

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year  
(1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009)**

**1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Strengthening Global Capacity to Sustain Transboundary Waters: The International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
-----------------------	--

<b>Executing Agency:</b>	United Nations Environment Programme/Division of Early Warning and Assessment (UNEP/DEWA)
--------------------------	---

<b>Project partners:</b>	United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank (IBRD)
--------------------------	---

<b>Geographical Scope:</b>	Global
----------------------------	--------

<b>Participating Countries:</b>	Global
---------------------------------	--------

<b>GEF project ID:</b>	1893	<b>IMIS number*<sup>1</sup>:</b>	GFL/2328-2732-4813
<b>Focal Area(s):</b>	International Waters	<b>GEF OP #:</b>	10
<b>GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:</b>	IW-2 Targeted IW Learning	<b>GEF approval date*:</b>	13 September 2004
<b>UNEP approval date:</b>	3 November 2004	<b>First Disbursement*:</b>	3 November 2004
<b>Actual start date<sup>2</sup>:</b>	November 2004	<b>Planned duration:</b>	months
<b>Intended completion date*:</b>	September 2008	<b>Actual or Expected completion date:</b>	October 2009
<b>Project Type:</b>	FSP	<b>GEF Allocation*:</b>	US\$1,346,534 (allocation to UNEP)
<b>PDF GEF cost*:</b>	0	<b>PDF co-financing*:</b>	0
<b>Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:</b>	US\$1,207,400	<b>Total Cost*:</b>	US\$2,553,934
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):</b>		<b>Terminal Evaluation (actual date):</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2007 (MTE handled by UNDP)	<b>No. of revisions*:</b>	1
<b>Date of last Steering Committee meeting:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> July 2009	<b>Date of last Revision*:</b>	30 June 2008
<b>Disbursement as of 30 June yyyy*:</b>	N/A	<b>Date of financial closure*:</b>	N/A
<b>Date of Completion<sup>3*</sup>:</b>	N/A	<b>Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2009<sup>4</sup>:</b>	US\$ 413,749.00

<sup>1</sup> Fields with an \* sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

<sup>2</sup> Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases where a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

<sup>3</sup> If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.

<b>Total co-financing realized as of 30 June yyyy<sup>5</sup>:</b>		<b>Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2009*:</b>	US\$ 30,112.24
<b>Leveraged financing:<sup>6</sup></b>	N/A		

<b>Project summary<sup>7</sup></b>	<p>The International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) is co-implemented with UNDP and IBRD. UNEP led components are presented in this document as a sub-project, other complementing activities that contribute to the overall objectives of IW:LEARN are described in the UNDP project document.</p> <p>IW:LEARN aims to strengthen Transboundary Waters Management (TWM) by facilitating structured learning and information sharing among stakeholders. In pursuit of this global objective, UNEP's component aims to improve the GEF IW projects' information base and encourage better replication efficiency, transparency, stakeholder ownership and sustainability of benefits through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitating access to information about transboundary water resources among GEF IW projects;</li> <li>• Structured learning among GEF projects and cooperating partners aimed at promoting inter-linkages in the Caribbean;</li> <li>• Testing innovative approaches to strengthen implementation of the IW portfolio through the development of a regional learning center for the South East Asia Region (SEA-RLC)</li> </ul> <p>The project builds upon the achievements of the experimental pilot phase IW LEARN project, incorporating the findings of its final independent evaluation. In view of the great interest raised by and successes of the UNDP-implemented pilot, all three Implementing Agencies have committed to jointly propose and realize this operational phase IW:LEARN project and UNEP will oversee the implementation of the outlined components based on its comparative advantage as one of the implementing agencies in the GEF.</p>
------------------------------------	---

<b>Project status FY08<sup>8</sup></b>	<p>Prior to FY08, implementation of the IWLEARN suffered due to lack of a full-time project manager to lead the implementation of the UNEP led component. Although demanding, the work plan for FY08 was necessary to address MTE observations and fulfill the backlog of slipping deliverables. FY08 marks significant increase of the planned ICT capacity building workshop (two in FY08) compared to previous year (one between 2004-2006). These in turn have contributed to improved interaction with the target group while at the same time promoted the uptake of IW:LEARN services and value for service. In line with the MTE recommendations, a review of the website and taxonomy was concluded and is currently being implemented through a redesign of iwlearn.net. In addressing FY07 PIR actions, the eBulletin as a tool to</p>
--	---

<sup>4</sup> Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

<sup>5</sup> Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format.

