



# Final Report

## 5<sup>th</sup> Biennial GEF International Waters Conference

*GEF International Waters:LEARN strengthens International Waters (IW) management by facilitating learning and information sharing among IW projects, partners and stakeholders. See <http://www.iwlearn.net> for details.*



**Table of Contents**

About this Report..... 3

    Introduction .....4

    Key Findings (Issues, Challenges and Lessons-Learned)..... 5

    Key Recommendations (Follow-up Actions) .....8

    Conference Results Framework and IWC5 Participant Evaluation Highlights .....9

        Results Framework .....9

        Highlights from Participant Evaluation Report .....11

    Session Reports.....13

        Global Change and Marine Resources: Marine Ecosystems Technical Workshop .....13

        Global Changes and Water Resources Workshop: Transboundary Freshwater Ecosystems Technical Workshop.....19

        Small Table Dialogues on Mainstreaming Climate Considerations in GEF IW .....20

        Update on New Technologies and Panel Discussion on GEF-IW Project Needs.....22

        Asia-Pacific Region Challenges & Issues .....24

        Technical Site Visits: From Ridge to Reef .....24

        Results-Based Management.....25

        GEF IW Experience Sharing and Learning Portfolio .....26

        Private Sector Involvement Round-table .....28

        Life After GEF - Sustainability .....30

        Discourse on Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis-Strategic Action Programmes .....31

        Development of GEF-IW Project Indicators .....33

        Gender and Water.....35

        CRTR: Impact at the Local-level, Coral Reef Restoration and Community Livelihoods .....36

        Towards a Synergetic GEF Programme for the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) LME's.....37

        Reaching Agreements Over Water.....38

        CC Adaptation Planning for the Coral Triangle .....39

        Connecting the Dots: Sharing Successes is Critical to Informing Future Investments.....40

        Interaction with Asia-Pacific Project Managers on Legal/Institutional Frameworks .....42

        African Water Governance: Achievement and Challenges .....45

        From Local to Global: Modeling Coral Reefs as if People Mattered .....47

        An LME Approach to Marine Biosecurity and Ships' Ballast Water - GloBallast Tools and Guidelines.....48

        GEF Evaluation Office Impact Study for the International Waters Focal Area.....48

        The IW:LEARN Website Toolkit .....48

        Closing Plenary .....49

        Awards and IWC5 Conclusion .....56

Acknowledgments.....56

    Sponsors .....57

    World Wild Fund for Nature - Australia.....57

    Project AWARE.....57

    Terrain Natural Resource Management.....57

    Reef & Rainforest Research Centre .....58

    Sinclair Knight Merz.....58

    Quicksilver Cruises .....58

    James Cook University .....58

    Cleaner Seas Alliance .....58

    Rapporteurs.....59

Australia Host Committee .....	59
GEF IWC5 Steering Committee .....	59
Coordination Team.....	60
Media Teams.....	60
Traditional Owners .....	60

**About this Report**

The IWC5 Final Report summarizes the discussion and key statements emerging from the 5<sup>th</sup> GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (IWC5) in Cairns, Australia. The majority of this report’s content consists of a review of reporting by session chairs and/or rapporteurs. The initial pages of this report contain highlights of this variety of documents. Readers should read

- ◆ pages 4-5 for background information about the IWC5
- ◆ pages 5-9 for highlights (both issues, challenges and/or lessons-learned, as well as actionable recommendations) from the individual sessions (including the mainstreaming climatic variability and change session as well as project management workshops)
- ◆ pages 9-11 for an evaluation of the IWC5 against the conference results framework
- ◆ pages 11-13 for highlights from the participant evaluation report (available separately)
- ◆ the remainder of the report for edited reports from all sessions as well as acknowledgments to the variety of parties making the IWC5 possible

## Introduction

The biennial Global Environment Facility International Waters Conference (GEF-IWC) constitutes a signature learning event for the GEF International Waters portfolio of projects and partners. It is both a training event (with plenaries, working groups, a project results exhibition space, workshops and other modalities) as well as a unique meeting of those involved to review how a portfolio of several hundred million dollars worth of investments is addressing transboundary water management globally.

Since 2000, the IWCs have convened on average 300 participants from about 70 projects and at least 80 countries to share practical experience, to apply evolving policies and procedures, address emerging priorities and improve overall project performance. IWC-5 took place in Cairns, Australia from 24-29 October, 2009. It involved the participation of 293 people, including government representatives, IW project managers, staff of international organizations, NGO's, the private sector and also key participation from Australian centers of excellence. Some 73 countries were represented as well as 66 GEF International Waters projects and 3 GEF Strategic Partnerships (including 33 of the 66 projects overall, represented by their project managers).

IWC-5 had two principle objectives, to facilitate cross-sectoral and regional learning and to conduct a dialogue for projects in the GEF International Waters portfolio, with a special emphasis on:

- ◆ Climatic Variability & Change
- ◆ Results-based Management

In 2009 there were two other key international water events focused on the links between Climatic Variability and Change and (i) Freshwater (the World Water Forum in Istanbul, Turkey in March), and (ii) Oceans (World Oceans Conference in Manado, Indonesia in May). The IWC-5 facilitated dialogue on how the GEF IW portfolio could incorporate climate variability and change into current and future project implementation. IWC5 solicited recommendations, collected via small table dialogues, from the existing portfolio on incorporating climate variability and change in the context of transboundary waters management. These recommendations are contributing to the discussions for developing the GEF IW Strategy for the 5<sup>th</sup> GEF replenishment (GEF5).

The conference also featured practical training and experience sharing discussions. In fact, the conference started with two days of pre-conference workshops. These workshops were organized by several Australian centers of excellence (Universities, NGO's and Australian government agencies). Australia as a country, has had to start dealing with some of the extremities of climatic variability and change earlier than the rest of the world. A decade of drought in South Queensland has reduced its major rivers—the Murray and the Darling, to fractions of their former flows. The choice of Australia as a host country reflected this reality and the technical expertise that has evolved to deal with it. In addition, the pre-conference workshops afforded GEF International Waters projects the chance to deliver presentations on their technical innovations and results in the context of water stress, changes in the periodicity and volume of flows, warming seas, bleaching events and ocean acidification. In addition, the GEF Scientific and Advisory Panel ran a workshop to synthesize results and also presented information on emerging technologies (for monitoring (living organisms, water quality, etc). Taken together, these workshops provided key contextual background on climatic variability and change and set the stage for the discussions during the rest of the IWC5.

The other focus of the conference lay in introducing results-based management (RBM) to the portfolio. This was achieved with a plenary roundtable, delivered by the GEF and GEF agencies on the mechanics of RBM. In support of the RBM topic, the conference featured project management workshops on topics like Sustainability: Life After GEF, a discourse on Transboundary Diagnostic

Analysis and Strategic Action Programmes, Development of Project Indicators and critically, a Private Sector Involvement Roundtable. The topic was rounded off with an interactive game, testing some participants' knowledge of GEF project results.

The city of Cairns itself was chosen for its proximity to both the Great Barrier Reef and Wet Tropics World Heritage Areas, and the many examples of "Ridges to Reef" integrated catchment, coastal and oceans management best practices available for show-casing in the immediate region. With many excellent examples of environmental management close at hand, the IWC5 offered, for the first time, three technical site visit options. The first was the Great Barrier Reef, a leading example of environmental degradation due to climatic variability and change (in addition to land-based sourced of pollution, tourism, and fishing pressures) but also of excellent research and management, including many examples of effective public-private partnerships. Additionally, a "Catchments to Coast" trip and a trip to the Daintree Rainforest focused on the ridge-to-reef concept of integrated ecosystem-based management.

Finally, IWC5 contained a suite of standard features. A Traditional Owners welcome and evening reception featuring one of Australia's premier didgeridoo and dance troupes was provided by the host country, building on traditions upheld at previous IWCs. The Australian Government gave a Keynote welcome address as well as the Government of South Africa, the previous IWC host. Projects from the Asia-Pacific host region presented their results and expectations. Participant-led workshops created space to present new concepts and for projects to organize their efforts. A few dozen projects exhibited their results and technical success in the innovation marketplace. The conference also featured a film festival where a dozen new project films were debuted to the portfolio. Daily reflections videos summarizing the conference were one of the conference highlights this year—produced with exceptional creativity and flair. Youtube feature stories (including interviews with participants) filled the cyberspace (all available at [www.youtube.com/gefiwlearn](http://www.youtube.com/gefiwlearn) and [www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009](http://www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009)). Finally, a session was dedicated to the rapidly emerging GEF IW Learning portfolio, a set of projects dedicated to enhancing the capacity of the portfolio to manage its resources in various topical areas.

### **Key Findings (Issues, Challenges and Lessons-Learned)**

The following are key highlights of issues, challenges and/or lessons-learned excerpted from the various session reports.

#### *The Global Change and Marine Resources: Marine Ecosystems Technical Workshop*

- ◆ Regional governance and management of LMEs, migratory fisheries, transboundary activities should balance regional obligations & responsibilities with national capacity. Participants suggested that it was pointless to fund/support establishment of regional institutions if there is no strategy or programme to build and sustain national capacity to participate and implement.
- ◆ Challenges in how to link targets that are marine based to catchment targets for management practices on farms/factories/urban run-off so that the marine targets can be met.
- ◆ The importance of effective communication – a good communicator works out who the audience is, what they understand and what they need to know. Participants suggested that projects need to think about how to get messages through and noted that communities and politicians must own the idea, proposal, management plan – not the scientist.

#### *The Global Changes and Water Resources Workshop: Transboundary Freshwater Ecosystems Technical Workshop*

- ◆ Regarding improved climate change estimates, practitioners need more precise estimates of future changes, especially regarding intensity, duration and frequency of rainfall
- ◆ We need to consider coupled or interconnected physical models for surface and ground water systems, and transfers to the oceans

- ◆ Promote awareness of and support the widespread ratification of the **UN Watercourses Convention**.

#### *Small Table Dialogues on Mainstreaming Climate Considerations in GEF IW*

◆ The biggest issues concerning climatic variability and change include the impacts of sea level rise & increased extreme events, the need for improved climate change modeling, greater communication, a fully integrated, holistic approach to mitigating climate change, and improved governance arrangements.

#### *Update on New Technologies and Panel Discussion on GEF-IW Project Needs*

◆ Most projects obtained technical advice from conferences, specialized agencies and through project-related contacts and consultants, and the most cited needs for support related to water quality monitoring.

#### *Results-Based Management*

◆ Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies. In line with the OPS 4 recommendations there will be a need of GEF 5 IW Tracking Tool indicators to be embedded in the project result framework/log frame. After GEF 5 Strategy adoption GEF SEC will develop GEF 5 IW TT and the IWTF will discuss and adopt the new TT.

#### *GEF IW Experience Sharing and Learning Portfolio*

◆ The portfolio values the learning, networking and experience sharing opportunities and would like to see these continued. However, sustained interaction with the portfolio is needed to ensure that the learning approach is adaptive and responds well to project needs.

#### *Private Sector Involvement Round-table*

◆ To achieve private sector involvement, there must be clear benefits to the private sector partners, including business benefits. The relationship between environmental performance (reductions in use of resources and production of waste etc) and business performance (reduced costs and increased profits), and concepts such as the triple-bottom line therefore need to be promoted in GEF projects.

◆ To be involved in projects the private sector needs an “honest broker” and this role can be played by the GEF agencies, giving public credibility to industry through involvement with UN and similar agencies.

◆ One of the benefits that GEF could offer the private-sector is a “Green Award” of some type, which would allow companies that won the award to gain marketing and public relations benefits from being recognized and awarded for their environmental “best-practices” by the GEF. Related to this is the need for the GEF and its EarthFund to develop and maintain reputation as “quality brands” with integrity.

#### *Life After GEF - Sustainability*

◆ Plan for the transition away from GEF early in project implementation. Project implementation time is often longer than planned because of changes in government, etc. Government thinks short term: planning long term saves overall. Projects should make annual reports on progress towards sustainability

#### *Discourse on Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis-Strategic Action Programmes*

◆ The TDA for the Okavango River Basin Project used an innovative methodology based on water use analysis to anticipate issues that will occur in the future for the region. This study was carried out by three different teams from each of the riparian states that allowed the three countries to develop capacity, to perform the work much faster, and to coordinate their work.

- ◆ The WIO-Lab project coordinated extensively with other projects in the region, such as the Agulhas and Somali Current LME project, as well as a mainstreaming the program into the riparian states' national development plans

#### *Development of GEF-IW Project Indicators*

- ◆ There is a need for development of measurable indicators, and more attention to be paid to baseline information.
- ◆ Concerns were noted with the (often) lack of proper and precise information for baselines and the need underlined to revisit and update indicators during project implementation stage.
- ◆ Targets need to be based on real interventions and 'concrete' activities to make indicators measurable and credible.

#### *Towards a Synergetic GEF Programme for the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) LME's*

- ◆ So far, ASCLMEs, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB have agreed on a common coordination framework, leading among others to the joint develop of a comprehensive TDA and SAP for the region.

#### *Reaching Agreements Over Water*

- ◆ This workshop introduced participants to the IUCN toolkits RULE, NEGOTIATE and SHARE, and used dialogue over geographic case studies to assist participants to priorities reform processes and the tools needed to build water governance capacity at national and transboundary levels.

#### *CC Adaptation Planning for the Coral Triangle*

- ◆ Coordination of efforts among multiple agencies and interests, as well as the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation considerations into development plans and programs, is a ongoing challenge in the Coral Triangle and in coastal and marine resources management efforts elsewhere, though some institutional responses are beginning to emerge (such as the creation of national coordination bodies for climate change).
- ◆ While there are a number of recently completed or ongoing surveys and syntheses of studies on the impacts of climate change on the Coral Triangle, there remains a need for further downscaled modeling and field-based analysis together with well coordinated application of the best available information for effective programming of resources and other decisions.

#### *Interaction with Asia-Pacific Project Managers on Legal/Institutional Frameworks*

- ◆ Problem-solving training needs a common vocabulary, clarity around goals, and clarity around why certain steps need to be undertaken (e.g. drafting of particular legislative or procedural provisions)
- ◆ Training courses may also serve a role as "disguised negotiations" – this could be a primary or a secondary function.

#### *African Water Governance: Achievement and Challenges*

- ◆ For transboundary water issues, there needs to be a strengthening of governance and oversight by parliamentarians to ensure political commitment to the projects. Most countries have the right policies in place - they just need to actually implement them.
- ◆ Indicators of good governance include: financial stability, cost and benefit sharing, and progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.
- ◆ Workshops can provide a forum to see what it will take to make river basin projects work, but the details of the workshop model still need to be worked out.

## Key Recommendations (Follow-up Actions)

The following are key actionable recommendations emerging from the various IWC5 sessions.

### *The Global Changes and Water Resources Workshop: Transboundary Freshwater Ecosystems Technical Workshop*

- ◆ Governments should reconsider connections between land and water management

### *Small Table Dialogues on Mainstreaming Climate Considerations in GEF IW*

- ◆ The government response to the challenge of mainstreaming climatic variability and change should include some of the following actions: greater political leadership, tangible actions, a long-term vision, enforcement of legal instruments, greater use of science, an emphasis on communication, engagement of all relevant stakeholders, a transboundary integrated ecosystem-based approach, efforts to address capacity asymmetries, attention to early warning systems and clear rules on the effects of sea-level rise.

- ◆ Recommendations to the GEF include inter alia: streamlining requirements for multi-focal area proposals, more flexibility and responsiveness with adaptive project design, set realistic project timelines, take a longer-term programmatic approach with sustainability considerations built in from the start, develop more critical and reflective evaluation processes and meet local-level needs.

### *Update on New Technologies and Panel Discussion on GEF-IW Project Needs*

- ◆ GEF STAP will design a more comprehensive approach to further explore and respond to the scientific and technical advice requirements of GEF projects under implementation

### *GEF IW Experience Sharing and Learning Portfolio*

- ◆ Establish a joint active information dissemination service e.g. email newsletter, RSS feeds, that provides IW project stakeholders (including perhaps also partners) about the latest developments, uploaded documents, meetings, UNU results, etc.

- ◆ Include more initiatives that are not funded by GEF in the IW:LEARN network and platforms. Very interesting networking opportunities exist within regional projects in related topics funded by SISA, IAEA, EU

### *Private Sector Involvement Round-table*

- ◆ Many private sector players are extremely active and advanced with developing and implementing best-practice sustainability actions, although these are often not known to the GEF community. To assist in identifying opportunities for collaboration between GEF and such companies, it would be useful to convene a global GEF/private sector workshop, through umbrella groups such as the World Business Council on Sustainability. This joint workshop would undertake a “stock-take” of relevant private-sector initiatives and “marry” these with potential GEF projects, where there are clear common goals and benefits and potential synergies.

### *Development of GEF-IW Project Indicators*

- ◆ Track long-term impact (stress reduction and environmental status indicators) by mainstreaming monitoring of such indicators into the activities of waterbody joint institutions.

- ◆ Focus on client ownership by having parallel indicators in case of various projects.

- ◆ A log frame should be flexible enough to incorporate changes as long as they are well-justified and do not jeopardize an ultimate project goal.

### *Gender and Water*

- ◆ The future of GEF IW will include gender mainstreaming in all its programs. This will assist all the GEF projects to develop more equitable frameworks and outcomes, ultimately resulting in more sustainable global water resources.

*Connecting the Dots: Sharing Successes is Critical to Informing Future Investments*

- ◆ There was interest among the participants to share the cost information on practices from the Mississippi River Basin for use in the Tisza. Participants also committed to provide additional data and information on projects and practices.

*Interaction with Asia-Pacific Project Managers on Legal/Institutional Frameworks*

- ◆ Produce a guidance document with basic elements of a data-sharing protocol
- ◆ Participants appeared to be keen to join the nascent Asia / Asia Pacific south-south peer group network which the project is striving to establish and maintain.

*Closing Plenary: Key Actions and Thoughts for GEF5 Implementation and Strategy*

- ◆ On climate, we need to find ways to ensure that we effectively mainstream climate resilience into our projects, in order to fortify ecosystems.
- ◆ On integrated management, we need to strengthen the project and programmatic linkages between freshwater & marine systems, as well as between surface & groundwater systems, as a single management continuum.
- ◆ We need to make the GEF more user-friendly for multi-focal area projects,
- ◆ We need to make projects relevant at the regional level but also the national level.
- ◆ We need to think more about the functional role of science.
- ◆ Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies. We need to find ways to translate those tools and the information they provide to broaden understanding not just among donors but also the broader public.
- ◆ Portfolio learning remains critical tool for programming and project design
- ◆ We need stronger engagement with the private sector on everything from fisheries, to agrobusiness, to wastewater treatment, to constructed wetlands and many other areas.

