners including UN Global Compact CEO Water Mandate, Alliance for Water Stewardship, also look at the WWF for their work, Groundwater governance project (part of the project to assess the state of the art in private sector engagement – Netherlands with the European consultation)

Target:

Should be amended to assisting partnerships instead of concluding them.

5e Mainstreaming Climate Impacts in IW (UNDP)

Discussion:

Supposed to be linked strongly to the TDA/SAP. Will be engaging a consultant in the near future to do a synopsis of existing materials already in existence.

Targets:

Scratch the in all in the IWTF endorsement requirement – out of control of the project

### Warming up Exercise: Vision for the Future

Endeavors:

* Vision for IW:LEARN, what to be in the future?
* Overall, and what should be done in a future phase.

On the strategic side

* To assist, share knowledge and learn from each other, to make sure the next iteration are better developed.
* Improve quality of projects (management) and sustainability of outcomes, leading to a better generation of projects…leading to sustainability of IW
* Creating knowledge within and without?
* Difference in data, information and knowledge, and maybe advocacy? Build a knowledge base.
* Right now it is staying within, it needs to be reaching out.

On the operational side

* Work with universities
* Work with the country level (proactive national governments, Russia, Dutch)
* Visualization – good but we need more data, and management.
* Need to establish a protocol for data sharing
* NOAA rules to take the data to a certain level so as to not upset the proprietary concerns.
* Stronger stake of the projects in IW:LEARN. They need the business case for investment of time in inputs.
* Activities:
	+ data capture
	+ global databases (GRDC Koblenz)
	+ stakeholders

For who?

* Projects (not just managers)
* Donors
* Wider public

### Cofinance

* Now at 18.5% of recorded co-finance has been received
	+ Haven’t recorded a lot of the co-finance
	+ UNDP E&E Ground, related to CC, a lot of that is related to guidance on mainstreaming CC, once we finish that activity we will receive it. Additionally, cofinance from UNU is tied to the Water Learning Centre which will be “collected” once the courses are active.
	+ Other big ticket item is the index insurance which is not happening now, which means that UNDP cash cofinance in connection with this will not materialize.
* Congratulating partners for bringing other partners in, IWSC related co-finance, etc., Coke for IWC6, Star Alliance.
* Apart from the index-insurance related cofinance, all partners and PCU felt that original targets can still be reached by the end of the project (despite the low percentage at midterm)

### External Partners

Rebecca Shuford. – NOAA

* Areas for collaboration?
* NOAA could post new tools and things that are developed on iwlearn.net
* Collaboration with a variety in LME projects
	+ ACLME – buoy arrays
	+ BOBLME – buoy arrays, training event together with USAID on EAFM training
	+ Tuna ABNJ project – development of the PIF
	+ IWCAM2
	+ Global Partnership on Oceans
* sustainable management tuna fisheries (ABNJ)
* CTI engagement for EAFM and OA
* West Africa – Fisheries observer trainings, IUU fishing, etc.
* Wider Caribbean Region strategic plan – governance frameworks for a variety of initiatives
* Training on MPA and spatial planning
* Integrate with the blog of NOAA
* The data and information sharing from the NODC. As mentioned previously, how to scale it up to a level that is not violating proprietary rights.
* Training workshops, we should collaborate and maybe send projects to them.
	+ resilience to climate change
	+ improvement of management of marine and coastal
	+ beginning fisheries management
	+ MPA trainings
	+ watershed/coastal area management
	+ hazard preparedness/response
	+ ecosystem approach to fisheries
		- -local to global
* Data visualization for ecosystem services workshop, may be more than NOAA
* All of this consists of tens of millions of dollars of investments

Sonja Koeppel – UNECE Water Convention

* 38 members and the EU as members
* More focused on water quality rather than quantity (UN Convention)
* Cooperation with GEF and IWLEARN as a priority
* Workplan 2013-15 – support implementation and accession, EU Water Initiative policy dialogues, quantifying the benefits of TB cooperation, adapting to CC in TB basins, Water-food-energy nexus, opening of the convention outside the ECE region
* Wanting to involve non ECE members in the activities, build capacity and exchange experiences, work with the UN Water Convention, cooperation with partners to support implementation
* Past cooperation with IWLEARN:
	+ Workshops on water and cc adaptation
	+ Addis Workshop
	+ International roundtable with GWP Med
	+ MOP Rome, GEF projects participated
	+ Plans for GEF projects on Drin and Chu Talas
* Guidance documents from the UNECE can be of relevance for iwlearn and vice versa
* Convention provides legal framework and political support
* Framework can provide platform for showcasing and benchmarking results and multiplying impacts
* Sustainability ?
* Next Steps
	+ LAC workshop in 2013
		- Opportunity for UNESCO to be involved in the workshop
	+ Similar events for the Water Convention
	+ CC in TB basins on 25-6 June
	+ Workshop for joint bodies in Sept 2013
	+ Exchange of experience and guidance
	+ Iwc7
	+ Legal and political framework
* GWP med and UNECE, more cooperation in capacity building in SEE

Kaisa U IW:LEARN-TWAP

* Building on existing databases, will IW:LEARN be able to fully support what TWAP needs to do.
* Need to have follow up conversations
* DHI river system agreement
	+ ipcc vytographics

### IWC7 and the role of partners

* Proper provisions need to be made to bring in partners or consultants to help with the organization of the event
* Still don’t have the time or location established
* Cabinet of Barbados is still debating what to offer for the conference
* We need closure yes or no by the end of the month.
* Themes
	+ COPs
	+ TDA/SAP
	+ IW to the broader development orgs/issues
	+ Communication/Stakeholder Engagement
	+ Presenting results
	+ international year of water cooperation (role play/Dutch group)
	+ science to valuation to policy
* Use the COPs to make suggestions to the IWC

### Sustaining the main activities

Main Activities – Need to have partners taking the costs on, but remains the need for umbrella to harness everything that is being talked about

* COPs
	+ UNESCO – To be hosted in one of the centers and continue, part of IGRAC mandate
		- If they succeed
	+ IUCN – depend on project finance that comes through the different core partners
		- Gets written into different projects
* Targeted Workshops
	+ Different Commissions, Regional Seas, GEF UNDP
	+ Increased allocation for projects for these activities
* Website/Results Archive
	+ UNEP will be taking it over, maintaining it, it was agreed it would be run by UNEP.
* Dialogues
	+ UNECE UFM German gov’t
* Twinnings
	+ Projects themselves (GEF allocation)
* Visualization
	+ UNEP
* IWC
	+ UNECE?
* Marketing
	+ Is the umbrella
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