<sup>6</sup> See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

<sup>7</sup> As in project document

<sup>8</sup> Please include additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

	<p>stimulate interaction (i.e. feedback and input) and raise awareness of IW:LEARN has proven to be an effective mechanism to engage projects towards the exchange knowledge and information and contribute to meeting the overall objective of IW:LEARN. Adaptive management of the project has resulted in an increased responsibility of the sub-project to overcome administrative burdens through the UN administrative system while at the same time increasing cost effectiveness through the regional counterpart (i.e. SEA START RC). The Caribbean activity is put on track after Steering Committee intervention at the end of the reporting period and access to Regional Seas technical publications made available and searchable through iwlearn.net, At the same time, efforts to improve the iw:learn search engine are underway. Unlike FY06/07, uptime of the information system has been above 98% (except for planned and announced maintenance outages). Overall, for FY08, the operations of iwlearn.net have been better defined proving to become more demand driven by way of request, user feedback, increased usage and a growing membership of the e-Bulletin service.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Project status FY09<sup>9</sup></b></p>	<p>FY09 has demonstrated continued streamlining of services to improve efficiency, cost and reliability of IW:LEARN operations. This has resulted in an increased demand for IW:LEARN services such as the use of the IW:LEARN website toolkit by GEF IW projects, as indicated by a 55% increase in the number of toolkit websites, and requests from projects for new features/functionality for collaborating and accessing online transboundary waters resources managed by UNEP. There has been a 65% increase in users of the IW:LEARN website directly accessing online resources (e.g., accessed by typing the URL address in a browser or clicking on a bookmark), and a steadily growing membership to the popular IWLEARN e-Bulletin, now reaching nearly 1350 subscribers. In addition, 90% of the IW portfolio link to iwlearn.net, a 13% increase from the previous period. Significant to this period is the redesign of the iwlearn.net website, formulation of website guidelines for circulation and feedback from project, to support the “fee for service” element of the project’s sustainability plan. The “fee for service” policy has already started to generate interest from projects to pay for IW:LEARN services in a relatively short period since implementation of the policy commenced. IWLEARN's Web-based GIS - a combined metadata catalogue and data viewer - is now integrated into IWLEARN.NET and every new Toolkit instance, providing greater access to geospatial data across the GEF IW community. Sustainability planning within IW:LEARN has anchored IW:LEARN for the first time within the larger programme of work of UNEP, has generated interest in the ongoing discussions surrounding knowledge management with the organization and the wide UN water initiatives. Finally, the Caribbean Inter-focal area dialogue on synergy was executed during this period and provoked interest from all focal area in the GEF portfolio for continued dialogue and outreach across the focal areas. As a result, more than 10 experience notes were drafted by project on areas of mutual benefit, a regional e-Bulletin (in addition to other recommendations) for the Caribbean is developed to continue stimulating cross focal area synergy.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Planned contribution to strategic</b></p>	<p>IW:LEARN's key role in GEF's Strategic Priority (IW-2) for targeted IW learning is emphasized in Business Planning (GEF/C.21/Inf.11 Annex 3,</p>
---	---

<sup>9</sup> Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

<p><b>priorities/targets</b><sup>10</sup></p>	<p>paragraph. 14): “The GEF Replenishment included a specific US\$20 Million for targeted learning within the portfolio, based on the success of the IW:LEARN approach in OP 10 and piloted in GEF-2. The learning experiences among GEF projects undertaken within the IW portfolio [have] been successful as judged by survey, project evaluations and OPS2. The learning is aimed at exchanging successful approaches among existing projects and those under preparation so that they may be adopted within the framework of adaptive management that characterizes the GEF approach to transboundary water systems. They also help avoid problems that have been encountered by projects. Such South-to-South ‘structured learning’ contributes significantly to the success of GEF’s foundational/capacity building work in IW.”</p> <p>With design guided by the IAs’ IW leads, all IW:LEARN components and activities align within the OP10 technical support component to realize these strategic priorities.</p>
---	--

## 2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

*State the global environmental objective(s) of the project*<sup>11</sup>

The global objective of IW:LEARN is to strengthen Transboundary Waters Management (TWM) by facilitating learning and information sharing among GEF stakeholders.