*Closing Plenary: Key Thoughts for IWC6*

- ◆ We need to look at best practice in using strategic action programmes both as governance reform but also as resource mobilization tools.
- ◆ We should look for ways to increase targeted training in particular for project managers.
- ◆ We will have more diversity, more task team leaders and project managers as well as people who are from client countries (rather than agencies), more women, and in general people who are closer to on-the-ground experiences.

**Conference Results Framework and IWC5 Participant Evaluation Highlights**

Results Framework

The conference facilitation team produced a results framework (published in the program book and available at [www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009](http://www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009)) with the purpose of establishing goals and providing a means to evaluate the “success” of the conference. The following table assesses the conference’s desired outputs and whether or not they were achieved:

Output	Target	Data Sources and/or Reporting Mechanisms	Evaluation
Key challenges and solutions for transboundary water	At least 10-15 topics and examples of good practice strategies	Rapporteur summary from small table	95 challenges of mainstreaming climatic variability and change

systems with regard to climatic variability and change identified	identified at IW-C5	dialogue sessions	identified, 108 recommendations to governments, 95 recommendations to program GEF5. A summary of the captured views is available at <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009">www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009</a> On top of this, some 29 presentations on specific topics were given in the marine workshop and 28 in the freshwater workshop.
Experiences and good practices shared among GEF IW projects	About 70% of GEF IW projects present at IWC5 share at least one of their top innovations and/or replicable experiences at IWC5.	Presentations from IW portfolio in pre-conference workshops and workshop sessions, background documentation, and innovation marketplace exhibits.	74% (49/66)  12 projects presented during the pre-conference workshops, 13 more presented during the course of the IWC, 24 ran exhibits in the innovation marketplace
Learning and capacity building promoted for GEF IW projects and project managers, including evaluations from OPS4	At least 90% of GEF IW present project managers at IWC5 attend training sessions at IWC5; At least 70% of participant evaluations in the IWC5 confirm increased knowledge	Attendance records at project management sessions at IWC5; Participant evaluation sheets and documented intentions to follow up on learning gained at IWC5.	This was not evaluated per se, but 50% (33/66) of attending projects were represented by their project managers  A glance at the evaluations indicates that most people felt the IWC5 increased their knowledge
Learning specifications are refined to improve IW:LEARN & Learning Portfolio project services to projects, including evaluation results from OPS 4.	List of emerging learning priorities; Demonstration of <a href="http://iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a> as nexus for IW learning activities at IWC5.	Rapporteur summary; Expressions of Interest for inter-project exchanges, regional & thematic workshops, etc., to continue and improve IW learning post-IWC5	Learning priorities from the learning session are included in this report, in addition the GEF Evaluation office presented results from OPS4 during the IWC5, furthermore, the participant evaluation contained a large number of recommendations for services and portfolio learning needs  The new IW:LEARN community space was

			demonstrated in the learning session
Emerging GEF policies and practices understood by GEF IW projects, especially reflecting improved results-based management and evaluation results	New GEF Strategic Objectives and programs clarified with IW portfolio by end of IWC5; New practices on RBM are incorporated into conference reporting	GEF documentation on emerging practices, project cycle, evaluation results from OPS 4, and evaluation, presented at IWC5.	GEF strategic priorities and RBM practices were outlined during the IWC5, an Evaluation Office participant-led workshop was conducted and the outputs of these sessions will be incorporated into the final report
New mechanisms for greater private sector involvement and public-private partnerships in future GEF IW projects discussed	Private sector sponsorship of IWC5 to exceed 10% of total costs; Private sector to co-sponsor at least 2 technical site visits.	IWC5 budget documents; Co-sponsorship arrangements technical site visits.	A private sector roundtable was conducted, a summary of which is included in the final report  A record 20% of conference costs were borne by the private sector and NGO's  Private sector and NGO partners covered all 3 site visits

#### Highlights from Participant Evaluation Report

*The full report can be downloaded from [www.iwlearn.net/2009](http://www.iwlearn.net/2009)*

Overall, participants of the 5<sup>th</sup> Biennial GEF International Waters Conference (IWC5) considered the event a success (3.84). They found it directly applicable to their work functions (3.7) and that it allowed sufficient time for networking (3.6). To a lesser extent, they felt it enhanced their understanding of results-based management (3.2) and that it communicated strategies for mainstreaming climatic variability and change (3.2).

The IWC5 consolidated the approach of the IWC4, in terms of retaining its new modalities like small table dialogues, innovation marketplace (exhibit area), project management workshops, participant workshops, technical sessions (pre-conference workshops) and built on others (expanded site visits, welcome reception). In general, most of the positive lessons of IWC4 were replicated, whilst some of the negative ones were not corrected.

Respondents displayed significant inconsistency in sentiment and observations, in that the evaluation results display many extremes in opinion. The average rating of all participants for all sessions is 3.54/5, where as the standard deviation of all those results is 0.8. This suggests a variety of opinion. Why is this? Plenty of explanations exist...ranging from the variety in sessions and types of sessions (as well as perceptions of success), to the wide variety of participants. Besides the usual mix of inter alia, project managers, international organization staff, government representatives, the IWC5 fielded many scientists. The conference thus had to play host to decision-makers, scientists, NGO personnel and others and the evaluation data bears this mix of success and shortfalls out.

Reviewing the data, one can state that broadly speaking, by all measures the IWC5 was a success defined by the evaluation data. There remain however, legions of problems to be corrected and lessons-learned to be absorbed in the design of the IWC6. The IWC5 can be argued to have achieved its general purposes in service to the GEF IW portfolio (this is borne out heavily by the responses to question #20 on why the experience was worthwhile). It performed less well on addressing the primary conference themes, although even that was considered above satisfactory.

Other key findings and recommendations for the future include:

- ◆ The **project management workshops (all four of them) and innovation marketplace** were the most highly regarded sessions of the conference.
- ◆ Participants regarded the project management workshops (all four topics) highly, but they **should not be concurrent next time.**
- ◆ The small table dialogue modality **remains a good concept but was again flawed in its execution.** It should be split over two days and have expert facilitation.
- ◆ There was **insufficient GEF IW project input** into both the design of the IWC5 and its sessions.
- ◆ Respondents want more **focus on technological innovation and project results/achievements** in the core program, although were not specific as to what conference modality should be used.
- ◆ For networking success, the concept of **lunchtime sponsor speaking should be abolished.**
- ◆ Participants desired a higher-quality approach to primary conference themes (in this case mainstreaming climatic variability and change and also results-based management), with greater attention to **known approaches and workable solutions** and less to general discussion.
- ◆ Key factors that made the conference worthwhile for participants: Face-to-face networking (48), Experience sharing/Feedback on approaches/Exposure to IW Portfolio (36), Understand the GEF, GEF5, Programmatic Approaches (18), Technical Field trip(s) (7), Pre-conference technical workshops (6), Innovation Marketplace (5), GEF IW:LEARN (4), Presenting results (3), Climate (3), Integrated Approaches (2)
- ◆ Many participants pledged to engage in a variety of follow-up actions
  - Regarding climatic variability and change, they pledged to incorporate considerations, develop transboundary water management models, solicit stakeholder inputs and climate proof their projects
  - On results-based management, some will review methodologies, stress the benefits of monitoring, review existing logical frameworks and prepare better sets of indicators
  - Many wrote that they will engage the private sector, speaking a language they understand
  - Some will engage the GEF STAP and applied science practitioners
  - Others plan to develop new risk assessment methodologies
- ◆ Some IWC5 participants have rather poor handwriting.

*Conclusions: Other Recommendations for the Future*

- ◆ Perhaps could have had a few **specific project coordinator sessions** to build relationships at project management level
- ◆ In terms of IWC5 sessions, the evaluators wanted to hear **more on climatic variability and change, TDA-SAP approaches, Sustainability (Life After GEF), Development of Indicators/Project Management, GEF5 Planning and Results-Based Management.**

- Some would like to hear more on how **climatic variability and change will impact the TDA-SAP process**.
- People would have liked to spend more time on the key factors in the **sustainability of project initiatives & results**, as well as the **GEF role in wider initiatives**.
- ◆ In the next IWC, people would like to see time spent on the following topics: Governance/Legal Frameworks, Community Engagement/Stakeholder Involvement, Innovative Technical Approaches, Resource Mobilization, Science-Governance Links and a Role for Projects and Government Representatives
- ◆ Participants would like to see **more time for bilateral discussions**.
- ◆ Some more general recommendations include:
  - We should have spent a **roundtable on innovation in the portfolio** rather than leaving it to the poster session
  - For each session GEF should **ensure each presenter is communicating well with target audiences** i.e. vet presenters more carefully.
  - No real issues, but **one extra day would have taken the pressure off** for more informal meetings
  - Trying to identify new priorities without **scaling up on "old" priorities**, which have not yet been sufficiently addressed.
- ◆ The GEF IW:LEARN project received some specific recommendations to:
  - improve its interactions with projects, advertise its services more and ask projects to designate an IW:LEARN focal point within each GEF IW project
  - improve external (to the GEF IW Portfolio) connections
  - focus more on project results
- ◆ Some selected recommendations for the design of the next IWC include:
  - GEF **projects under implementation should have been surveyed** for input in the planning/information for the IWC
  - Have GEF IW **project managers as session coordinators**
  - Take into account **regional/gender balance/diversity**
  - **Resolve visa problems early on**.
  - Use **inquisitive facilitation or a journalist in plenary** to enhance interaction.
  - Set up a **"speakers corner"** where people can present during coffee breaks and other sessions where participants are out and about

## Session Reports

The IWC5 featured over thirty sessions, ranging from pre-conference workshops on technical innovations & project results, to small table dialogues on mainstreaming climatic variability and change, project management workshops to participant workshops on a variety of topics. The following section of the report recaptures those sessions and in some cases offers a summary of the discussion therein. The report captures highlights from each of the main sessions in the blue boxes.

### Global Change and Marine Resources: Marine Ecosystems Technical Workshop

#### Key Issues Highlighted

◆ Participants noted concerns that regional governance and management of LMEs, migratory fisheries, transboundary activities should balance regional obligations & responsibilities with national capacity. Participants suggested that it was pointless to fund/support establishment of regional institutions if there is no strategy or programme to build and sustain national capacity to participate and implement.

- Participants discussed challenges in how to link targets that are marine based to catchment targets for management practices on farms/factories/urban run-off so that the marine targets can be met.
- Participants noted the importance of effective communication – a good communicator works out who the audience is, what they understand and what they need to know. They don't operate in a silo when everyone else is compartmentalised. Participants suggested that projects need to think about how to get messages through and noted that communities and politicians must own the idea, proposal, management plan – not the scientist.

#### Key Actions Highlighted

- Participants suggested that there needs to be a stronger unified voice concerning crucial marine issues that need to be presented and properly considered. Some strong concerns were noted that GEF projects should better support consideration of ocean interactions.
- Participants suggested that GEF projects should include support and strategies for developing alternative livelihoods when implementing conservation and management measures, particularly where measures include closure or significant reductions of existing activities.

#### Session Coordinators:

Susan English, [Australian Institute for Marine Science](http://www.aims.gov.au), [s.english@aims.gov.au](mailto:s.english@aims.gov.au)  
 Melanie King, [University of Queensland \(GEF-IBRD Coral Reef Targeted Research project\)](http://www.uq.edu.au), [m.king4@uq.edu.au](mailto:m.king4@uq.edu.au)  
 Campbell Davies, [Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization](http://www.csiro.au), [campbell.davies@csiro.au](mailto:campbell.davies@csiro.au),  
 Peter McGinnessy, [Great Barrier Marine Park Authority](http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au), [peter.mcginnessy@gbrmpa.gov.au](mailto:peter.mcginnessy@gbrmpa.gov.au)

#### Session Chairs:

Session I *The likely response of tropical marine systems to climate variability & change* Chair: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, [University of Queensland](http://www.uq.edu.au), [oveh@uq.edu.au](mailto:oveh@uq.edu.au)  
 Session II *Regional Economic Development and Alternative Sustainable Livelihoods*  
 Chair: Simon Foale, [James Cook University](http://www.jcu.edu.au), [simon.foale@jcu.edu.au](mailto:simon.foale@jcu.edu.au)  
 Session III *Solutions to Issues of Marine Management and Governance*  
 Chair: Quentin Hanich, [University of Wollongong](http://www.uow.edu.au), [hanich@uow.edu.au](mailto:hanich@uow.edu.au)  
 Session IV *The Importance of Land-sea Interactions for Coastal Receiving Waters*  
 Chair: Britta Schaffelke, [Australian Institute for Marine Science](http://www.aims.gov.au), [b.schaffelke@aims.gov.au](mailto:b.schaffelke@aims.gov.au)  
 Session V *Science for Managers: interface between science & management*  
 Chair: Richard Kenchington, [richard.kenchington@netspeed.com.au](http://www.netspeed.com.au)

The Global Change and Marine Resources Pre-Conference workshop included five sessions with presentations by a range of GEF IW projects and relevant Australian experts. Each session concluded with a group discussion which provided a number of insights of relevance to the design of future GEF IW projects. Various presenters and participants raised the following points.

#### *Session I: Likely responses of tropical marine ecosystems to climate change*

The session discussed the dynamic nature of marine ecosystems, particularly in light of climate change impacts. It began by painting two future worlds. In one world, the growth of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere continues unabated, and attempts to rein in local impacts on marine ecosystems fail. In the second world, strong international treaties reduce the rate of growth of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and local management attempts are escalated. In the latter case, marine ecosystems will continue in some shape or form to contribute to human well-being. But what local management strategies are likely to improve the resilience of these systems to rapid climate change?

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ Participants suggested that we needed to move away from concepts of resilience to a more pragmatic recognition that **systems are changing, and will continue to change**.
- ◆ Participants suggested that we have to work on how we can **minimise disturbances and impacts** of transitioning systems.
- ◆ Participants noted that we don't know what transitioning systems will look like. Consequently, we need to change the way we think, and recognise that there **is no going back**. We need to think about what the new world will look like in terms of reefs, fisheries etc.
- ◆ Participants discussed concerns regarding targets for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, noting the **current target of 450** and reflecting that this should not be exceeded. Every effort should be made to minimise levels, preferably to lower levels.
- ◆ In this context, participants noted the **limited representation of international waters and ocean issues** within Climate Change discussions.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

- ◆ Participants discussed the need to implement **Ecosystem-Based Approaches to management** to mitigate impacts and adapt to new systems.
- ◆ Participants suggested that there needs to be a stronger unified voice concerning crucial marine issues that need to be presented and properly considered. Some strong concerns were noted that GEF projects should better **support consideration of ocean interactions within Climate Change negotiations**.

#### *Session II: Regional economic development and alternative sustainable livelihoods*

The search for ecologically, economically and socially sustainable livelihoods has always been challenging for people in developing countries. In the meantime, an important social impact of increasing global economic inequality includes growing aspirations among many developing country citizens to opt for the short-term financial gains offered by unsustainable and often environmentally destructive economic activities such as export fisheries, industrial logging and mining, rather than less lucrative but more sustainable alternatives, where these exist. The session addressed the ongoing challenge of developing sustainable and economically attractive livelihood options in these difficult economic, social and political circumstances.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ Participants noted that **recovery of coral communities** following bleaching and other stress impacts was **enhanced where effective reserves and fishing regulations were implemented**.
- ◆ Participants noted that new conservation and management measures sometimes resulted in **unforeseen and broad socio-economic impacts**.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

- ◆ Consequently, participants suggested that GEF projects should include **support and strategies for developing alternative livelihoods** when implementing conservation and management measures, particularly where measures include closure or significant reductions of existing activities.

#### *Session III: Solutions to issues of marine management and governance*

This session explored marine management and governance within the context of climatic variability, and discussed some of the emerging new marine activities that are appearing on the horizon. The session began with a discussion of cooperative approaches to fisheries management from the

perspective of the GEF IW Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. This provided a real-world grounding for subsequent discussions of climate change challenges and potential solutions. Subsequent presentations addressed emerging issues related to climate variability within the context of existing or proposed governance frameworks. The session concluded with a discussion of how existing cooperative management and government fora might change in order to adapt to climatic variability in the marine environment, and manage emerging new marine activities.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ Participants expressed concerns that as sea levels rise, coastlines will be inundated and maritime claims may be lost. In particular, if **small island States lose their maritime claims**, vulnerable communities will lose important rights to valuable marine resources and such waters may revert to a free for all, with all the inherent difficulties of high seas management.
- ◆ Participants noted concerns that regional governance and management of LMEs, migratory fisheries, transboundary activities should **balance regional obligations & responsibilities with national capacity**. Participants suggested that it was pointless to fund/support establishment of regional institutions if there is no strategy or programme to build and sustain national capacity to participate and implement.
- ◆ Participants suggested that management and governance institutions need the flexibility and 'longview' to address existing and forthcoming climate variability impacts. **Projects need intergenerational-long objectives** that reflect environmental and natural resource dynamics and avoid funding gaps.
- ◆ Participants suggested that management and governance must look beyond biophysical science and better **incorporate other information and analysis – socio-economic, political, legal, etc.** Participants noted that translation of science to governance is critical but difficult and sometimes poorly done.
- ◆ Participants noted major advances in high seas governance and migratory fisheries management through instruments such as the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, but also noted **flaws in obligations and structures relating to collaboration and cooperation**.
- ◆ Participants noted that **regional fisheries management needs to occur within the broader context of ocean activities** and ecosystems, and needs to better engage global community.
- ◆ Participants discussed opportunities for **developing archipelagic LMEs** to support implementation of ecosystem-based approaches to management.
- ◆ Projects need to be strategic in what can be achieved and how projects can be implemented around **civil disturbances (i.e. piracy) and war**.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

- ◆ Noting legal presentations by Dr. Clive Schofield and Professor Rosemary Rayfuse, participants suggested that increased support was required for small island developing States to **preserve their maritime claims** into the future in the context of receding baselines (in the best case) and disappearing States (in the worst case).
- ◆ Participants suggested that the GEF consider **funding projects to preserve these claims** through building the capacity of vulnerable States to comprehensively set their baselines, and negotiate and resolve gaps in international law in such a manner that protects their maritime claims.
- ◆ Given the multitude of marine issues, complexity of management solutions and limited demographics of many developing States, participants suggested that creative strategies were required that can build and sustain capacity of States to implement solutions. Such strategies might **explore funding of national staff, sub-regional cooperative structures, industry/NGO government partnerships** etc.

- ◆ Participants noted that **high seas governance was a continuing weakness** and needed urgent attention. Participants suggested that high seas projects needed to look beyond immediate issues relating to fisheries and consider broader context.