The immediate objectives are:

- To facilitate the integration, exchange and accessibility of data and information among GEF IW projects, their partners and stakeholders (Component A)
- To establish and technically support a series of face-to-face and electronically-mediated structured learning activities – or learning exchanges – among related projects within the GEF IW portfolio (Component B)
- To test, evaluate and replicate novel approaches and ICT tools to meet IW stakeholder needs (Component D)

UNEP is in charge of component A and contributes to components B and D.

*Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)*

FY09 marks a shift in the projects implementation from development and testing to operations. While the nature of the project demands ongoing adaptation to emerging needs and refinement of tools and services, UNEP/IW:LEARN with the help of UNDP/IWLEARN has advocated its services to projects. This in turn has resulted in a greater demand for the IW:LEARN website toolkit and greater feedback from project towards shaping IW:LEARN service to better meet the needs of its targeted user. At the same time, the lag between

<sup>10</sup> For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

<sup>11</sup> Or immediate project objective

uptake of services, sensitization of projects towards the value of IW:LEARN versus the planned duration of the project has made implementation challenging. The uncertainty of the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of the project and no concrete direction on the future of the project has further raised questions in the minds of potential users of IW:LEARN services towards its ability to be sustained and the broader interest at the corporate level to continue IW:LEARN.

*Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document <sup>12</sup> (not more than 200 words)*

While still preliminary, indications of progress being made towards the GEF strategic priorities as a result of IW:LEARN are encouraging. The GEF has started to enforce policy for new projects to set aside funds for “learning”, at the programme level within the GEF Secretariat a serious effort to assess and replicate the IW:LEARN model across all focal area is on going and promising. In parallel, IW:LEARN continues to refine its suite of knowledge management tools to meet the anticipated needs in the future. These include user driven and customizable community platform with inbuilt project management tools, news feeds that mimic and in some cases rivals popular tools like Facebook and LinkedIn. A refined search engine that is capable of crawling any online resource (including project websites, stakeholder repositories) and categorizing them for easier access and based on similarities in content (i.e. text analysis).

---

<sup>12</sup> Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>13</sup> will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

#### 3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

<sup>13</sup> For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

<sup>14</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

<sup>15</sup> Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

<sup>16</sup> Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

<sup>17</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.



Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<p><b>Objective 2 (Component B):</b> To establish and technically support a series of face-to-face and electronically-mediated structured learning activities – or learning exchanges – among related projects within the GEF IW portfolio.</p>	<p>Number of projects that apply lessons from IW:LEARN structured learning activities to improve TWM within their respective basins</p>	<p>No structured learning exchange taking place</p>	<p>The revised log frame has now included December 2007 targets at the Outcome level (see below)</p>	<p>30+ projects apply lessons from IW:LEARN structured learning activities to improve TWM within their respective basin</p>	<p>Component B comprises of 4 sub components for which UNEP’s responsibility relates to a sub-activity of activity B1 (Regional Multi Project Exchanges): structured learning among GEF projects and cooperating partners aimed at promoting inter-linkages in the Caribbean.</p> <p>For this reporting cycle, UNEP/CEP with support of IW:LEARN held a cross focal area workshop in Jamaica, has established a moderated virtual forum (mediated by email and web interfaces). The activity has yielded 11 case studies to date, exceeding the expected anticipated number of case studies.</p>	
<p><b>Objective 3 (Component D):</b> To test, evaluate and replicate novel approaches and ICT tools to meet IW stakeholder needs.</p>	<p>GEF IW projects and partners benefit from a set of demonstration projects integrating information sharing and structured learning</p>	<p>No GEF IW portfolio-wide targeted demonstration projects exist</p>	<p>The revised log frame has now included December 2007 targets at the Outcome level (see below)</p>	<p>GEF IW projects and partners benefit from a set of demonstration projects integrating information sharing and structured learning</p>	<p>NA –Inactive per MTE:</p> <p>Following the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE), it was realised that a regional approach to IW:LEARN in the context of Information and Communications tools and assistance would be more effective through a central access point (i.e <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>) with regional (and thematic) views. Therefore, component D1 was revised to support the implementation of component A1 in the areas indentified as deficient during the MTE. Namely, organisation of ICT workshops and content management.</p>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 1 (Component A):</b> Improved access to TWM data and information across the GEF IW portfolio	% of GEF IW projects that access the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of February 2005, 69% of GEF IW project indicated they access <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	At least 75% of projects indicate they access <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	At least 85% of projects indicate they access <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	77.4 % GEF IW project staff indicated they use iwlearn.net (survey done during the WWF in March,09) Increase of 8.4% from FY08	
	Number of ICT requests from the IW community that UNEP-IWLEARN responds to.	As of June 2006, UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 25 IW community ICT request	UNEP-IWLEARN responds to 50 IW community ICT request	UNEP-IWLEARN responds to 100 IW community ICT request	148 issue tracker submissions related to technical backstopping projects in using the website toolkit out of a total of 637 issues covering other topics including internal, PCU, SC, etc) were addressed	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	Number of IW projects with web sites	As of July 2006, 59 GEF IW project have websites	90 GEF IW projects have websites	By 2009, 140 IW projects have websites	60 % (115 out of 190 projects) of the GEF IW portfolio (based on records on <a href="http://www.gefonline.org">www.gefonline.org</a> ) have websites based on the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a> project database. 40% of projects with websites are still under Implementation while the remaining 20% that have been completed have been archived on <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/archive">iw:learn http://www.iwlearn.net/archive</a>	
	Number of IW projects that have websites link to <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of January 2006, 10% (estimated) of IW projects that have websites link to <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	60% of IW projects that have websites link to <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	By 2009, 90% of IW projects that have websites link to <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	90% of IW projects that have websites link to <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a> (google search)	
	% of projects that are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of January 2006, 0 of IW projects with websites are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	95% of IW projects that have websites are accessible from <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	By 2009, 95% of IW projects that have websites are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	100% of IW projects with website are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a> (this is largely due to the technology utilized by the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a> search engine)	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	Increased number of unique visitors accessing <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of December 2006, >38,000 (estimated) unique visitors accessed <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	>48,000 (estimated) unique visitors access <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	>60,000 (estimated) in unique visitors access <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	<p>For this PIR cycle, a total of 166,356 unique visitors accessed iwlearn.net, which represents an increase of 83% compared to the previous PIR cycle. <a href="http://stats.iwlearn.net/cgi-bin/awstats.pl?config=www.iwlearn.net">http://stats.iwlearn.net/cgi-bin/awstats.pl?config=www.iwlearn.net</a></p> <p>Monthly increase of unique visitors.</p> <p>July 07 – 5590 July 08 -12254 (119% increase)        Aug 07 – 5560 Aug 08 -13835 (149% increase)        Sept 07 – 5711 Sep 08 -13992 (145% increase)        Oct 07 – 8141 Oct 08 -13554 (66.5% increase)        Nov 07 – 8462 Nov 08 -13959 (65% increase)        Dec 07 – 6412 Dec 08 -12257 (91% increase)        Jan 08 – 7910 Jan 09 -13170 (66.5% increase)        Feb 08 – 8316 Feb 09 -13858 (66.6% increase)        March 08 –9136 March 09 -1526(167% increase)        April 08 – 8241 April 09 -15007 (82% increase)        May 08 – 9564 May 09 -15127 (58% increase)        June 08 – 7656 June 09 -14082 (84% increase)</p> <p>Total number of unique visitors between 1 July 07 and 30 June 08 = 90,699</p> <p>Total number of unique visitors between 1 July 08 and 30 June 09 = 166,356</p> <p>Percentage increase = 83%</p>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	Number of datasets from and about IW projects sites available through the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of January 2006, 0 datasets about IW projects available through the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	20 datasets about IW project available through the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	50 datasets about IW projects available through the <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	74 datasets have been gathered to date. Of this total, meta-data has been written, and are searchable. The datasets are now linked to the iw:learn website <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis">http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis</a>	
	% of projects that have deployed a website using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	As of January 2006, 0 projects have deployed a website using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	> 20 project deploy websites using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	> 60 projects deploy websites using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	34 projects (roughly 1/3 the IW portfolio) have deployed the Website Toolkit. Significant websites implemented using the Toolkit include. Out of these 34 projects using the toolkit 18 are under development and include:  <a href="http://caspien.iwlearn.org/">http://caspien.iwlearn.org/</a> <a href="http://clme.iwlearn.org">http://clme.iwlearn.org</a> <a href="http://twap.iwlearn.org">http://twap.iwlearn.org</a> <a href="http://coast.iwlearn.org">http://coast.iwlearn.org</a> <a href="http://lss.iwlearn.org">http://lss.iwlearn.org</a> <a href="http://lta.iwlearn.org">http://lta.iwlearn.org</a> <a href="http://nutrient-bestpractices.iwlearn.org/">http://nutrient-bestpractices.iwlearn.org/</a> <a href="http://hungary.iwlearn.org/">http://hungary.iwlearn.org/</a> <a href="http://plone25.iwlearn.org/sites/workshops/map">http://plone25.iwlearn.org/sites/workshops/map</a> Among others	
	Number of projects indicating satisfied assistance from IWLEARN	N/A	60% of project responses indicate satisfaction	80% of project responses indicate satisfaction	Based on surveys and feedback documented: WWF workshop participants (March 09) =100% Tunis Workshop participants (July 09) = 100% Athens workshop participants (Sep 08) =90%  The findings of an IWLEARN survey that included questions to gauge users on satisfaction on the ICT Services <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/websit toolkit/survey">http://www.iwlearn.net/websit toolkit/survey</a>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 2 (Component B):</b> Enhanced TWM capacity at project and basin-levels through sharing of experiences among subsets of the GEF IW portfolio, including projects, their partners and counter parts.	Number of GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing in the Caribbean region drafted and accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	As of January 2007, 0 GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	N/A	At least 10 GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing are accessible through <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>	A consultative workshop represented by all focus areas of the GEF was held in Jamaica in June, 09. An interactive forum mediated by email and web interface has been launched and maintained by the executing partner UNEP/CEP. As a result of the consultation, to date 11 case studies which have been drafted will be used to formulate experience notes.	
<b>Outcome 3 (Component D):</b> A widely available suite of tested and replicated ICT and other tools and approaches for strengthening TWM	Number of GIS related requests from the IW community that UNEP-IWLEARN responds to.	As of January 2006, UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 0 IW community request	UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 10 GIS IW community request	UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 20 GIS IW community request	64 requests related to the GIS catalogue tool, received by projects were addressed <a href="http://issuetracker.iwlearn.org">http://issuetracker.iwlearn.org</a>	
	Number of projects using the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	As of January 2006, 0 project use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	As of January 2007, 5 projects use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	10 projects use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	17 projects use the GIS toolkit as an add-on to the website toolkit of UNEP-IWLEARN. <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis">http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis</a>	