*Session VI: The Importance of Land-sea interactions for coastal receiving waters*

In this session, participants were encouraged to exchange experiences with how the pressures of coastal development and land-based pollution have been addressed in their jurisdictions. The session also focused on how to improve management of land-sea interactions and the role of science in supporting coastal management.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ Participants discussed examples of land-sea interactions and noted that **land sourced inputs through freshwater run-off are major inputs** into marine systems.
- ◆ Participants reflected that GEF water projects should **be better integrated** across freshwater and marine systems.
- ◆ The session discussed issues relating to nutrient trading and concerns relating to the **efficacy of setting targets**.
- ◆ Participants noted that management needs to take place in the upper catchment while guidelines are set for ecosystem health in the marine environment. Participants discussed challenges in **how to link targets that are marine based to catchment targets for management practices on farms/factories/urban run-off** so that the marine targets can be met.
- ◆ Participants expressed disappointment that the GEF conference did not include a **combined session on the land to the ocean**.
- ◆ Participants noted difficulties juggling **life cycles of projects, government electoral periods and generational change**.
- ◆ Participants discussed implementation of the **precautionary approach**, noting that the setting of thresholds juggled scientific advice with measures that the community will accept.

*Session V: Science to Management*

This session explored the experience of research programs designed to support environment and natural resource management. Participants were asked what has been learnt a decade's worth of experience with design, delivery, targeting and impact maximization of science projects, programs and agendas to address management problems.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ The session discussed the **different cultures and demands** that exist within science and management. Each have different time frames, different objectives, different cultures and different performance criteria. Both jobs are difficult and complex, both sides need to better understand complexities of each side.
- ◆ Participants discussed **unrealistic expectations** that sometimes occur on both sides and the need to mutually agree on a strategy or framework.
- ◆ Participants stressed the **need for good relationships** and communication between scientists and managers.
- ◆ Participants discussed views that science should have its arguments about the issues of science in its own arena and not in the public arena.
- ◆ Managers, policy makers and public love science as long as it can be provided in an understandable format. What they don't understand is the nuances.

- ◆ Participants noted that understanding/education amongst managers and policy-makers varies greatly from country to country, region to region. Some projects need to work within management contexts that have very little training in science.
- ◆ Participants suggested that projects **need to understand what drives political will and understand how to build and use this** (i.e. community pressure, science, industry pressure, legacy, opportunity and personal interest). The session discussed messaging strategies and targets and reflected that such strategies should not just focus on politicians – they only make up a small amount of the population. Similarly, participants suggested that we need to recognise that science and managers are not the only stakeholders in the equation. Need to recognise that public, NGOs etc are stakeholders as well and can be more adept in some countries in implementing actions.
- ◆ Participants noted the importance of effective communication – a good communicator works out who the audience is, what they understand and what they need to know. They don't operate in a silo when everyone else is compartmentalised. Participants suggested that projects need to think about how to get messages through and noted that **communities and politicians must own the idea, proposal, management plan** – not the scientist.
- ◆ Participants noted the benefits of icons such as the Great Barrier Reef (GBR). Participants reflected that if the GBR was not regarded as an icon, a lot of the management and policy wins would not have occurred. **Establishing the iconic nature of critical habitats is important** and science can help with this. Science can put the material on the plate that enables a community to appreciate they have something special. Participants suggested that it is about stories – things that are iconic and special. Research and science can play a role in this.
- ◆ Participants suggested that transparency was absolutely essential.
- ◆ Participants reflected, in a fisheries context we are **good at natural science but not at the social sciences**. Not good at including economists right at the beginning – they tend to be incorporated towards the end.
- ◆ Participants noted that scientists shouldn't bow to pressure – language is important and science needs to come across as unbiased.
- ◆ Participants noted that the science/management nexus was particularly difficult because when we talk about marine and coastal protection, we are facing issues we have never had to face before and to achieve results we haven't needed before.
- ◆ Participants noted that many of the GEF Projects cross multiple developing countries and are faced with constraints that are not seen in developed countries. There are multiple cultures, languages etc that have to be worked across to get a response from managers. Participants further noted that there are cultural gaps when experts come into developing countries and implement projects, which incorporate local scientists and managers. Participants suggested that the GEF needs to consider how it can increase capacity where the projects are, so that indigenous capacity can be developed in order to achieve the outcomes.
- ◆ Participants noted problems where scientists are not motivated to address many of the problems, questions and/or issues because they are not interesting or academically rewarding to them and therefore the needed science isn't available to make the decisions.
- ◆ Participants noted the need for information on the economic value of doing different things.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

- ◆ Participants discussed the need to involve community in the process and suggested that the GEF needs to **support translation of science into useful information** and advice.

*Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ Regarding improved climate change estimates, practitioners need more precise estimates of future changes, especially regarding intensity, duration and frequency of rainfall
- ◆ We need to consider coupled or interconnected physical models for surface and ground water systems, and transfers to the oceans

*Key Actions Highlighted*

- ◆ Governments should reconsider connections between land and water management
- ◆ Promote awareness of and support the widespread ratification of the UN Watercourses Convention.

*Session Coordinators:*

*Marc LeBlanc, James Cook University, marc.leblanc@jcu.edu.au*

*Alice Aureli, UNESCO, a.aureli@unesco.org*

The aim of the workshop was to facilitate the exchange of experiences derived from projects aimed at fostering freshwater integration and transboundary governance and then to contribute some recommendations to the GEF-IW portfolio. The workshop featured a number of GEF projects as well as numerous experts from Australian centers of excellence. The James Cook University took the lead in organizing this workshop, which also was believed to be the first integrated workshop for surface and groundwater GEF IW projects.

In the session, participants identified the following issues and challenges:

- ◆ Regarding improved climate change estimates, practitioners need
  - **more precise estimates** of future changes, especially regarding intensity, duration and frequency of rainfall
  - estimates at a **scale relevant** for basin studies and modeling
  - more information on interactions and **feedback loops between the hydrosphere and biosphere** within the water cycle
- ◆ Practitioners should consider not just climate change but all global environmental changes, including
  - changes in **land-use** and land-cover and especially the role of agriculture;
  - **water diversions** (dams, drainage of wetlands);
- ◆ On the question of integrated water management, participants suggested that we need to consider
  - coupled or **interconnected physical models** for surface and ground water systems, and transfers to the oceans
  - linked physical models and **socio-economic approaches**
  - move from the linear world to complex and non-stationary states

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

For governments, workshop participants had the following recommendations:

- ◆ sign and implement CO<sub>2</sub> reduction international **conventions**
- ◆ dramatically reduce CO<sub>2</sub> **emissions** now to avoid 3 or 4 degrees global warming;
- ◆ reconsider **connections between land and water management**

- ◆ complement the present set of international water conventions (particularly for groundwater);
- ◆ **enforce** the present laws and regulations.
- ◆ **ratify the UN Watercourses Convention**, which will be the only global UN instrument in the field of transboundary water management.
- ◆ **define** the global, transboundary, national and local scales
  - which uses or **consequences of water uses** (transfer of energy, agricultural products) have or will have a transboundary importance?
  - **which national issues** (policy, management, etc) have a transboundary component?

To the GEF, participants suggested the following actions

- ◆ support deployment and maintenance of **in-situ observation networks**
- ◆ identify long-term trends (change) and effects of management actions (are **targets** reached?)
- ◆ address the social and environmental **demand**
- ◆ enhance **stakeholder involvement** and targeted capacity building through dissemination and training
- ◆ help the preparation of **joint contingency plans**
- ◆ **utilize the water cycle** as a common reference framework for further GEF programmes
- ◆ promote awareness of and support the widespread ratification of the **UN Watercourses Convention**.
- ◆ The next GEF replenishment is to consider the opportunity provided by the UN GA resolution as a new tool of international law (Codification of International Law for Transboundary Aquifers by the United Nations UN Resolution 63/124). In line with goals of the GEF, the resolution encourages the States concerned to make appropriate **bilateral or regional arrangements** for the proper management of their transboundary aquifers taking into account the recommendations contained in the annexed draft articles.

*All presentations and summaries are available at: [www.inlearn.net/inv2009](http://www.inlearn.net/inv2009) or [www.jcu-hydrology-lab.com](http://www.jcu-hydrology-lab.com).*

#### Small Table Dialogues on Mainstreaming Climate Considerations in GEF IW

*The full report on this session, along with captures from all the individual tables can be downloaded from [www.inlearn.net/inv2009](http://www.inlearn.net/inv2009).*

#### *Key Issues Highlights*

◆ The biggest issues concerning climatic variability and change include the impacts of sea level rise & increased extreme events, the need for improved climate change modeling, greater communication, a fully integrated, holistic approach to mitigating climate change, and improved governance arrangements.

#### *Key Actions Highlighted*

◆ The government response to the challenge of mainstreaming climatic variability and change should include some of the following actions: greater political leadership, tangible actions, a long-term vision, enforcement of legal instruments, greater use of science, an emphasis on communication, engagement of all relevant stakeholders, a transboundary integrated ecosystem-based approach, efforts to address capacity asymmetries, attention to early warning systems and clear rules on the effects of sea-level rise.

◆ Recommendations to the GEF include inter alia: streamlining requirements for multi-focal area proposals, more flexibility and responsiveness with adaptive project design, set realistic project

timelines, take a longer-term programmatic approach with sustainability considerations built in from the start, develop more critical and reflective evaluation processes and meet local-level needs.

Session Coordinators:

Chris Severin, GEF, cseverin@thegef.org

Mish Hamid, GEF IW:LEARN, mish@iwlearn.org

This session utilized a small-table dialogue format to consolidate outputs from the pre-conference workshops and engagement all IWC5 participants on the question of priority topics for the future GEF IW project design. Small table dialogues are designed to enable participation by all conference participants, and be extension, to solicit input from the entire plenary on important questions. In this case, participants were asked to deal with three fundamental question regarding climatic variability and change, and its consequences for the GEF IW portfolio. Specifically, they were asked three questions:

1. What are the key challenges for transboundary water systems with regard to climatic variability and change?
2. What do Governments and transboundary waters joint institutions need to do to address those challenges?
3. What type of assistance is needed from the GEF IW focal area to meet those challenges during the next GEF Replenishment?

Participants were divided into over 30 small tables featuring roughly eight participants each. Almost all tables were facilitated by a GEF IW project manager. Participants went through two rounds of discussion, the first focused on answering the above questions. The second round featured a more broad-based discussion on the questions as they apply to specific regions and ecosystem types. All of those outputs are available at [www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009](http://www.iwlearn.net/iwc2009).

Based on the consolidated findings, the following major outcomes of the Small Table Dialogues can be attributed to each question posed.

*Major Outcomes for Question 1: The key challenges for transboundary water systems with regard to climate variability and change, as summarized from the outcomes of the Small-table Dialogues, are:*

- ◆ The **impacts** of sea level rise, increased extreme events, reduced livelihoods and resource security and changes to ecosystems and ecosystem services, as well as the transboundary nature of these impacts.
- ◆ The need for improved climate change **modeling** supported by high quality data that is accessible to all.
- ◆ The need for greater **communication**, at all levels, about the threats of climate change and about available mitigation and adaptation tools and options.
- ◆ The need for a fully **integrated**, holistic approach to mitigating climate change, including integrating climate change into all aspects of sustainable development and natural resource management, as well as taking an integrated approach to water resources management, where surface, ground and marine waters are managed as linked systems.
- ◆ The need for improved **governance** arrangements, including building governance capacity of developing countries, improving cooperative transboundary governance arrangements and mainstreaming climate change issues into all governance structures.

*Major Outcomes for Question 2: In summarizing the most significant outcomes of the Small-table Dialogues, in order to address the challenges identified in the responses to Question 1, Governments and transboundary waters institutions need to:*

- ◆ Demonstrate greater political **leadership**, awareness and recognition of climate change and its impacts, and translate this recognition into commitment to action.
- ◆ Translate political discussions into **tangible actions** to address climate change.
- ◆ Adopt a **long term vision** and approach to investments and actions to address climate change.
- ◆ Give greater emphasis to implementing and enforcing **international legal instruments** regionally, nationally and locally, in particular the UN Watercourses Convention.
- ◆ Strengthen the **use of science** in formulating policy responses to climate change, and improve understanding of climate change, including through improved modeling supported by high quality data that is accessible to all.
- ◆ Give greater **emphasis to communicating the causes, threats and impacts** of climate change and the options available for mitigation and adaptation, from the political to the local level, in order to galvanize action.
- ◆ Give greater emphasis to engaging and working with **all relevant stakeholders** and sectors at all levels in addressing climate change.
- ◆ Give greater emphasis to taking a **transboundary, integrated, eco-system-based approach** to addressing climate change, including strengthening transboundary institutional frameworks and mechanisms for cross-sectoral cooperation at local, national, regional and international levels.
- ◆ Give greater emphasis to building capacity and institutional strengthening, including **addressing capacity asymmetries** between countries.
- ◆ Implement **early warning** systems and response, resilience and adaptation plans.
- ◆ Formulate **clear rules for the effect of sea-level rise** on maritime jurisdictions.

*Major Outcomes for Question 3: In summarizing the most significant outcomes of the Small Table-dialogues, in order to meet the needs identified under Questions 1 and 2, GEF-5 should:*

- ◆ **Streamline requirements for multi-focal area proposals** and allow for more innovation in cross-sectoral projects that address specific needs in different regions and countries.
- ◆ Be more **flexible and responsive in adaptive project design** and management as conditions and issues change.
- ◆ Set **realistic project timelines** to allow for proper planning and establishment of implementation arrangements.
- ◆ Take a **longer-term programmatic** rather than project-specific approach, with **sustainability considerations** built in from initial design.
- ◆ Further develop mechanisms for **critical and reflective evaluation** and promulgation of lessons learned into improving the effectiveness of portfolio investments.
- ◆ Projects to be more country-driven and flexible to meet **local-level needs**, as well as more adaptive, flexible and less prescriptive

Update on New Technologies and Panel Discussion on GEF-IW Project Needs

#### *Key Issues Highlights*

◆ Most projects obtained technical advice from conferences, specialized agencies and through project-related contacts and consultants, and the most cited needs for support related to water quality monitoring.

### *Key Actions Highlighted*

◆ GEF STAP will design a more comprehensive approach to further explore and respond to the scientific and technical advice requirements of GEF projects under implementation

#### Session Coordinators:

Douglas Taylor, GEF STAP, douglas.taylor@unep.org  
Meryl Williams, GEF STAP

The GEF Scientific and Advisory Panel (STAP) workshop on new technologies was attended by 30 participants across two sessions held as part of the pre-conference workshops for the IWC5 and also later as participant workshop. The workshop was intended to explore the need for greater awareness by GEF projects and GEF agencies of the latest technologies for monitoring (living organisms, water quality, etc), and if such needs were detected test the “market” for STAP advice and follow-up within the GEF IW project community.

As the GEF-IW projects move beyond their foundational and planning stages into implementation, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment stages, STAP recognizes that relevant technologies will play a more important role. Therefore, STAP, at the agreement of the GEF IW Task Force, undertook to begin exploring the demand for knowledge on suitable technologies during the IWC5. The presentations chosen and the number of participants attending were considered to be a representative sample of the available information and needs of GEF projects, rather than a comprehensive analysis of either the technologies or the needs for project support.

#### *Discussion and conclusions*

The design of the workshop considered three questions which informed the presentations chosen:

- ◆ What are the technologies for?
- ◆ What should be measured?
- ◆ How to do the measurements in terms of technologies to use, data capture and analysis?

Participants at the workshops demonstrated interest in the technologies that were presented and encouraged STAP to provide further information including on the cost/benefit of alternatives for measuring and monitoring various parameters within the IW field. The analysis of questionnaires (see Annex 2a in the full report) revealed that most projects obtained technical advice from conferences, specialized agencies and through project-related contacts and consultants, and the most cited needs for support related to water quality monitoring.

A demand for systematic support to GEF IW projects over technologies was demonstrated at the workshops and STAP was encouraged to use the IW:LEARN website and its tools, and to link with other projects undertaking technology scans (e.g., IW:LEARN Nutrition Reduction Best Practice in Central/Eastern Europe) to provide further information to projects and to offer follow-up opportunities (with clear information about possible costs) for advice.

At the parallel session event STAP distributed a questionnaire (see Annex 3) to sample the needs of participants and the results of the feedback provided will be used to design a more comprehensive approach by STAP to further explore and respond to the scientific and technical advice requirements of GEF projects under implementation

*These presentations and the full report are available on the STAP website at <http://stapgef.unep.org/>*

Session Coordinators

Marilou Drilon (ADB), mldrilon@adb.org  
Tessa Goverse (UNEP), tessa.goverse@unep.org  
Marea Hatzios (IBRD), mhatziolos@worldbank.org  
Anna Tengberg (UNDP), anna.tengberg@undp.org

The purpose of the session was to highlight key achievements from the GEF IW portfolio in the Asia-Pacific region and share knowledge and experiences from coral reef research, management of oceanic fisheries in the Pacific and integrated coastal management and control of land-based pollution in the East Asian seas. The session also provided an overview of the recently launched Coral Triangle Initiative and its different sub-projects on coral reefs, fisheries and food security and explained how previous lessons and experiences from the region have been reflected in the programme design. Finally, the audience was given an opportunity to provide feedback and share similar experiences in a question and answer session.

Technical Site Visits: From Ridge to Reef

Session Coordinator:

Steve Raaymakers, IWC5 Technical Coordinator, Eco-Strategic, steve@eco-strategic.com

For the first time (at an IWC), participants were able to choose from three technical field trips. Conference participants were offered both marine and watershed management options for the field trips, and these showcased integrated water and other natural resource management issues; the consequences of climatic variability & change, as well as local innovations and best practices aimed at addressing those issues and consequences, including public-private partnerships. The participants heard presentations from and be guided by leading Australian scientists and natural resource managers, working in the various ecosystems visited.

The Catchment to Coast field trip showcased catchment management issues in the wet tropics world heritage area. Participants embarked on a unique experience of traveling through a rainforest canopy (via cable car). They also received briefings from the Management Authority and indigenous natural resource managers. Participants on the trip also observed best management practices at a sugar-cane farm (on a coastal low-land) as well as a flagship wastewater treatment plant operated by the Cleaner Seas Alliance. The latter is a local leading example of a private-sector partnership.

Most participants opted for the Great Barrier Reef field trip. The trip showcased integrated coastal and marine resource management issues and initiatives and public-private partnerships in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, and included a practical demonstration of the CoralWatch coral bleaching monitoring method by Project AWARE. The trip also included interpretive talks by biologists and resource managers on coral island reef management issues.

Finally, some IWC5 participants also opted for the so-called Rainforest Research trip. This trip demonstrated state of the art tropical rainforest research and management initiatives in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area near Cape Tribulation, in the world famous Daintree National Park. The trip included a visit to the Rainforest Canopy Crane operated by James Cook University (JCU), surface- and groundwater monitoring sites, indigenous involvement in rainforest research and management and an award-winning education and interpretive center with suspended rainforest board-walk.

### *Key Issues Highlights*

◆ Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies. In line with the OPS 4 recommendations there will be a need of GEF 5 IW Tracking Tool indicators to be embedded in the project result framework/log frame. After GEF 5 Strategy adoption GEF SEC will develop GEF 5 IW TT and the IWTF will discuss and adopt the new TT.

### Session Coordinator:

Ivan Zavadsky, GEF Secretariat, [izavadsky@thegef.org](mailto:izavadsky@thegef.org)

The results-based management session reflected the increasing focus of the GEF on results-based management, reporting requirements and tools introduced during GEF4 in the International Waters Focal Area (including the GEF IW 4 Tracking Tool). GEF agencies and project representatives had an opportunity to share their experiences with their own reviews and assessments of project performance and results and how they feed in the GEF IW Tracking Tool.

Aaron Zazueta from the GEF Evaluation Office delivered a presentation of the main conclusions and recommendations of the Overall Performance Study IV and in particular, the International Water focal area and the relevance of findings for GEF5. Some critical recommendations emerged from this study including:

- ◆ IW impact analysis need to be done at the water body or catchment level
- ◆ Need to examine combined effects of phased and concurrent projects
- ◆ Focus on involving **all countries in a catchment area** before investment stage, while continuing to support all participating countries
- ◆ Other Focal Areas should consider IWs Phased Approach (Foundation, Demonstration, Investment) when appropriate
- ◆ GEF should draw lessons from the IW:LEARN Initiative when developing a Knowledge Management approach across Agencies and Focal Areas
- ◆ Continue to develop and integrate tools for results-based management (Logframes, tracking tools and emerging evidence on impact drivers )

Chris Severin of the GEF Secretariat then delivered a presentation on the GEF4 IW tracking tool, a signature element of results-based management. The presentation covered its objectives, basic categories of analysis and ratings scale. UNEP's Isabelle van der Beck delivered remarks on logframes and indicators results-based management. The presentation focused on the centrality of indicators to measuring project impact. Indicators support the efficacy of the result based management process from planning to implementation, to monitoring, reporting and evaluation. However, indicators only indicate, one must also determine baselines and targets. The World Bank's Tracy Hart and UNDP's Paula Caballero contributed their thoughts on results-based management.

Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for **better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies**. In line with the OPS 4 recommendations there will be a need of GEF 5 IW Tracking Tool indicators to be embedded in the project result framework/log frame. After GEF 5 Strategy adoption, GEF SEC will develop the GEF 5 IW TT and the IWTF will discuss and adopt the new TT. The challenge to overcome would be to get the ownership of M&E frameworks by countries in order to ensure post-project life monitoring of established indicators, including socioeconomic indicators.

*Key Issues Highlights*

◆ The portfolio values the learning, networking and experience sharing opportunities and would like to see these continued. However, sustained interaction with the portfolio is needed to ensure that the learning approach is adaptive and responds well to project needs.

*Key Actions Highlighted*

◆ Establish a joint active information dissemination service e.g. email newsletter, RSS feeds, that provides IW project stakeholders (including perhaps also partners) about the latest developments, uploaded documents, meetings, UNU results, etc.

◆ Include more initiatives that are not funded by GEF in the IW:LEARN network and platforms. Very interesting networking opportunities exist within regional projects in related topics funded by SISA, IAEA, EU

Session Coordinators:

Vladimir Mamaev, Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP, vladimir.mamaev@undp.org

Tessa Goverse, UNEP, tessa.goverse@unep.org

Discussants

◆ Legal and Institutional Frameworks project in Transboundary Waters Management: Richard Paisley, University of British Columbia

◆ Science-Based Understanding: Dansie Andrew, United Nations University-INWEH

◆ Nutrient Reduction Best Practices in Central/Eastern Europe: Chuck Chaitovitz, Global Environment and Technology Foundation

◆ Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme: Elina Rautalahti, UN Environment Programme

◆ Wastewater Management Training, Robert Bechtloff, UN Environment Programme - GPA

◆ GEF IW:LEARN: Sean Khan, UNEP and Mish Hamid, UNOPS-UNDP IW:LEARN

The session aimed to engage projects managers and stakeholders on the direction taken in the GEF IW portfolio on mutual learning. The history of portfolio learning in IW was discussed and the “learning projects” introduced to the portfolio. Six projects discussed how they can assist the portfolio, what their services are and what support they are providing. In addition, Phillip Weller of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River presented the coming ICPDR-CTI-IW:LEARN Learning Exchange Program ([www.iwlearn.net/exchange](http://www.iwlearn.net/exchange)).

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ The portfolio values the learning, networking and experience sharing opportunities and would like to see these continued. However, sustained interaction with the portfolio is needed to ensure that the learning approach is adaptive and responds well to project needs.
- ◆ It is essential that a common learning approach is developed in the GEF IW portfolio and that uncoordinated action is avoided.
- ◆ Participants want to see an improved mapping tool of IW:LEARN with GIS functionality.

In the session, participants produced the following recommendations for GEF IW:LEARN:

- ◆ The GEF IW:LEARN project is maturing. Don't overstretch on improvement for now, just continue building on current plan.
- ◆ The IW:LEARN team should take up the guidance provided by the portfolio during the session in its further work with the GEF projects and other partners. The learning projects are diverse but should continue to work together to further **coordinate their work**.
- ◆ A **working space for further collaboration** should be set up on the IW:LEARN website, [www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net).

- ◆ Establish a joint **active information dissemination service** e.g. email newsletter, RSS feeds, that provides IW project stakeholders (including perhaps also partners) about the latest developments, uploaded documents, meetings, UNU results, etc.
- ◆ Find means to **get the IW community more actively engaged in information exchange**, perhaps by personally inviting people to contribute short papers/articles to newsletter/website, offering rewards, proposing questions for discussion (e.g. similar to the online “ask the expert” from UNEP), and so on.
- ◆ Perhaps IW:LEARN, in collaboration with UNU could play a more active and explicit role in **translating and disseminating science** and project results to the general public, practitioners and politicians
- ◆ Consider in this session/conference local level pilot considerations to improve livelihoods, tools and learning available through IW:LEARN/GEF Agencies for design, implementation and monitoring of these projects, especially in developing countries with large maritime/coastal populations in South East Asia and the Pacific
- ◆ **Harmonize work on indicators** across all projects; link all project websites and identify cross-cutting topics
- ◆ Include more **initiatives that are not funded by GEF** in the IW:LEARN network and platforms. Very interesting networking opportunities exist within regional projects in related topics funded by SISA, IAEA, EU
- ◆ IW:LEARN needs to promote itself even more
- ◆ IW:LEARN should **consolidate all IW Experiences Notes** into publication (book) with introductory chapters to each - these edited by experts/scientists.

Participants had the following recommendations for the IW Science project:

- ◆ Try to **link other national/international science** related to IW (example would be the significant science underpinning EU Water Framework Directive) aimed at sharing data and inter-comparisons of water status etc.
- ◆ Provide a clear **definition of “science”**.
- ◆ Every project should know you exist and what your development objective is
- ◆ Your demand should be from the projects/adaptive management
- ◆ Establish **collaboration with the GEF STAP** to ensure sustainability of processes that will ensure that GEF IW projects benefit from sound science

Participants had the following recommendations for the Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme project:

- ◆ Address **critical needs of any methodology** developed: reliable, accessible, credibility of data and information to feed the assessments; promote manageable number of indicators for each type of water systems and clarity of compatibility and/or changeability of those between different approaches
- ◆ Need to be able to **explain** what an assessment methodology is
- ◆ Your baseline should include a few “good practice” assessment examples

Suggestions for new learning topics in IWC’s:

- ◆ Enlargement of activities to **vulnerable regions** (Arctic, Antarctic, High Seas) – weather kitchens for climate change
- ◆ Endorse the **human right to water**, legal reforms and policies
- ◆ Linkages to datasets that we are using to **support TDA formulation** in order to be able to go back to them for other activities e.g. global or sub-regional water quality assessment – snapshot – trends on e.g. N, P, etc.
- ◆ Increase emphasis on **social and economic dimensions** of transboundary (+ within country) water resource management

- ◆ How to work effectively at **community scale(s)** within the transboundary strategy
- ◆ “Science” to include “social science” and relevant areas for practice change, behavioral change, (rural) sociology, psychology, adult education, gender, involvement of youth, approaches of working at community/catchment scale, trust building, social capital, community development, etc.
- ◆ Capacity building and knowledge sharing between participating countries and advanced countries to help **SIDS** better manage their resources with changes
- ◆ Use of indicators and measurements of impacts for **multi-focal projects**

#### Private Sector Involvement Round-table

##### *Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ To achieve private sector involvement, there must be clear benefits to the private sector partners, including business benefits. The relationship between environmental performance (reductions in use of resources and production of waste etc) and business performance (reduced costs and increased profits), and concepts such as the triple-bottom line therefore need to be promoted in GEF projects.
- ◆ To be involved in projects the private sector needs an “honest broker” and this role can be played by the GEF agencies, giving public credibility to industry through involvement with UN and similar agencies.
- ◆ One of the benefits that GEF could offer the private-sector is a “Green Award” of some type, which would allow companies that won the award to gain marketing and public relations benefits from being recognized and awarded for their environmental “best-practices” by the GEF. Related to this is the need for the GEF and its EarthFund to develop and maintain reputation as “quality brands” with integrity.

##### *Key Actions Highlighted*

- ◆ Many private sector players are extremely active and advanced with developing and implementing best-practice sustainability actions, although these are often not known to the GEF community. To assist in identifying opportunities for collaboration between GEF and such companies, it would be useful to convene a global GEF/private sector workshop, through umbrella groups such as the World Business Council on Sustainability. This joint workshop would undertake a “stock-take” of relevant private-sector initiatives and “marry” these with potential GEF projects, where there are clear common goals and benefits and potential synergies.

##### Session Coordinator:

Steve Raaymakers, Eco-Strategic Consultants (CTI IW:LEARN), [steve@eco-strategic.com](mailto:steve@eco-strategic.com)

Rapporteur: Joel Bailey, James Cook University

Conference delegates from the private sector, including sponsors, were invited to meet with senior representatives from GEF, GEF projects, World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, other UN agencies, regional development banks and national governments. The roundtable had the following objectives:

- ◆ Brainstorm ways to increase private-sector involvement in GEF-5.
- ◆ Explore ways to enhance the adoption of public-private partnerships in GEF projects.
- ◆ Discuss private-sector solutions to shared water resources management.
- ◆ Share experiences of GEF projects that have been successful in partnering with private sector.
- ◆ Encourage networking between private-sector delegates and senior GEF, UNDP and development bank representatives.

##### *Current and previous examples*

- ◆ Al Duda, Senior Adviser for International Waters (IW) at the GEF Secretariat provided some background on GEF-IW partnering with the private sector to date. Several IW projects have been successful in this regard, for example:
  - **Danube** basin project partnering with Coca Cola / Hellenic Water to minimize their water footprint in the basin.
  - **PEMSEA** establishing a waste management partnership between municipal government and industry at Batangas Bay demo site in Philippines.
  - The existence of significant offshore oil and gas activities in **BCLME and GCLME** areas is being explored for partnering potential.
  - Additionally, the current GEF CEO has established the **EarthFund to specifically support GEF/private sector partnerships**, and which has a fast-track project approval process separate from the mainstream GEF procedures. Within two years US\$50M has been mobilized through this Fund, although none (yet) in the IW area. The EarthFund replenishment may be up to \$500M and IW should start getting mobilized to access this.
- ◆ Jose Matheickal of the GloBallast programme outlined their success with partnering with the private sector, including:
  - GloBallast Phase I securing significant private sector co-financing from the **shipping industry** for a broadcast quality, 1 hour TV documentary.
  - GloBallast Phase II building on the relationships formed during Phase I to establish a **Global industry Alliance (GIA)**, under which a small select group of shipping companies contribute to a fund administered by IMO, which is used to meet mutual industry and IMO needs in relation to technical R&D and similar activities.
- ◆ Carlsberg breweries outlined the work they have been doing on assessing and **minimizing their water footprint** and indicating that this was highest in the base-levels of their supply chain (agriculture activities that supply their raw ingredients). Carlsberg is interested to work in partnership with GEF to develop ways to reduce their water footprint.
- ◆ Terrain NRM stated that in implementing the Federal Governments “Reef Rescue” initiative to improve water quality on the Great Barrier Reef, they need to work with **individual, small-scale private-sector entities** such as sugar-cane farmers, and that engaging at this level is just as important as engaging with large corporations. Similar approaches are required in the fisheries sector, where there are both large corporations and small, individual operators.
- ◆ UNIDO stated that as the UN agency that deals specifically with industrial issues, they could bring a lot of experience to the UN family in dealing with the private-sector.

#### *Key Lessons-Learned in Private Sector Partnerships*

The group brainstormed the key “success factors” for securing private sector involvements and identified the following:

- ◆ All GEF projects should include a **requirement for project proponents to secure private-sector involvement**, including if possible co-financing, as part of standard project design criteria.
- ◆ The most successful examples of private sector involvement in GEF projects have been initiated and achieved through **personal and professional relationships** and networks, so developing such networks is clearly important, and this can be a long-term exercise.
- ◆ To achieve private sector involvement, there must be **clear benefits to the private sector partners**, including business benefits. The relationship between environmental performance (reductions in use of resources and production of waste etc) and business performance (reduced costs and increased profits), and concepts such as the **triple-bottom line** therefore need to be promoted in GEF projects.

- ◆ GEF projects also need to **identify “common” objectives** and benefits with private-sector.
- ◆ To be involved in projects the private sector needs an **“honest broker”** and this role can be played by the GEF agencies, giving public credibility to industry through involvement with UN and similar agencies.
- ◆ One of the benefits that GEF could offer the private-sector is a **“Green Award”** of some type, which would allow companies that won the award to gain marketing and public relations benefits from being recognized and awarded for their environmental “best-practices” by the GEF. Related to this is the need for the GEF ad its EarthFund to develop and maintain reputation as “quality brands” with integrity.

*Participants identified some possible follow-up actions*

- ◆ Many private sector players are extremely active and advanced with developing and implementing best-practice sustainability actions, although these are often not known to the GEF community. To assist in identifying opportunities for collaboration between GEF and such companies, it would be useful to **convene a global GEF/private sector workshop**, through umbrella groups such as the World Business Council on Sustainability. This joint workshop would undertake a “stock-take” of relevant private-sector initiatives and “marry” these with potential GEF projects, where there are clear common goals and benefits and potential synergies.
- ◆ This might also result in the formation of a **“Captains of Industry Roundtable on International Waters”**, to advise the GEF-IW focal area on areas of collaboration.
- ◆ Consideration should be given to developing a GEF-IW Project Proposal on transferring best-practice management through **twinning between the Great Barrier Reef and the Meso-American Barrier Reef management agencies**, including catchment management approaches which involve private-sector land-users such as the Reef Rescue initiative, and state of the art approaches to managing the impacts of reef tourism.
- ◆ **NGO’s** should be considered as partners particularly as they have valuable experience and knowledge relating to dealing with the private sector

Life After GEF - Sustainability

*Key Session Highlights*

- ◆ Plan for the transition away from GEF early in project implementation. Project implementation time is often longer than planned because of changes in government, etc. Government thinks short term: planning long term saves overall. Projects should make annual reports on progress towards sustainability

Session Coordinator:

Philip Weller, ICPDR, Philip.weller@unvienna.org

Rapporteurs: Tony Forsyth, James Cook University & Leon Cuauhtemoc (Legal and Institutional Frameworks project)

The session focused on examining the elements that are necessary to ensure the continuation and sustainability of progress made in GEF funded projects following the completion of projects. The example of the Danube River - a fifteen year GEF intervention that has continued to realize success following the project completion was highlighted. The elements that can be built into project design to ensure sustainability will be highlighted and discussed. Exploration and exchange of experience in ensuring that the projects support sustainable institutions and funding took place. The opportunities of the private sector to contribute to and assist in meeting project goals and ensuring the long term sustainability of projects was also explored as well as the elements necessary to make such cooperation possible.

*Key Lessons-Learned in promoting project sustainability (learned by ICPDR)*

Phil Weller, Executive Secretary of the ICPDR opened the session by declaring that four years after GEF intervention, the ICPDR is still there. He described some of the following lessons-learned:

- ◆ Projects should build or **consolidate institutions**, as opposed to creating new ones. Also, there is a distinction between institutions and project. Be realistic: a project is a project
- ◆ Projects should build or consolidate a **legal basis**
- ◆ Build **personal capacity** of leaders, as new stakeholders will eventually mean new institutions. The experience the managers have after a project is social capital with great value to institutions. Skills required for IW projects are not taught in universities. Also institutional support at simple level (e.g. someone paying for travel) provides basis for building of personal relationships amongst negotiators.
- ◆ Encourage and facilitate **partnerships** especially with influential companies and agencies. Private participation = commitments of business to carry on in sustainable fashion; best practice; water use; pollution; energy use; funding for projects (can include government involvement) e.g. power sector, shipping, chemical company, Coca-Cola.
- ◆ Set funding and activities within **resource capabilities**
- ◆ Ensure communication and public awareness (to obtain **public support**). Create regular celebrations, for example “Danube Day”.
- ◆ **Plan for the transition** away from GEF early in project implementation. Project implementation time is often longer than planned because of changes in government, etc. Government thinks short term: planning long term saves overall. Projects should make **annual reports on progress towards sustainability**.

Discourse on Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis-Strategic Action Programmes

*Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ The TDA for the Okavango River Basin Project used an innovative methodology based on water use analysis to anticipate issues that will occur in the future for the region. This study was carried out by three different teams from each of the riparian states that allowed the three countries to develop capacity, to perform the work much faster, and to coordinate their work.
- ◆ The WIO-Lab project coordinated extensively with other projects in the region, such as the Agulhas and Somali Current LME project, as well as a mainstreaming the program into the riparian states’ national development plans

Session Coordinator:

Andrea Merla, UNESCO, merla.andrea@gmail.com

Rapporteur: Jennifer Maul, White and Case L.L.P (Legal and Institutional Frameworks)

The session featured three of these IW foundational projects, dealing with basin management (Okavango River Basin), coastal zone management and pollution reduction (Western Indian Ocean), and a major Large Marine Ecosystem (Guinea Current) and its living resources. Speakers presented their project's achievements particularly concerning the application of the TDA - SAP methodology as the major step for creating the needed basis for on the ground action.

In his opening remarks, Mr. Merla stated that the GEF recommends the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Programmes (SAP) methodology for its projects in order for the projects to know the challenges they face and then to be able to work with stakeholders to develop a consensus on actions to be undertaken. But the GEF is considering revisiting this

methodology to take into account new considerations such as climate variability and groundwater issues.