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY20.. rating	FY20.. rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

### 3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs <sup>19</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>20</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>21</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

<sup>20</sup> As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

<sup>21</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outputs <sup>19</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>20</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>21</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>22</sup>
<b>Output 1: Designed and operating IW:LEARN information system</b>	Q3/2009	100%		
Activity A1.1: Design, launch and maintain the IW:LEARN Information system	Q1/2006	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/">http://www.iwlearn.net/</a>	
Activity A1.2: Migrate all content from the Pilot Phase IW:LEARN website (www.iwlearn.org & iwlearn.net) into new IW:LEARN information system	Q1/2006	100%		
A.1.3: Develop a metadata-base of the GEF IW project portfolio and stakeholders	Q1/2006	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects">http://www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects</a>	
Activity A1.4: Develop a search engine for the IW:LEARN information system that can access information held in various project and stakeholder websites.	Q3/2006	100%		
Activity A1.5: Produce and maintain an online calendar of IW events as part of the IW:LEARN information system	Q3/2006	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/calendar">http://www.iwlearn.net/calendar</a>	
Activity A1.6: Develop a multilingual glossary and/or thesaurus of IW terminology	Q4/2007	100%		
Activity A1.7: Integrate the IW:LEARN information system to a wider environmental information network infrastructure	Q4/2007	75%	Rethinking priorities within UNEP continue to impact the project's ability to deliver sustained access to and gather relevant data and information through networks.	
Activity A1.8: Implement a disaster recovery system (e.g. back-up or mirror server)	Q4/2007	100%		
Activity A.1.9: Maintain a metadata-base of the GEF IW project portfolio and stakeholders	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects">http://www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects</a> <a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/con-info/contacts">http://www.iwlearn.net/con-info/contacts</a>	
Activity A.1.10: Deploy at least 2 collaborative	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/gcw">http://www.iwlearn.net/gcw</a> . Although	