*Chaminda Rajapakse, UNDP/FAO Okavango River Basin*

The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission, which includes the three riparian states of Angola, Namibia, and Botswana, has partnered with the GEF to promote the environmental protection of the Okavango River Basin. But unlike most projects that the GEF is involved with that deal with current problems, the Okavango River Basin is still in near pristine condition and is therefore concerned with emerging pressuring.

To achieve this different focus, the TDA for the Okavango River Basin Project **used an innovative methodology based on water use analysis** to anticipate issues that will occur in the future for the region. The present state of the river basin was taken as the status quo, and then different development paths were modeled in order to analyze the different potential outcomes. The models predicted what would happen in the different scenarios, including a climate change situation, to the hydrology of the river and the ecological responses (such as drought) and how that would affect the socioeconomy and macroeconomy of the three countries. An in-depth analysis was conducted of eight specific sites and then those results were extrapolated to the entire Okavango River Basin. **This study was carried out by three different teams from each of the riparian states that allowed the three countries to develop capacity, to perform the work much faster, and to coordinate their work.**

In completing the TDA, **existing organizations in the three riparian countries were used** as much possible and close links and collaborations were formed with other initiatives in the region. Some of the trends projected in the TDA include: population increases, increases in irrigation, increases in urbanization, significant increases in water demand, and increases in rainfall and evaporation as a result of climate change. Incorporating these trends into the models, some of the key findings of the TDA are that the placement of obstructions and impoundments along the river will have a huge impact on the system and that sediment transport is very important to the functioning of the Okavango delta.

*Peter Scheren (UNEP Western Indian Ocean – Land Based Activities Project)*

The Land Activities Project is being executed by UN Office for Project Services under the legal framework of the Nairobi Convention (a legal agreement between 10 countries for the management of the Eastern Indian Ocean). In completing the TDA, the Land Activities Project **coordinated with other projects** in the region, such as the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem and WIO-Lab.

Overseen by a Project Management Unit, the TDA was drafted by a team of experts working in the three main technical themes of pollution, legal, and river coast interaction who reviewed the problems in the region based on input from stakeholder meetings and fact finding missions. The TDA provided a detailed ranking of the problems facing the region (ranging from high importance to low importance), a description of their causes, and a stakeholder analysis.

For the SAP, the Land Activities Project established a drafting team with representatives from stakeholder groups and academic institutions and worked to bridge the gap between the TDA and the SAP (especially on governance concerns and other cross-cutting issues). The SAP developed environmental quality objectives with specific targets over the short, medium, and long term and provides for national and regional collaboration and the use of already existing institutions.

In order to implement the SAP (which is expected to be finalized in March 2010 at the Nairobi Convention Conference of Parties), the project needs to **mainstream the program into the riparian states' national development plans**, identify partners for implementation and develop concrete proposals for support, designate Regional Activity Centers, and use the Nairobi Convention Secretariat to monitor and evaluate the results of SAP implementation.

The plus side of these development processes for the TDA and the SAP include: the involvement of **only regional experts** in the development of the TDA which facilitated regional acceptance, the inclusiveness of the SAP process which led to strong partnerships and regional ownership of the process, and the use of the Nairobi Convention framework to provide a legal mechanism for implementation. But one of the drawbacks is delay since the stakeholder involvement and the national mainstreaming process for the SAP are very time and resource intensive.

*Stephen Maxwell Odonkor (UNDP/UNEP/UNIDO Guinea Current LME Project)*

The Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem, a coastline that stretches along the West Coast of Africa and includes 300 million people from 16 riparian countries, is one of the oldest projects and already has both its TDA and SAP complete. The ultimate goal of the TDA and the SAP is to mitigate the current rate of environmental degradation in the region and to restore the health of the current. The Guinea Current faces tremendous challenges related to the decline of fish stocks and non-optimal harvesting of living resources, loss of ecosystem integrity, introduction of alien species, and deterioration in water quality and it needs to have a system that address the highly variable and potentially fragile nature of the Guinea Current and its coastal environment.

The SAP was prepared through cooperation and negotiations among participating countries and identifies the policy, legal, and institutional reforms that are necessary and the investment that are needed to address the transboundary problems that were identified in the TDA. There is also a focus on cross-cutting issues such as capacity building and institutional strengthening, stakeholder participation, public participation, and investment.

As a basis for cooperative action, the riparian states have already partnered together in negotiating the legal framework of the Abidjan Convention and in forming the Interim Guinea Current Commission. For the next step, the riparian states need to implement their respective National Action Plans concerning actions that they will take to implement the SAP and show a stronger commitment towards meeting the SAP's targets. In addition, the project wants to upscale the Interim Guinea Current Commission into a more institutionalized Permanent Guinea Current Commission that would be under the Abidjan Convention framework and to agree on funding mechanisms for the Commission in a post-GEF period.

#### Development of GEF-IW Project Indicators

##### *Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ There is a need for development of measurable indicators, and more attention to be paid to baseline information.
- ◆ Concerns were noted with the (often) lack of proper and precise information for baselines and the need underlined to revisit and update indicators during project implementation stage.
- ◆ Targets need to be based on real interventions and 'concrete' activities to make indicators measurable and credible.

##### *Key Actions Highlighted*

- ◆ Track long-term impact (stress reduction and environmental status indicators) by mainstreaming monitoring of such indicators into the activities of waterbody joint institutions.

- 💧 Focus on client ownership by having parallel indicators in case of various projects.
- 💧 A log frame should be flexible enough to incorporate changes as long as they are well-justified and do not jeopardize an ultimate project goal.

Session Coordinators:

Andrew Hudson, UNDP, andrew.hudson@undp.org

Tracy Hart, World Bank, thart@worldbank.org

Rapporteur: Dinara Ziganshina UNESCO - Centre for Water Law, Policy & Science, University of Dundee (Legal and Institutional Frameworks project)

Effective, results-based management of GEF IW projects requires well-designed projects including logical framework matrix. Project outcomes and outputs require quantifiable targets and measurable indicators. This session reviewed GEF IW experience with the design of logical frameworks, drawing on the experience of several of GEF's most seasoned project designers and managers as well as from session participants, and aim to identify and codify some best practices. The panelists, moderators and audience members discussed the role of indicators as a diagnosis, as a communication tools, and as a means to ensure long-term sustainability of project objectives.

Panelists included Peter Whalley (Tisza River Basin), Isabelle van der Beck of UNEP, Liping Jiang, World Bank (Hai River Basin) and David Vousden (Agulhas and Somali Current LME).

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- 💧 Peter Whalley addressed the effectiveness of indicators and the ways they might be improved. He raised two main points: the need for **development of measurable indicators**, and more attention to be paid to **baseline information**. He warned against rolling up all indicators into single simplistic number.
- 💧 Isabelle van der Beck addressed some challenges that relate to IW Log Frame design. She observed a close link between project design from one side and indicators and results, from another. In this regard, panelists stressed the need to capture appropriately all three main elements of a log frame - **quantifiable indicators, baselines and targets**. Concerns were noted with the (often) lack of proper and precise information for baselines and the need underlined to **revisit and update indicators during project implementation** stage.
- 💧 Liping Jiang shared his experience of using a log frame for two projects in China. He pointed out three advantages of log frames:
  - Focus on impact and outcomes of the project rather than input
  - Important linkages between objectives/outcomes and risks/assumption
  - Added value of using a well-designed log frame for project supervision
- 💧 David Vousden (Agulhas & Somali Current LME) suggested some perspectives to effective indicators from both a project management and evaluation point of view. Targets need to be **based on real interventions and 'concrete' activities** to make indicators measurable and credible. There are special challenges that relate to IW log frame design in terms of the need to focus on **transboundary deliverables at a regional level**. Log frames are often out-of-date at the project inception therefore special focus should be based on their review and revision during inception phase. Other improvements to the use of indicators include ongoing 'progress-chasing' (continuous assessment) and post-project evaluation of indicators to ensure sustainability of project objectives and GEF investment.

*Project Indicator Question & Answer*

Project management indicators and sustainability indicators

Q: How to achieve continuous, long-term monitoring and sustainability? How to transfer responsibility from the project to country? Is there a mechanism to oblige countries to report on post-project impact?

A: Project indicators and sustainability indicators were addressed in two different ways. Some participants stressed that there is a need to separate project management indicators and sustainability indicators, whilst others pointed out that sustainability indicators should actually be built in project management indicators. Andrew Hudson stressed the need to track long-term impact (stress reduction and environmental status indicators) by **mainstreaming monitoring of such indicators into the activities of waterbody joint institutions**. In this respect, GEF should enable regional and national capacity and commitment to monitor and report long-term impact.

#### Country ownership

Q: How to make design and use of indicators more oriented on countries needs?

A: Long term harmonization of what countries themselves and/or river basin organizations want to measure and project indicators. **Focus on client ownership by having parallel indicators** in case of various projects. A continuous review and revision of a log frame to ensure accuracy of evaluation and true country ownership is needed.

#### Changes and GEF IW-Indicators

Q: How to address changes (external and internal) in a log frame and whether GEF mechanisms are available to capture unexpected developments (both positive and negative)? How to update indicators that are already signed up for?

A: The main points suggested by GEF agencies is that a log frame should be flexible enough to **incorporate changes as long as they are well-justified and do not jeopardize an ultimate project goal**. At the same time, participants and GEF agencies acknowledged existing gaps in capturing critical catalytic effects of the projects. Participants also pointed out the failure of PIR format reporting to capture changing contexts in project implementation.

#### *Additional Session Recommendations*

Participants recommended some possible ways to improve the development and use of GEF IW indicators:

- ◆ continuous assessment and fine-tuning of log frame indicators
- ◆ post-project evaluation to ensure sustainability and long term impact
- ◆ flexibility to capture catalytic impacts of the projects
- ◆ respond to countries demands

#### Gender and Water

##### *Key Actions Highlighted*

◆ The future of GEF IW will include gender mainstreaming in all its programs. This will assist all the GEF projects to develop more equitable frameworks and outcomes, ultimately resulting in more sustainable global water resources.

##### Session Coordinator:

Susan Bazili, Legal and Institutional Frameworks MSP, [susanbazilli@gmail.com](mailto:susanbazilli@gmail.com)

Gender mainstreaming is crucial to the overall success of GEF projects, both for contributing to goals of gender equality as well as achieving the GEF's goals. This workshop presented an overview

of the issues of gender and water, with examples of why it is critical in case studies in Central Asia, Laos, the EU, and India. Climate change is a cross-cutting theme. Workshop presenters represented diverse perspectives and belong to a number of global gender and water networks. Participants engaged in discussion and leave with some practical tools to proceed in their own projects.

Gender mainstreaming is crucial to the overall success of GEF projects both for contributing to the goals of gender equality as well as achieving the GEF's goals. This workshop began with an overview presentation by session coordinator, Susan Bazili, from the Legal and Institutional Frameworks Governance Project, on the various issues of gender and women pertinent to the water sector. Governance is the central overarching theme within which to see issues of lack of equitable participation of women. **Policies result in more sustainable development if women are involved in decision making.** In the international waters sector there are few women at the table, and few men with a gender perspective. Climate change was also introduced as a cross-cutting theme, as women are adversely impacted by climate change as the majority of the poor are women.

Chandavanh Dethrasagong presented the work of the gender and water sector in Laos by grounding her presentation in the Millennium Development Goals. She provided a snapshot of socioeconomic development and gender equality issues in Laos, and applied this to the water and sanitation and health MDGs. She concluded by arguing for ensured equitable participation in water governance.

Seema Kulkarni described the implications of a gender blind water sector on women, and more importantly, on gender relations. She provided an overview of the history of women and water over the past few decades and how the changing analysis impacted on policy development and programs. She set out an exercise on how to do a gender analysis of water resources, benefits and incentives. Her examples from India served to illustrate the grassroots perspective of women and water and how that is transformed in policy development.

There are several networks on gender and water globally. The Gender and Water Network in Central Asia (GWANET) formed from a demand in the field from women who wanted to promote gender equality in the water resources management by improving gender awareness among the water sector stakeholders at all levels, and building their capacity to include gender into the decision making processes. Dinara Ziganshina from Uzbekistan presented the story of the GWANET as demand driven from needs. Gender mainstreaming and training must be supported from project inception. While there are many issues clearly specific to the water sector, there are transferable lessons for GEF IW programs from other sectors.

Florence Pauly discussed how to implement gender mainstreaming in EU supported research. Ensuring that men and women work together within a gender equitable framework from the outset of projects will result in better policies, utility, outcomes and accountability. In conclusion, GEF has lagged behind other international institutions such as the UNDP, which includes a gender lens on its programs of poverty reduction, democratic governance, crisis prevention and recovery, environment and sustainable development. This workshop session concluded with a commitment from participant Al Duda that **the future of GEF IW will include gender mainstreaming in all its programs.** This will assist all the GEF projects to develop more equitable frameworks and outcomes, ultimately resulting in more sustainable global water resources.

CRTR: Impact at the Local-level, Coral Reef Restoration and Community Livelihoods

Session Coordinators:

Alasdair Edwards, Coral Reef Targeted Research project, a.j.edwards@newcastle.ac.uk  
Edgardo Gomez, Coral Reef Targeted Research project, edgomez@upmsi.ph,  
edgomezph@yahoo.com

Communities and NGOs are increasingly managing their coral reef resources at the local level. Often these have become degraded with loss of biodiversity, habitat structure and fisheries production and, having established some protection, local managers are seeking to restore the reefs and the services they provide. The science underpinning reef restoration is still in its infancy, aspirations are often unrealistic and the focus on active restoration through activities such as coral transplantation is often misguided.

Towards a Synergetic GEF Programme for the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) LME's

*Key Actions Highlighted*

◆ So far, ASCLMEs, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB have agreed on a common coordination framework, leading among others to the joint develop of a comprehensive TDA and SAP for the region.

Session Coordinator:

Peter Scheren, Western Indian Ocean Land Based Activities project, peter.scheren@unep.org

The overall objective of the proposed WIO-LMEs Workshop was to **enhance the coordination between GEF projects in the WIO region**, in particular as it concerns the development of a synergistic GEF programme for the region based on a comprehensive TDA and SAP. The WIO International Waters Projects Workshop brought together Project and Task Managers of the various GEF projects active in the WIO region. Represented were the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP); the Agulhas and Somali Currents Large Marine Ecosystem Programme (ASCLMEs); the project “Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean” (WIO-LaB); the project “Reduction of Environmental Impact from Coastal Tourism through the Implementation of Pilot Demonstration Projects, Promoting the Development of Sustainable Tourism Policies and Strategies and Strengthening Public-Private Partnership”; and the Marine Highway Development and Coastal and Marine Contamination Prevention Project. The meeting was chaired by Dr. Johan Augustyn of the Department for Environmental Affairs and Tourism in South Africa, national focal point for the ASCLMEs Project.

So far, ASCLMEs, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB have **agreed on a common coordination framework, leading among others to the joint develop of a comprehensive TDA and SAP for the region<sup>1</sup>**. The SAPs will provide an important step forward towards a more comprehensive and synergistic programme of intervention for the WIO region, based upon the conclusions of the ongoing suite of projects. The intention is that GEF-support would be sought for such programme, but further financing would be sourced from other financial partners. In the meantime, a TDA and SAP focused on land-based and activities has already been developed as part the WIO-LaB Project. The WIO-LaB SAP therewith forms the first ‘leg’ towards the later to be produced LME-wide SAP, and a basis for advanced action to address issues related to land-based sources and activities in the WIO region from 2010 onwards.

The Workshop objectives and discussions were introduced by short presentations by Dr. David Vousden, ASCLME Project Coordinator, and Dr. Peter Scheren, WIO-LaB Project Manager. The meeting focused, in particular, on arrangements for the policy-level stocktaking meeting to be organized back to back with the Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention, on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010. In this regard, the workshop provided a few basic items for the agenda of this meeting, being:

<sup>1</sup> Currently debates are ongoing as to the desirability of a separate TDA and SAP for the Agulhas and Somali Current LMEs respectively, within the light of the limited scope for data collection and governance-intervention in the conflict-struck regions of Somalia.

1. A visioning exercise: setting the scene for an ecosystem-based management approach for the WIO region based on the TDA/SAP framework.
2. A status assessment: where are we and where do we want to go as a region? This will involve among others presentations on the status of the ongoing GEF projects in the region.
3. A roadmap: how can the region from where we are to where it want to go? This would involve outlining the TDA/SAP process as well as discussing various elements thereof. It would also involve discussing the advance implementation of the WIO-LaB SAP.

The workshop furthermore discussed several pertinent issues that should be tabled to delegates during the stocktaking meeting, including:

1. The question of whether the region (which includes two LMEs) warrants a single TDA/SAP or two separate TDA/SAPs.
2. The issue of coordination of the TDA/SAP process between projects, in particular at the national level, recognizing that each project has its own national management committee.
3. The issue of a Governance Analysis to be undertaken under the overall coordination of the ASCLMEs Project.

Finally, it was agreed that further details for the stocktaking meeting, including logistical arrangements, participants, etc. would be discussed during a follow-up preparatory session to be held between the ASCLME, WIO-LaB and SWIOFP Projects.



**Addressing Land-based activities in the Western**



## Reaching Agreements Over Water

### *Key Issues Highlights*

💧 This workshop introduced participants to the IUCN toolkits RULE, NEGOTIATE and SHARE, and used dialogue over geographic case studies to assist participants to priorities reform processes and the tools needed to build water governance capacity at national and transboundary levels.

### Session Coordinator:

Mark Smith, IUCN, [mark.smith@iucn.org](mailto:mark.smith@iucn.org)

Water governance capacity is the competence of a society to implement effective water governance reforms through transparent and cost efficient policy, law and institutions. Building water governance capacity ensures that changes in policy, law and institutions are coordinated, internally consistent and able to catalyze progress on safe water supply and sanitation and implementation of IWRM. This workshop introduced participants to the IUCN toolkits RULE, NEGOTIATE and SHARE, and used dialogue over geographic case studies to assist participants to priorities reform processes and the tools needed to build water governance capacity at national and transboundary levels.

### *Discussion summary*

- ◆ Building a **dialog with stakeholders** is a need and action that should be designed as explicit strategy
- ◆ **Building trust** among the key institutional partners and leaders is a milestone of the whole process
- ◆ Integration of the **gender perspective** and the traditional rules is needed
- ◆ **Communication and educational** process needs to be conducted
- ◆ Acknowledgement that these are **complex systems** gives managers good perspective
- ◆ Assure public and transparent participation will derives in a better conflict management
- ◆ **Negotiation** is needed in order to contribute actively in the project management process

#### CC Adaptation Planning for the Coral Triangle

##### *Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ Coordination of efforts among multiple agencies and interests, as well as the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation considerations into development plans and programs, is a ongoing challenge in the Coral Triangle and in coastal and marine resources management efforts elsewhere, though some institutional responses are beginning to emerge (such as the creation of national coordination bodies for climate change).
- ◆ While there are a number of recently completed or ongoing surveys and syntheses of studies on the impacts of climate change on the Coral Triangle, there remains a need for further downscaled modeling and field-based analysis together with well coordinated application of the best available information for effective programming of resources and other decisions.

##### Session Coordinator:

David McCauley, Asian Development Bank, dmccauley@adb.org

An active discussion was held among experts involved in the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) as well as others interested in the associated issues and approaches. Representatives from the Interim CTI Regional Secretariat were on hand to answer questions, with the session facilitated by the Asian Development Bank.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ The CTI recognizes the need to respond to **climate change impacts as one of its priorities**, for action at the national and local levels as well as through regional cooperation.
- ◆ **Coordination** of efforts among multiple agencies and interests, as well as the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation considerations into **development plans and programs**, is a ongoing challenge in the Coral Triangle and in coastal and marine resources management efforts elsewhere, though some institutional responses are beginning to emerge (such as the creation of **national coordination bodies for climate change**).
- ◆ Certain problems created by climate change impacts require regional responses, and **ecosystem-based platforms** - such as GEF's large marine ecosystems - **may offer useful frameworks to address some regional challenges**, especially those employing ecosystem-based adaptation approaches.
- ◆ There are considerable differences among the 6 CTI countries in terms of their concerns, resources and capacities, with one notable distinction being the high level of external adaptation funding already available to Pacific countries relative to their **absorptive capacities**, which is in contrast with the still large and mostly unmet demands from Southeast Asian countries.

- ◆ While there are a number of recently completed or ongoing surveys and syntheses of studies on the impacts of climate change on the Coral Triangle, there remains a **need for further downscaled modeling and field-based analysis together with well coordinated application of the best available information** for effective programming of resources and other decisions.

#### Connecting the Dots: Sharing Successes is Critical to Informing Future Investments

##### *Key Actions Highlighted*

- ◆ There was interest among the participants to share the cost information on practices from the Mississippi River Basin for use in the Tisza. Participants also committed to provide additional data and information on projects and practices.

##### Session Coordinator:

Chuck Chaitovitz, Global Environment and Technology Foundation (The Living Water Exchange: A GEF/UNDP project promoting nutrient reduction best practices in Central and Eastern Europe), [chuck@getf.org](mailto:chuck@getf.org)

The Living Water Exchange held a participant workshop to promote discussions among GEF project managers regarding specific, emerging pollution prevention, technology deployment and nutrient reduction/removal management strategies and their cost effectiveness. This session focused on how coordination and dissemination of the significant GEF, World Bank and other nutrient reduction portfolios is critically important to appropriately develop and implement models for emerging and effective nutrient reduction applications going forward. Discussions underscored the data collection and best practice development process and describe specific pollution prevention, technology deployment and nutrient reduction/removal management strategies and their cost effectiveness. A panel discussion, followed by time for Q&A, gave IWC 2009 participants a chance to:

- ◆ Learn about the most cost effective best practices on nutrient reduction
- ◆ Provide experiences that can be added to the knowledge inventory
- ◆ Invest time and/or funds in one of the pilot projects
- ◆ Help to forge/leverage partnerships through international and local contacts

Several participants made presentations uncovering some of the following issues:

*Chuck Chaitovitz, Project Manager, Living Water Exchange – provided a brief overview of the Living Water Exchange and framed the purpose of the discussion:*

- ◆ There is a solid body of work on nutrient reduction in the ECA region.
- ◆ The GEF/World Bank Investment Fund on Nutrient Reduction and the Danube River Basin Project form the core of GEF investments, but we are only starting to understand the impacts – real reductions in nitrogen and phosphorus.
- ◆ The project is a key element of the GEF learning portfolio and underscores the importance of practical, on-the-ground solutions.
- ◆ We need help in gathering and appropriately evaluating all the relevant nutrient reduction projects and practices.

Miodrag Milovanic, Jaroslav Cerni Institute, Tisza River MSP, Serbia - discussed the key nutrient challenges in the region based on data and information from the International Commission on the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR):

- ◆ **Policies** including the EU Water Framework Directive, an MOU between the ICPDR and the International Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea and others are **driving the**

- need for environmental performance improvements**, including addressing nutrient issues.
- ◆ These agreements call for reducing the total amount of nutrients entering the Danube and its tributaries to levels consistent with the achievement of the good ecological/chemical status by 2015, and returning the Black Sea to 1960s conditions.
  - ◆ Much is known about the challenges and issues in the Danube-Black Sea region, including nutrient pollution from wastewater, agricultural run-off, detergents, etc.
  - ◆ The **MONERIS provides a quantitative framework** for making reductions in the absence of sufficient data in the region.
  - ◆ Significant progress has been made in reducing nutrient loads especially with the implementation of urban wastewater treatment across the region.
  - ◆ However, this leaves **agricultural run-off as a major issue**.
  - ◆ Countries with the lowest GDP still require the most nutrient reduction investments and actions.

*Aleksandar Bogumovic, Project Coordinator, Serbia Danube River Enterprise Nutrient Reduction Project, Serbia – provided highlights of the outcomes and best practices from the Danube River Enterprise Nutrient Reduction Project:*

- ◆ The project has overcome substantial management and administrative hurdles and is now on schedule.
- ◆ There has been significant progress including:
  - The Code of Good Agricultural Practice
  - 86 nutrient management plans prepared
  - New procedures and activities developed and introduced
  - 64 farms- received grant support
  - 3 Slaughterhouses received grant support
  - 7 Agriculture Schools received grant support
- ◆ Established Training and Information Centre (TIC) - 570 participants trained in TIC about EU legislation on ND and WFD, CGAP, proper manure and slaughterhouse animal waste management
- ◆ Key capacity building improvements are needed at the World Bank and with the Ministries, including more flexible permitting.
- ◆ There is data regarding the amount of manure slurried and/or composted, but water quality improvements will not be available for several years.
- ◆ A replication strategy for best practices should emerge during 2010.

*Mark Peters, Senior Economist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture – provided a summary of the nutrient and hypoxia challenges in the Gulf of Mexico and the Mississippi River Basin and offered analysis of costs and benefits of specific management practices:*

- ◆ Like the Danube, agriculture is largest source of nutrient loading in the Mississippi River Basin.
- ◆ Practices are often divided into two categories: **1) prevention; and, 2) treatment**. The most common practice in each respective category is fertilizer management and wetlands restoration.
- ◆ There are often competing habitat goals with wetlands restoration.
- ◆ Fertilizer management is more cost effective if small nutrient reductions are needed. However, as more fertilizer is reduced, yields are reduced significantly, making wetlands restoration a more cost effective practice for high nutrient load reductions.

*Peter Whalley, Project Manager, Tisza River MSP – summarized key solutions and opportunities for nutrient reduction strategies in the region, highlighting successes in the Tisza River Basin:*

- ◆ **Best agricultural practices**, including manure management and buffers have had solid impact on water quality/stress reduction at demonstration sites, reducing 14 tons of nitrogen annually.
- ◆ P-Free detergents have been a successful element of phosphorus load reduction strategies in the region.
- ◆ **Burden sharing options**, including nutrient trading offer market-based mechanism for meeting nutrient reduction targets and sharing the costs.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

There was interest among the participants to **share the cost information on practices from the Mississippi River Basin for use in the Tisza**. Participants also committed to provide additional data and information on projects and practices.

#### Interaction with Asia-Pacific Project Managers on Legal/Institutional Frameworks

##### *Key Issues Highlights*

- ◆ Problem-solving training needs a common vocabulary, clarity around goals, and clarity around why certain steps need to be undertaken (e.g. drafting of particular legislative or procedural provisions)
- ◆ Training courses may also serve a role as “disguised negotiations” – this could be a primary or a secondary function.

##### *Key Actions Highlighted*

- ◆ Produce a guidance document with basic elements of a data-sharing protocol
- ◆ Participants appeared to be keen to join the nascent Asia / Asia Pacific south-south peer group network which the project is striving to establish and maintain. sdfsdfdsfsd

##### Session Coordinator:

Susan Bazilli, Legal and Institutional Frameworks MSP, [susanbazilli@gmail.com](mailto:susanbazilli@gmail.com)

The UNDP-GEF “Good Practices and Portfolio Learning in GEF Transboundary Freshwater and Marine Legal and Institutional Frameworks Project” seeks to examine both fresh and marine experiences through identification, collection, analysis, adaptation and replication of beneficial practices found in legal and institutional frameworks. The objectives are to strengthen and promote multi-country cooperation in the GEF Portfolio, and to enhance regime development in an eco-systemically sustainable manner. This session was aimed at all Asian GEF Project Managers and any other experts working in Asia on transboundary waters to bring best practices, lessons, experience, questions, and knowledge to share with the project team in order to develop new experiential learning tools and teaching guides, and foster local expertise in training and tool delivery. The topics involved in these discussions included: dispute resolution, funding mechanisms, data and information sharing and exchange mechanisms, international law and active adaptive management. Workshop participants also directed their attention to the development of experiential learning tools. Participants also discussed various “adult learning” strategies including: case studies, simulation exercises, short videos, skills training e.g. negotiation, web based tools and information packaging, such as “Tool Books”.

In the session, participants identified the following issues:

- ◆ **Capacity building** among Pacific Island states is needed

- ◆ “Implementation fatigue” is evident, whereby there is initial buy-in with a new convention / initiative but involvement fades rapidly because **domestic institutions are not well resourced**.
- ◆ Participants noted that they were highly **reliant on external advice** in order to update their legislation to keep laws compliant with international obligations.

In the session, participants identified the following lessons:

- ◆ **Problem-solving training needs a common vocabulary**, clarity around goals, and clarity around why certain steps need to be undertaken (e.g. drafting of particular legislative or procedural provisions)
- ◆ Training courses may also serve a role as “**disguised negotiations**” – this could be a primary or a secondary function. Example of using training courses to resolve groundwater conflicts in Mexico.
- ◆ Use **appropriate communications pathways** and technology (e.g. online training programs disseminating large amounts of information are not a realistic option for small island states with limited internet capacity).
- ◆ **Study tours** have proven very successful.
- ◆ Focus on hardest-hit countries first (i.e. those countries that suffer from “the lot”)
- ◆ Where formal negotiation is required, **practice negotiations** prior to the real meeting have been able to resolve some issues.
- ◆ Some countries are highly reluctant to share data with other countries, unless they face a **common threat**. For example, Bangladesh and India tend not to share data, but have done so when confronted with a common, external threat, such as a glacial lake outburst. However China now shares data with the MRC through the flooding season.

Representatives of two sample projects (East Asian Seas and the Arafura and Timur Seas were asked common questions on funding mechanisms, dispute settlement and data & information sharing and exchange):

#### *East Asian Seas*

- ◆ Funding Mechanisms: PEMSEA receives founding from 2 sources – GEF and member countries. China, South Korea, and Japan are the big funders – with co-financing based on capacity and interest. Funding has been a strictly voluntary mechanism and this has been sufficient as countries have been forthcoming in turning over money. To date, this funding arrangement has worked, but as PEMSEA moves out of the UN framework it will also look at alternative arrangements to become financially self-sustaining. Currently, PEMSEA is operating under a business plan that is in effect until 2011
- ◆ Dispute Settlement: PEMSEA is a partnership that **operates on consensus – with no formal mechanisms for dispute resolution**. Even though PEMSEA is moving towards establishing its own institutional framework, the member countries are not ready for any legally binding mechanism. On the more local level, more local institutions are in a better place to identify areas of conflict and to bring the parties together to work towards a solution. Some of the steps include stakeholder involvement, risk assessment, negotiations, mediation, and other non-binding participatory processes.
- ◆ Data Information Sharing: In November 2009, PEMSEA will host the East Asian Seas Congress – whose main purpose is to serve as a **marketplace for information** and to discuss progress and challenges facing projects. These conferences happen every three years. When more local issues are involved, those countries can get together and negotiate separate agreements with data information sharing provisions (an agreement within an agreement). For example, in the Gulf of Thailand, the riparian states negotiated an agreement concerning

- marine pollution. Local governments have also worked on land-sea zoning and in trying to reduce conflicting uses between parties.
- ◆ At the East Asian Seas Conference in 2003, the member states and other participating stakeholders, after much consultation, adopted the SDS-SEA – which promotes achieving the sustainable development of the seas of East Asia through stakeholder partnerships under the six major action programs of Sustain, Preserve, Protect, Develop, Implement, and Communicate.
  - ◆ Member states have worked together in 8 major project areas: Regional Mechanisms for SDS-SEA Implementation, National Policies and Reforms for Sustainable Coastal and Ocean Governance, Scaling Up Integrated Coastal Management Programs, Twinning Arrangements for River Basin and Coastal Area Management, Intellectual Capital and Human Resources, Strategic Partnership Arrangements, Investment and Financing, and Corporate Social Responsibility.
  - ◆ PEMSEA focuses on the **issues that are achievable and on which its member states are willing to cooperate**. At the November 2009 East Asian Seas Congress, each country is expected to recognize PEMSEA as a mechanism to implement agreements and as an independent institution (outside of the UN framework) with international legal personality. This will allow PEMSEA to become a country-owned, self-sustaining regional mechanism. Asian countries have shown resistance to binding international agreements (especially since there is a huge socioeconomic disparity between the different member states and unresolved water conflicts). While eventually PEMSEA might become a legally binding agreement, it is currently functioning well as a framework partnership agreement that can bring countries together to work on agreed projects while also encompassing other subregional agreements.

#### *Arafura and Timor Seas Expert Forum (ATSEF)*

- ◆ **Funding:** The project was financed by a Project Preparatory Grant (PPG) provided by GEF. This grant was supported by co-financing at a rate of 2:1. This co-financing support for the preparation of the program was provided by Indonesia, Australia, and Timor Leste. For the implementation of the project, the co-financing level will rise to 4:1. The first phase of the project is expected to take 4 years and the second phase is expected to take 2-5 years. Funds have already been earmarked for the second phase of the project. Want to make sure that there is a sustainable source of funding in the future.
- ◆ **Data Sharing:** In terms of data sharing, the project will be conducting an oceanographic survey of the region using research crews on board an Indonesia vessel. Even though Australia will be doing its own monitoring in its own territory. The Australian Institute of Marine Science will analyse the resulting data and this research will result in a series of publications and technical reports. The oceanographic survey aims to provide a measure of the impact of climate change in the region. For some areas, previous Australian data can provide a reference point on which to compare the results of the oceanographic survey. But for many other parts of the region, the oceanographic survey will try to fill in the gaps where no data existed before and to provide this preliminary data. Over the course of the project, the Regional Secretariat wants to establish additional coordination mechanisms between the three countries.
- ◆ **Dispute Resolution:** There is no formal mechanism involving dispute resolution as there is no overlying treaty structure for the region. Going forward, the Regional Secretariat wants to capitalize on the current willingness and commitment of Australia, Indonesia, and Timor Leste to establish a more formal structure to govern the region.
- ◆ Since the project is so new (launched in October 2009), it still remains to be seen how effective all these projects and mechanisms will be. ATSEF is working to develop a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the region. Then, ATSEF will move to implementing demonstration projects in each country (such as fisheries capacity building and projects that encourage sustainability). Although

ATSEF is still getting started, there has already been a series of consultations among the three countries and the project has made it a point to respond to the needs of stakeholders and to incorporate local methods.

In the session, participants identified the following action items:

- ◆ An inventory of existing tools already available to GEF project managers is required.
- ◆ Produce a **guidance document with basic elements of a data-sharing protocol**
- ◆ David McCauley (ADB) offered to provide an **introduction to the Network of Asian River Basin Organisations**, which promotes common understanding of water resource management principles.
- ◆ Participants appeared to be keen to join the nascent Asia / Asia Pacific **south-south peer group network** which the project is striving to establish and maintain.
- ◆ At least two **universities** in the Asia Pacific (Chulalongkorn and NUS) appeared to be very keen to further engage with the project.

#### African Water Governance: Achievement and Challenges

##### *Key Issues/Lessons Highlights*

- ◆ For transboundary water issues, there needs to be a strengthening of governance and oversight by parliamentarians to ensure political commitment to the projects. Most countries have the right policies in place - they just need to actually implement them.
- ◆ Indicators of good governance include: financial stability, cost and benefit sharing, and progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.
- ◆ Workshops can provide a forum to see what it will take to make river basin projects work, but the details of the workshop model still need to be worked out. sdfsdfdsfsd

##### Session Coordinator:

Thomas Petermann, InWEnt (Africa Water Governance MSP), thomas.petermann@inwent.org  
Rapporteur: Jennifer Maul Thomas, White and Case LLP (Legal and Institutional Frameworks)

The policy dialogue for Transboundary Water Governance in Africa promotes enabling framework for intersectoral and multi-level cooperation and regional benefit sharing for balancing sustainable uses of water resources at the transboundary and basin systems scales. Issues that are currently discussed include sustainable water infrastructure development, adaptation to climate change and effective stakeholder participation. Based on hands-on experiences of River Basin Organizations especially from the SADC region we will discuss issues that are of interest for policy makers, decision-makers and managers at operational levels in shared watercourse institutions.

Three projects made presentations during the session.

- ◆ *Orange-Senqu River Commission (ORASECOM)*: ORASECOM (which is comprised of the four riparian states of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, and Lesotho) manages the ecologically diverse Orange-Senqu River Basin. The basin faces challenges resulting from increased demand due to economic and population growth and extensive development that has led to the building of dams, poor land management, and the deterioration of water quality. Governance of this basin is guided by international, regional, bilateral and basin guidelines (such as the Treaty of the Southern African Development Community and the Revised Protocol on Shared Watercourses) – even though more stakeholder participation is needed. ORASECOM was established by agreement in 2000 to advise the riparian states on matters related to the development, utilization, and conservation of the water resources in the basin. ORASECOM has a permanent secretariat (which is located in South Africa), makes decisions by consensus, mandates equal representation and cash contributions for the

- riparian states, and has worked to mobilize funding partners and other international partners to learn best practices (such as the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River). Some of the governance challenges confronting ORASECOM include maintaining institutional memory and ensuring that institutional growth is only driven by the riparian states themselves so that ownership and commitment of ORASECOM remains with the riparian states.
- ◆ *Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)*: OKACOM, which is composed of the riparian states of Namibia, Botswana, and Angola, works to promote the coordinated and environmentally sustainable development of the Okavango River Basin, a relatively small basin that has 90% of its surface flow in Angola and a river that does not reach the sea. The governance structure for OKACOM is determined by the people in the basin. As Angola has only recently emerged from a protracted and bloody civil war, OKACOM cannot neglect the history of the region and needs to deal with it in a sustainable way. OKACOM was actually created in 1994, but its internal organization was not consolidated until 2007 when a Secretariat was established to look after day-to-day management issues. OKACOM is working to increase consultations with stakeholders (especially with youth), increase the use of science (especially in the areas of fisheries and hydrology), and use local institutions to generate information and support trust-building. In addition, OKACOM wants to **bring the private sector into the governance structure (especially the tourism industries as they are an important part of the economy)**. This can help make the commission sustainable, since after three years, international cooperative funding for commissions tend to decrease and member states contributions are expected to grow.
  - ◆ *Lake Tanganyika Authority (LTA)*: Guided by the Lake Tanganyika Convention adopted in 2003, the LTA, which includes the riparian states of Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Tanzania and Uganda, is called upon to protect and ensure the sustainable use of the Lank Tanganyika River Basin and is currently working on an Integrated Regional Management Program. The LTA is a new organization – with the LTA Secretariat being established in December 2008. Key governance issues in the LTA include project oversight, coordination, implementation, and ensuring that the projects are consistent with the priorities of the member states. In addition, the LTA is working with partners on the national, provincial, and district levels to implement projects that focus on priorities identified in the Strategic Action Programme (such as pollution and sedimentation). Plus, the LTA has teamed up with international partners for technical assistance (such as with the Lake Victoria Basin Commission on catchment management and lake monitoring). Some of the challenges facing the LTA include human capacity issues, funding, and dealing with the effects of climate change. Recommendations for future action include collecting baseline data, having project steering committees be more active in project implementation, and having a clearly articulated plan for after a project finishes.

In addition to these three main presentations, there was also a panel of representatives involved with water issues from various African states and UN agencies. This section highlights some of their remarks as well as certain comments from the audience:

- ◆ For transboundary water issues, there needs to be a **strengthening of governance and oversight by parliamentarians** to ensure political commitment to the projects. In Uganda, for example, there is a focus on capacity building and other issues that are likely to deliver results to the population. Most African countries are moving in the right direction of water policy reform, but implementation remains the weakest link. Most countries have the **right policies in place - they just need to actually implement them**.
- ◆ Most of the water governance commissions in Africa are very young. Proper water governance can help to alleviate poverty, but there needs to be legislative backing and capacity and institution building in order to make water commissions more concrete and

sustainable. People in the riparian states also need to see the benefits of such water agreements.

- ◆ As long as national governments do not see water management as important, water commissions will not succeed. The commissions need to **show the economic and social value of their work to ensure support**. To get funds for a water commission, it can be difficult to demonstrate the benefits of the agreement.
- ◆ Once a commission is up and running, it should work to become self-sustaining and decrease its dependence on funds from international donors. One funding mechanism could be imposing a **fixed levy (such as a customs duty) on certain goods**.
- ◆ **Multi-stakeholder forums** need to be developed to foster cooperation. Establishing and strengthening institutions poses numerous challenges, especially when dealing with human rights and climate change issues.
- ◆ African countries have a 40 year tradition of jointly managing the continent's water resources. Currently, every country in the region is covered by some type of international water agreement. The **Senegal River Basin has served as the best example** of these agreements and has achieved major accomplishments in institution building and in constructing two dams that provide benefits to all riparian states in terms of irrigation, navigation, and hydropower.
- ◆ River basins are shared by multiple countries, so an **ecosystem approach is critical**. Water governance would also benefit from a cross-sectoral approach – which would cover issues such as fisheries, finance, and agriculture in addition to water.
- ◆ There still needs to be **improvements in local implementation of projects** that are adopted on the national and the regional level. Also, there should be a distinction between what qualifies as a total basin issue and what can be considered a local issue that can be handled at a local level.
- ◆ **Indicators of good governance include: financial stability, cost and benefit sharing, and progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.**
- ◆ There is concern that many river and lake basin systems in Democratic Republic of **Congo** are being overlooked since they are not covered by any governance agreement and do not receive any GEF funding.
- ◆ Workshops can provide a forum to see what it will take to make river basin projects work, but the **details of the workshop model still need to be worked out**. There is also the African River Basin Networks that promote the sharing of experiences.
- ◆ There were also concerns raised about the burdens placed on a country with tight resources constraints belonging to multiple river basin organizations and if it would be possible to **consolidate some of these organizations**.
- ◆ When there are multiple (and sometimes conflicting) agreements concerning water rights, there tends to be confusion about which agreement applies.
- ◆ **GEF wants to foster a dialogue** on what would be needed to increase national support for water commissions and to demonstrate the benefits of proper water management to local populations.

From Local to Global: Modeling Coral Reefs as if People Mattered

Session Coordinator:

Mr. Roger Bradbury, Australia National University Tjurunga (Chair: Coral Reef Targeted Research project working group on modeling), roger@tjurunga.com

The session explored ways in which to include people into the modeling process – by including social and economic issues together with biophysical issues in examining the futures of coral reefs and, especially, by including the people that use the reefs in creating the models about the reefs. It used

examples from two very different coral reef systems – the artisanal fisheries dominated system of the Philippines’s South China Sea coasts, and the tourism dominated system of the Meso-American Barrier Reef.

#### An LME Approach to Marine Biosecurity and Ships' Ballast Water - GloBallast Tools and Guidelines

Session Coordinator:

Jose Matheickal, International Maritime Organization (Ballast Water Partnerships),  
JMATHEIC@imo.org

The workshop provided a forum for dialogue among LME Programme Managers / Stakeholders on the issue of marine biosecurity with an emphasis on shipping as a major vector for transfer of harmful organisms and pathogens between ecosystems. The workshop benefited from the presentations by GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Programme on the latest developments in terms of regulatory instruments and management approaches to address this challenging marine environmental issue that many LME managers and stakeholders are taking seriously. The workshop will also discuss a number of tools, templates and guidelines that were developed by project on this issue and ways and means of integrating such tools into LME strategies and to assist TDA/SAP process.

#### GEF Evaluation Office Impact Study for the International Waters Focal Area

Session Coordinator:

Aaron Zazueta, GEF Evaluation Office, azazueta@thegef.org

One of the recommendations of OPS 4 is that the GEF Evaluation Office undertake a study of the results and progress towards impacts of GEF support in one or more international water bodies. This will require the adaptation of the methodology used by the Evaluation Office for a analysis of sets of phased or concurrent projects that address a common set of transboundary environmental concerns. The IW Conference presents an unusual opportunity to for the Evaluation Office to interact with the IW practitioners in the earliest stages of the planning of the evaluation. The workshop was an informal exchange on the issues and concerns that should be considered while assessing impacts and results specific to international water projects and on study questions or issues that would be useful for IW practitioners

#### The IW:LEARN Website Toolkit

Session Coordinator:

Sean Khan, GEF IW:LEARN, sean.khan@unep.org

As project managers we constantly faced with challenges in the day to day execution of responsibilities. Communication with team members and stakeholders, outreach, access to data and technical knowledge, task management and so on, seem to be recurrent challenges we tackle. The session aimed to address these challenges by presenting a suite of tools for improving communication, interaction and management in out projects. Its an open and frank discussion on how to level simple tools to better manage, share and exchange experience and "network". Time permitting, we may also discuss the GEF Web Style Guidelines and its potential implications for GEF funded projects. The audience had an opportunity to share experiences and ask questions on their particular information needs. Feedback from the session will help inform future activities and services of IW:LEARN.

*Key Actions and Thoughts for GEF5 Implementation and Strategy*

- ◆ On climate, we need to find ways to ensure that we effectively mainstream climate resilience into our projects, in order to fortify ecosystems.
- ◆ On integrated management, we need to strengthen the project and programmatic linkages between freshwater & marine systems, as well as between surface & groundwater systems, as a single management continuum.
- ◆ We need to make the GEF more user-friendly for multi-focal area projects,
- ◆ We need to make projects relevant at the regional level but also the national level.
- ◆ We need to think more about the functional role of science.
- ◆ Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies. We need to find ways to translate those tools and the information they provide to broaden understanding not just among donors but also the broader public.
- ◆ Portfolio learning remains critical tool for programming and project design
- ◆ We need stronger engagement with the private sector on everything from fisheries, to agrobusiness, to wastewater treatment, to constructed wetlands and many other areas.

*Key Thoughts for IWC6*

- ◆ We need to look at best practice in using strategic action programmes both as governance reform but also as resource mobilization tools.
- ◆ We should look for ways to increase targeted training in particular for project managers.
- ◆ We will have more diversity, more task team leaders and project managers as well as people who are from client countries (rather than agencies), more women, and in general people who are closer to on-the-ground experiences.

Session Coordinator:

Ivan Zavadsky, GEF Secretariat, [izavadsky@thegef.org](mailto:izavadsky@thegef.org)

The Closing Plenary featured comments communicated via an inter-agency panel featuring representatives of the GEF Secretariat and several GEF agencies. The session opened with initial thoughts from the GEF Secretariat. For the Agency panel, each representative gave their thoughts about the IWC5, ideas and plans for GEF5 implementation and some additional recommendations for the IWC6.

*GEF Secretariat Reflections, Ivan Zavadsky*

The entire GEF IWC 5, its plenary and break-out sessions, small workshops and round-tables provided us not only with a feedback from different angles to the recent projects, highlights of the results and challenges of the existing portfolio but also showed us way forward at brink of the next GEF cycle, which likely to be adopted draft strategy is being discussed. Let me briefly highlight from a personal perspective several points, which resonate from the discussion we have had over the course of the conference and challenges, without an ambition make a summary of this plenary discussion:

- ◆ **Adding climatic variability and change** to multiple stressors to shared water bodies, which already are or would be subject of GEF intervention. This brings additional challenges and demands for expansion of **analytical work** under all GEF 5 TDA/SAP developments, either for new water bodies or within revisions of earlier developed TDAs and SAPs.
- ◆ **Emphasis on assessments of surface and ground water in an integrated way** and development of also integrated management responses has been generally acknowledged as

one of the essential features of new/revised TDA/SAP work. Equal importance in future programmes/project designs for GEF 5 funding the link or interconnection of river basin – coast – LME should be reflected in link or interconnection between Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) including coordination with LME governance reforms. The “Ridge-to-Reef” approach should be championed in the GEF 5 IW programme.

- ◆ Results-Based Management should be seen also as a key for **better communication of project results to various GEF constituencies**. In line with the OPS 4 recommendations there will be a need of GEF 5 IW Tracking Tool indicators to be embedded in the project result framework/log frame. After GEF 5 Strategy adoption GEF SEC will develop GEF 5 IW TT and the IWTF will discuss and adopt the new TT. The challenge to overcome would be to get the ownership of M&E frameworks by countries in order to ensure post-project life monitoring of established indicators, including socioeconomic indicators.
- ◆ **Portfolio learning** remains critical tool for programming and project design; this should be seen as two way street between IW:LEARN and individual projects.
- ◆ There is increased **role of TDA/SAP approaches and processes in narrowing the gap between science and policy making**; critical in these efforts remain focused capacity building and harnessing scientific assessments in the TDA/SAP processes.
- ◆ The **cross-sectoral approaches** in project interventions should be used more than in the past in order to reverse the “silo mentality”, under which in most of the beneficiary countries agencies and institutions operate. This truly limits the efficiency of GEF IW projects promoted reforms in water management.
- ◆ Examples of stronger and capacitated transboundary management institutions after GEF project intervention emphasizes a need for **strengthening of a legal international framework** at all stages of GEF intervention, from foundational projects to programmatic approaches and/or projects to assist countries in SAP implementation.

#### *Reflections after IWC5*

##### Meryl Williams, GEF Scientific and Advisory Panel (STAP):

- ◆ STAP assesses that GEF IW is tackling the most critical transboundary water issues, in a way that is integrated and cross-sectoral, and in a way that puts governance front and center.
- ◆ First reflection theme on Climate and IW. The challenge is bringing a set of challenging issues to all water system types. IW projects are already complex, but now we will have to retrofit strategies to deal with climate risks (ocean acidification, drought, temperature rise, etc.) We’ve heard about a large number of climate risk assessments here, but the real take home message is that we need to **fortify ecosystems**. This is the only thing IW projects can do is make sure the ecosystems are in as healthy a state as possible (the wetlands, mangroves, seagrass, etc).
- ◆ One thing that surprised me during the climate discussions is that we heard relatively little about **ocean acidification**, which will affect all life in the ocean and on the planet in general (it will impact a lot more than coral). I am wondering whether our LME projects should **start tracking pH**. Related to that would be the tracking of oxygen in coastal zones (measuring eutrophication and hypoxia).
- ◆ Second, reflecting on the theme of the science and policy-management interface. This is the area where STAP works in the GEF system. We’ve heard a lot about science, science is an essential but not sufficient input into policy and management. We also need inputs like cost-effectiveness, social values, legal regimes, practical feasibility, etc. Science still has an important role to play. We haven’t discussed this interface in detail, but hopefully the IW Science project will address, is that unique role that science plays in the IW portfolio
  - Science can generate basic knowledge.

- Science can identify issues, for example, determining decline in coral calcification was due to ocean acidification
- Science can help determine causal chains with water pollution
- Create solutions and options, new types of sustainable aquaculture, water treatment

#### David McCauley, Asian Development Bank

- ◆ ADB has a strong ongoing water management programme including water partnership platforms, focused more on sanitation and access. We do some work in transboundary basins, on the Chu Talas and Amu Darya basins, as well as the Greater Mekong subregion programme (under the Commission). The main story I want to communicate is that there is a strong foundation for our work. After the IWC5, we have a better understanding of expectations within the international waters programme.

#### Andrew Hudson, UN Development Programme

- ◆ In recent months, UNDP has partnered with IUCN, UNEP, FAO, UNIDO, UNESCO-IOC and NOAA to produce the **LME Handbook**, a seminal publication that highlights recent LME developments in terms of reforms and investments, as well outcomes that GEF has catalyzed. Please take this publication.
- ◆ In terms of pros, the conference was extremely well organized, the venue was superb as well as the city itself, the field trips. Overall we had a good balance of formal and informal gatherings. In general, this IWC reinforces a long history of **IW culture of portfolio learning**, which is unique to the IW focal area. Lastly, I want to thank the Australian Government, sponsors, host entities and academic institutions as well as Mr. Steve Raaymakers.
- ◆ On the con side, I witnessed in this IWC5 a bit of **plenary creep** with big powerpoints and a departure from the small breakouts that have proved so effective in the past. By shifting too much to plenaries you reduce opportunities for the most closely linked stakeholders to convene and compare notes on project management and strategies for GEF projects. In that same context, I **missed the thematic, water-body oriented breakouts** that were consistently well-received. They were a venue for sharing on-the-ground best practice as well as partnership building.

#### Tracy Hart, The World Bank

- ◆ I'd like to thank the traditional owners and the Australian hosts for having us here and sharing their knowledge, as well as everyone who have come so far to be here to be here as an IW family. The most important thing that happens here is the informal knowledge sharing.
- ◆ I got a few things out of this conference. The most visible contribution in terms of results-based management was that we really had large regions of river basins and LME's talking to each other about how to **manage entire regions**. We haven't had those discussions before, unless they've been in a GEF mandated programmatic approach. It's a testament to the maturity of our portfolio that we are understanding how project's fit, for example in the Western Indian Ocean or East Asian Seas in that we have projects that link together and need to operate as a single organism. It is happening with some supply-drivenness but is happening very well. This is related to results-based management because it relates to a higher global development objective.
- ◆ With respect to climatic variability and change we saw some common threads. First is that the role of science is being helpful for any project. The second is the **inter-section of the ridge and the reef**. The third is that we need to find a solutions for our portfolio in terms of climate change is that they are external. So we need to either go outside or bring external resources to our body of knowledge to produce effective solutions. They might be even in

entirely different sectors. So there is a challenge, and risks in looking beyond. We need to think innovatively about that.

Isabelle van der Beck, UN Environment Programme

- ◆ Out of all of the five unique IWC's, but I believe this one was the best for me. On the downside, we didn't have enough time for our **bilateral meetings**. This meeting is a nice opportunity to meet with our project people. We need more time for those interactions.

*Thoughts on GEF5 Implementation and Strategy*

Meryl Williams, GEF Scientific and Advisory Panel (STAP):

- ◆ We need to think more about the **functional role of science**.
- ◆ Third reflection...who wants to be a results-based project manager. On this theme, we will need to sort out our indicators, get good baselines, get good monitoring and evaluation information. We'll also need good technology to help with this monitoring and evaluation, for water quality assessment. We will need to look more at creating **learning platforms for the technology area**.

David McCauley, Asian Development Bank

- ◆ As we look at the GEF5 strategy, it seems to emphasize a more integrated, programmatic approach that cuts across the different program areas. Our Coral Triangle Initiative is an example this. We will pursue this **programmatic approach in major river basins in our area**, as well as links to biodiversity and climate change. In that regard, we also have to reevaluate how we look at water management and climate change. We have **three streams to our water programme: rural, urban and basins**. We also completed an analysis of the climate change impacts on agriculture across Asia, which is troubling. For example, irrigated rice production will fall by 16% by 2020, irrigated wheat by more. We look forward to operating, within a programmatic approach, and dealing with climatic variability and change but especially adaptation work.

Andrew Hudson, UN Development Programme

- ◆ On the GEF IW Strategy, a clear cross-cutting theme of this IWC is how the portfolio can respond to new challenges inherent in both the new GEF5 programming and financial framework and the new mandate to fully mainstream climate change into our operational work. A few ideas came forward as a result.
  - One is to **strengthen the project and programmatic linkages between freshwater & marine systems**, as well as between surface & groundwater systems.
  - Two, regarding the linkage between different GEF focal areas, while there has been some progress (for example we have some joint biodiversity/IW and land degradation/IW projects), we need to make the GEF **more user-friendly for multi-focal area projects**, particularly in the area of portfolio reporting. In general, the GEF focal areas still exhibit this silo-ization that is a barrier as we all know.
  - Third, we need to find ways to ensure that projects are not just **relevant at the regional level but also the national level**. In other words, so that they can secure commitment from national governments, not just in terms of short-term needs for implementing SAP's (reforms and so forth) but also long-term sustainability of those programmes.
- ◆ We also need to look at ways to ensure that there is better (and long-term) **ownership of these GEF IW project indicator frameworks** (stress reduction, process, environmental status). These indicators are not just for the GEF projects, but they are a useful tool for long-term waterbody monitoring and adaptive management. We want to embed that kind of monitoring and evaluation framework in the long-term strategies for those water bodies.

And sustain the capacities to monitor them, the commitment to monitor them and to report them, because that's one way that GEF can retrospectively look back at our successes...especially given the long time frame for these responses.

- ◆ With climate resilience pretty much explicitly recorded in our GEF IW strategic programmes we need to find ways to ensure that we **effectively mainstream climate resilience into our projects**. UNDP has a special niche in that area in that we have a diverse range of climate adaptation tools and methodologies. We have things like the climate change adaptation toolkits, a new programme called the Territories Initiative which is sub-regional adaptation planning, new work that Mirey is doing on reducing climate change risk through introduction of index insurance.
- ◆ Lastly, with the tools like the Annual Portfolio Review and IW Tracking Tool, they are great tools which are good for internal reporting, but we need to find ways to **translate those tools and the information they provide to broaden understanding** not just among donors but also the broader public. While that tracking tool is good for reporting on TDA-SAP progress, interministerial committees and so forth, it is not so good at both harvesting information and reporting on more intangible outcomes of GEF IW projects for example regional security and economic integration and socioeconomic development. If we can find ways to gauge and measure such developments it would help us a lot.

#### Tracy Hart, The World Bank

- ◆ Moving forward, I wanted to share how the World Bank is addressing some of these solutions. The first is, in terms of science, we have been working quite a bit on something called **ecosystem-based adaptation**, which looks across natural resource management, how particular ecosystems can or is changing or can become resilient (adapt to climate change). Related to that is the **valuation of ecosystem services** especially in the context of marine and coastal management. Marea Hatzios has been doing most of her work in that area. Most of that can be adapted to other water bodies.
- ◆ We are also working at the intersection of ridge to reef, for example with **carbon finance** for coastal forests. We are trying to extend that finance to seed mangroves so that carbon finance has been pushed out from inland forests to coastal forests to salt bodies. So that may prove useful for funding for transboundary work.
- ◆ We have a series of climate investment funds and carbon finance interventions that can supplement work in international water resource management in a variety of ways.
- ◆ We will continue to work on our investment funds, in particular on the Danube Black Sea where we have no more financing but we are still working with those countries to loan money to continue nutrient reduction.
- ◆ We are also looking to continue supporting innovative solutions with regard to **private sector partnerships in areas like constructed wetlands and agricultural water use efficiency**.
- ◆ Lastly we are also trying to support environmental fiscal reform in areas of forests and fisheries. With those points in mind, if any of these are interesting to you please make contact with Tracy or Marea.

#### Isabelle van der Beck, UN Environment Programme

- ◆ Building on what Meryl Williams said, we have heard that it is critical to mainstream climatic variability and change into our operations, but one point not mentioned, there is a need to manage surface and groundwater as a **single management continuum**. There is also a need for a more holistic approach to joint management of watersheds and results. So in view of this and GEF5 priorities as well as UNEP, we would want to work with countries in **continuing support for foundational projects in regional contexts** but making sure there is due consideration for climatic variability and change. We want to capitalize on the learning we are gaining through the implementation of the Amazon and Plata projects. In

doing so we would want to, as Al says, combine the top-down and bottom-up approaches, both governments and local communities are important, as well as the private sector. As Tracy mentioned it was very interesting to work at the regional level in this conference. We will have more meetings on how to coordinate better. UNEP would like to continue working with other GEF partners to ensure that this is done.

- ◆ We want to ensure that the Regional Seas and GPA programmes continue to provide support. We also have a strong marine and coastal strategy run by Jackie Alder, which will allow us to launch actions to maintain and **rehabilitate marine and coastal resources**.
- ◆ UNEP will also support countries to obtain tools to **reduce nutrient overenrichment and oxygen depletion** from land-based pollution of coastal waters and LME's. In that context, UNEP is working with IADB under the Cartagena Convention to support wider Caribbean countries to access a wastewater fund. UNEP is supporting the governance aspects of that project (Caribbean CREW), as well as local technology transfer. We heard about the science and technology projects, the Science and TWAP projects. We hope to soon have good methodologies to share with you from those projects. Finally, we all have a commitment to support the service projects, those two but also the IW:LEARN, because these projects can only be as rich and useful as we make them.

#### Jake Burke, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations

- ◆ The institutional lock-in is still an enormous problem in the environmental crusade, you have to choose a few Jerusalem's. This begs questions about the concentration of resources and the scale of environmental problems to be resolved. For that reason, does the GEF IW strategy have enough muscle, does it have enough legs to get us there, can it hit the right targets, can it hit them with effect? With the climate change thing, can imprecise science beget good environmental policy? Or is it just too late for some systems? The elephant in the room is the projected population of 9 billion people by 2050 and the environmental complacency across the sectors. For me it was telling that on the Great Barrier Reef trip, it took marine scientists to point the finger at agriculture, and discriminate the sources of pollution. I wonder if there will come a day when agriculture really owns up to the damage it causes before it has to be pointed out by others. The risk being that as fast as we can catch up with good agricultural or fisheries practice, a new chemical or a new market threat comes around the corner...the 9 billion. Even now there is a heady cocktail of pesticides, nutrients, herbicides that are infiltrating our oceans and aquifers...our biggest sinks. For this reason the deeper integration of groundwater, surface water and coastal outlets into the LME's is welcome in the GEF strategy. But **the test will be whether the GEF funding can leverage policy and quality investment in more adaptive freshwater management across these basins, aquifers, coastal zones that are at risk**.
- ◆ How can the FAO help countries implement the GEF strategy in GEF5? Aquifers, 40% of irrigated areas are sourced from groundwater and aquifers are the ultimate source and the ultimate sink for freshwater. Under climate change it will get it in the neck from more demand for precision agriculture, changed patterns of land use and recharge, and yet more persistent and more mobile pollutants. At FAO we are keen to get agriculture to account for this use, but we should remember that while the habit of modern groundwater use with pumps is deeply entrenched there is often no culture of aquifer management or protection. We hope to address this issue of groundwater culture and governance with a project under formulation.
- ◆ With regard to the private sector and fisheries we get a lot of demand from the fishing industry on how to manage fisheries better and cater to the discriminating consumer (the green fish issue). Perhaps this interest could be injected into the GEF IW programme, with more cofinance, to lead to a **stronger engagement with the private sector on food production generally**.

- ◆ Finally, joining up all this is as much an issue of culture as it is reforming institutional bureaucracy. Getting communities of practice from hydropower, land tenure, tour operators, agribusiness to save an IW system at risk will hinge on collective behavior. We certainly need a global environment but we also need an environment of good conduct. We hope here that some of the FAO good conduct guides have been helpful, the fisheries conduct has been foundational, also on wastewater and on the social aspects.

#### Ludovic Bernaudat, UN Industrial Development Organization

- ◆ UNIDO has taken note of all the new directions and focus for this focal area, which have been captured by everyone who spoke before me. UNIDO as the industrial development organization also has a contribution to make to the GEF5. In particular, we will **expand our activities in the LME's** (in the Gulf of Mexico and Guinea Current). As all of you know the Guinea Current project is back up to speed with a new team. During the last steering committee the countries green-lighted three agencies to implement the next phase.
- ◆ We also propose to work with industry to **reduce water withdrawal, improve its efficiency during the process and improve the quality of effluents**. UNIDO developed a methodology called TEST (Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies) that assist industries in reducing their environmental impact. This project methodology was successfully used to implement SAPs from LME or water course projects in the Danube or the Mediterranean Sea and replication potential to other areas will be sought. We see this is as a win-win product where industry reduces their costs whilst reducing environmental impacts, bringing double benefit to the local communities.
- ◆ We also propose to continue working on **artisanal gold mining** as it is currently the largest anthropogenic source of mercury pollution, after coal power plants, and is unlikely to diminish as the price of gold is constantly increasing. We have developed a successful scheme to reduce mercury emissions. As you know mercury is easily bioaccumulatable in fish with potential to seriously disrupt the fisheries sector globally.
- ◆ We are also working on some new initiatives, as was mentioned in the private sector engagement roundtable. UNIDO is working with UNDP and Carlsberg in a scheme, under the **GEF Earth Fund, to improve water use by the group's breweries whilst integrating local community benefits**. The bottom line being that we need the private sector involvement to achieve larger environmental benefits. Together with UNESCO, we are addressing a key priority area which is integrated management of surface and groundwater. UNIDO proposes to **work in SIDS to develop a TEST project** to work with industry when these are identified as a major source of ground water contamination.
- ◆ Finally, using our experience in the **agro-business** area, we will contribute to reducing nutrient overloading in water courses. To conclude, we look forward to work together with member states, GEF international waters and other agencies to fulfill the objectives of the focal area in the next GEF cycle.

#### Maria del Rosario Navia Diaz, Inter-American Development Bank

- ◆ Two years ago, as part of the re-alignment process the Bank approved two very relevant initiatives that are available for IADB member countries that are available for leveraging resources and scaling up efforts in international waters. The first is the **Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Initiative (TECI)** which addresses renewable energy, energy efficiency, sustainable biofuels, access to carbon markets and adaptation to climate change.
- ◆ The second initiative is the **water and sanitation initiative** which focuses on incrementing water and sanitation coverage with emphasis on institutional strengthening on a more transparent sector and more emphasis on water as a resource (how we deliver it back to the environment). The Bank is leveraging \$1 billion a year which is a dramatic increase. This year already IADB has approved \$1 billion this year alone for sanitation. Both initiatives are supported by multi-donor trust funds. Those two funds will finance technical assistance for

- project preparation, project development, feasibility studies, training, partnership development and even small investment projects. Please visit [www.iadb.org](http://www.iadb.org).
- ◆ As far as the IADB's realignment we are moving toward the construction of **alliances with traditional and non-traditional donors and partners**. These will help us leverage resources and have a great activity in the LAC region water sector. One of these alliances is the Spanish Fund for Water and Sanitation in LAC which was created by the Spanish government. IADB is a supervising partner of this 300 million euro fund. I want to highlight a specific initiative with UNEP, where we are creating a specific fund for financing wastewater management in the Caribbean. We will finance pilot mechanisms to develop lessons to replicate. I invite IADB member countries to approach us with your ideas.

#### *Recommendations for the IWC6*

##### Andrew Hudson, UN Development Programme

- ◆ For the next IWC, we need to look at best practice in using **strategic action programmes both as governance reform but also as resource mobilization tools**.
- ◆ We should look at the linkage between IW projects and the broader regional & national socioeconomic objectives, such as PRSPs and MDGs (particularly for Africa but also the rest of the world).
- ◆ We need to find a **better balance** between marine and freshwater aspects.
- ◆ We should increase the time allotted for the **intergovernmental and project led participant workshops**.
- ◆ Lastly, we should look for ways to increase targeted training in particular for **project managers**. Their skills are one of the most instrumental factors affecting project performance.

##### Tracy Hart, The World Bank

- ◆ One thing I have noticed about this conference is that the composition of facilitation and plenary presenters is not what I want in terms of **diversity and inclusion**. I hope that in IWC6 we will have more diversity, more task team leaders and project managers as well as people who are from client countries (rather than agencies), more women, and in general people who are closer to on-the-ground experiences, i.e. people who are closer to what we are really working on. We need to show this, that we are working closer to our real beneficiaries.

#### Awards and IWC5 Conclusion

Awards were presented in several IWC5 competitions. The **Pacific IWRM project** won the IW:LEARN website competition, with a laptop as the award. The **Agulhas and Somali Current LME** won the Who-Wants-To-Be-a-Results-Based-Manager competition with a US\$5000 IW:LEARN stakeholder learning exchange as the reward. Finally, a collective representation of several African GEF IW projects, with the **Africa Water Governance** project as representative, won \$2500 in IW:LEARN Learning Exchange funds for having the best Innovation Marketplace exhibit.

The IWC5 closed with some reflections from Al Duda of the GEF Secretariat. Representatives of the Republic of South Africa (Mr. Johan Augustyn), the IWC4 host, the Australian Government (Ms. Laura Holbeck), the IWC5 Host and then the Secretariat for the Barcelona Convention (represented by Mr. Ivica Trumbic) as the overarching host of the next IWC6, which will take place in the Mediterranean Sea.

#### Acknowledgments

## Sponsors

The 5th GEF Biennial International Waters Conference is made possible thanks to generous financial support from a variety of sources. Our extreme gratitude goes to our host country, whose support is furnished by Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID).



[AusAID](#) is the Australian Government agency responsible for managing Australia's overseas aid program. The objective of the aid program is to assist developing countries reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, in line with Australia's national interest. AusAID provides advice and support to the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary on development policy, and plans and coordinates poverty reduction activities in partnership with developing countries.

Significant support has also been provided by the following private sector sponsors:

### **World Wild Fund for Nature - Australia**

Contact: [Peter Ramshaw](#)



With more than 40 years experience at an international level, and more than 25 years of operation in Australia, WWF is the world's largest and most influential conservation organisation. We have close to five million supporters and a global network active in more than 100 countries. In Australia, WWF works to conserve the nation's biodiversity, providing practical solutions to our greatest environmental threats. Our teams work on the ground with local communities, and in partnership with government and industry, advocating change and effective conservation policy. We take a science-based approach to our conservation work and are committed to real, measurable outcomes for the environment which

directly benefit Australian species and natural resources like water, land and the marine environment. WWF's work in Australia focuses on eight key areas: climate change, weeds and feral animals, land and forests, marine protection, species, water management, sustainable industry and business partnerships.

### **Project AWARE**

Contact: [Joanne Marston](#)



The [Project AWARE](#) Foundation is a nonprofit organization dedicated to conserving underwater environments through education, advocacy and action. With headquarters in the United States and offices in Australia, Japan, Switzerland and United Kingdom, Project AWARE combats challenges facing aquatic resources in 175 countries and territories with direct support from

divers and water enthusiasts worldwide.

### **Terrain Natural Resource Management**

Contact: [Alan Dale](#)



[Terrain NRM](#) is the Natural Resource Management body for the Wet Tropics. We are a not-for-profit company, and our membership includes over 120 local

organizations with key roles managing the region's natural resources according to the targets and actions set out in our regional NRM plan.



#### **Reef & Rainforest Research Centre**

Contact: [David Souter](#)

The [Reef and Rainforest Research Centre](#) Limited (RRRC) was created in 2006 to implement the Australian Government's Marine and Tropical Sciences Research Facility (MTSRF) in North Queensland. The RRRC manages a major portfolio of catchment, coastal and marine research projects, focused on meeting the needs of research. Users include natural resource managers and industry.



#### **Sinclair Knight Merz**

Contact: [Mike Huber](#)

[Sinclair Knight Merz](#) (SKM) is a leading engineering, sciences and project delivery firm. Its purpose is to deliver a positive and enduring impact on the world. With offices across Australia, New Zealand, Europe, the Middle East, South America and Asia.



#### **Quicksilver Cruises**

Contact: [Russell Hoare](#)

With the widest range of Great Barrier Reef experiences, [Quicksilver](#) offers a choice of award-winning day trips to the magnificent Outer Barrier Reef and the idyllic Low Isles. Quicksilver is also extremely active in reef conservation and research and maintains an in-house team of marine biologists.



#### **James Cook University**

Contact: [Michael Bird](#)

One of the world's leading institutions focusing on the tropics, Australia's [James Cook University](#) is surrounded by the spectacular ecosystems of the rainforests of the Wet tropics, the dry savannahs, and the iconic Great Barrier Reef. Our unique location enables students from Australia and overseas to study in a diverse physical environment unparalleled by any university in the world.



#### **Cleaner Seas Alliance**

Contact: [Mike Huber](#)

As part of its obligations to meet the requirements of the state government's Coastal Management Plan, Cairns Regional Council initiated the [Cleaner Seas Initiative](#). Compliance with the requirements of this plan sees Cairns Water & Waste undertaking major upgrades at our four major wastewater treatment plants over the next three years. The \$188 million plus Cleaner Seas Project is being delivered by an alliance between, Cairns Regional Council and an expert team involving United Group Limited Infrastructure, CEC Construction, GHD and Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM).



### **EcoStrategic Consultants**

Contact: [Steve Raaymakers](#)

[EcoStrategic Consultants](#) is a global network of experts providing science based solutions for a sustainable society. We focus mainly on coastal and marine services, with specialist expertise in the design, development, implementation and evaluation of international technical cooperation projects, including in the GEF International Water portfolio area.

EcoStrategic can deploy a single consultant to undertake specific tasks, or assemble tailor-made project teams for larger projects.

### Rapporteurs

Thanks to our rapporteurs:

- ◆ Joel Bailey, James Cook University
- ◆ Tony Forsyth, James Cook University
- ◆ Leon Cuauhtemoc (Legal and Institutional Frameworks)
- ◆ Dinara Ziganshina, UNESCO - Centre for Water Law, Policy & Science, University of Dundee (Legal and Institutional Frameworks)
- ◆ Jennifer Maul Thomas, White and Case LLP (Legal and Institutional Frameworks).

### Australia Host Committee

Our thanks to the Australia Host Committee, whose double billet included coordinating host country input into conference planning and political support, as well as leveraging and coordinating participation of Australian institutions in the conference. The Committee was chaired and regularly convened by AusAID and resulted in the outstanding contributions of Australia's scientific/academic committee in providing rich presentations to and organizing the Pre-Conference Workshops held prior to the IWC5. These workshops put the overall conference on the right foot and launched the dialogue on mainstreaming climatic variability and change.

AusAID: Chakriya Bowman, Laura Holbeck, Joanne Ridolfi

GEF: Al Duda, Ivan Zavadsky, Christian Severin

GEF STAP: Meryl Williams

UNDP: Anna Tengberg, Andrew Hudson

GEF IWLEARN: Mish Hamid

UNESCO: Alice Aureli

Australian Institute of Marine Science: Susan English

CSIRO: Campbell Davies

CSIRO Land and Water: Mac Kirby

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority: Peter McGinnity

International Water Centre: Fiona Chandler

James Cook University: Chris Cocklin, Michael Bird, Marc Leblanc

University of Wollongong: Quentin Hanich

University of Queensland: Melanie King, Peter Fogarty

### GEF IWC5 Steering Committee

The GEF IWC5 Steering Committee had as its mandate, to oversee the coordination and programming of the 5th Biennial GEF International Waters Conference and ensure its strategic role in the context of international waters management.

GEF: Al Duda, Ivan Zavadsky, Christian Severin  
GEF STAP: Doug Taylor  
ADB: Marilou Drilon, (Daniele Ponzi and David McCauley)  
FAO: Jacob Burke  
IADB: Maria del Rosario Navia Diaz  
IFAD: Jesús Quintana  
UNDP: Andrew Hudson, Anna Tengberg  
UNEP: Tessa Goverse, Isabelle van der Beck  
UNIDO: Christian Susan  
World Bank: Marea Hatzios, Andy Hooten (alternate)  
GEF IW:LEARN: Mish Hamid, Steve Raaymakers

#### Coordination Team

A special thank you to Mr. Steve Raaymakers of EcoStrategic Consultants, for his excellent service as Technical Coordinator. Thank you to Sarah, Florence and Becky of ICMS Pty for their work on event coordination.

#### Media Teams

Thank you to Francois Odendaal and Kyle O'Donoghue of Francois Odendaal Productions, as well as Gaye Scott and Ron Donnelly of 20/20 Media for their outstanding service in production of Reflection (and Expectation) Videos, as well as the YouTube Feature Stories & Media Relations.

#### Traditional Owners

Thank you to the Traditional Owners, who welcomed us to Australia and gave their blessing to our efforts in Cairns.