<sup>22</sup> To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs <sup>19</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>20</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>21</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>22</sup>
tools (such as list servers, blog or syndication tools) to encourage dialogue among GEF project practitioners.			a significant number of modules have been delivered new needs and ideas to better address learning across the GEF IW portfolio continue to surface. As a result, a Community Platform module is being developed.	
Activity A1.11: Compile and make accessible selected data and information on key topics identified through IWLEARN surveys, feedback and projects.	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/survey">http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/survey</a>	
Activity A1.12: Develop a portal for news, and other information about GEF IW projects (e.g., announcements, events etc) within the IWLEARN Information System	Q2/2007	95%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/News/iwlearn">http://www.iwlearn.net/News/iwlearn</a>	
Activity A1.13: Develop and operate an archive/repository service for GEF IW project data and information	Q3/2007	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/archive">http://www.iwlearn.net/archive</a>	
Activity A1.8: Implement a disaster recovery system (e.g. back-up or mirror server)	Q3/2009	100%		
Activity A.1.9: Maintain a metadata-base of the GEF IW project portfolio and stakeholders	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects">www.iwlearn.net/iw-projects</a>	
<b>Output 2: ICT assistance provided to GEF IW projects</b>	Q2/3 2009	100%		
Activity A2.1: Develop a tracking system to manage help request from IW projects regarding ICT matters	Q2/2006	100%	<a href="http://issuetracker.iwlearn.org">http://issuetracker.iwlearn.org</a>	
Activity A2.2: Develop and maintain a ICT help section within the IW:LEARN information system	Q3/2006	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/help">http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/help</a>	
Activity A2.3: Develop a website toolkit to enable any GEF project to deploy and manage a project website and exchange information with other	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit">http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit</a>	

Outputs <sup>19</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>20</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>21</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>22</sup>
projects and stakeholders.				
Activity A.2.4: Conduct at least 2 regional ICT capacity building workshops among GEF IW projects to enable projects to utilize the website toolkit and associated utilities.	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events">http://www.iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events</a>	
Activity A2.5: Conduct periodic surveys to assess user needs and effectiveness of ICT utilities	Q3/2009	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/survey">http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/survey</a>	
<b>Output D1: South East Asia Regional Learning Centre (SEA-RLC)</b>	Q3/2009	100%		
Activity D1.1: Transfer the Regional Learning Center (RLC) website to www.iwlearn.net server	Q2/2007	Closed		
Activity D1.2 Selected RLC resources and functions migrated to IWLEARN.Net	Q4/2007	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis">http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis</a>	
Activity D1.3 Create GIS section on IWLEARN.Net	Q2/2007	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis">http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis</a>	
Activity D1.4 Establish a GIS test platform for projects using existing spare RLC server	Q2/2007	100%	<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis">http://www.iwlearn.net/webgis</a>	
Activity D1.5 Produce IWLEARN GIS toolkit module	Q2/2007	100%		
Activity D1.6 Content management of information on the IWLEARN.net information system	Q3/2009	Closed	Consolidated into the delivery and operation of iwlearn.net (component A of the project)	
Activity D1.7 Provide logistical support for UNEP-IWLEARN planned workshops	Q3/2009	100%		
Activity D1.8 Provide technical back stopping to projects on GIS related issues	Q3/2009	100%		

Overall project implementation progress <sup>23</sup> *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings):*

FY.. rating	FY.. rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. *(To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager<sup>24</sup>)*

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation *(To be completed by Project Manager)*.

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

<sup>23</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

<sup>24</sup> UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

3.3. Risk

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

RISK FACTOR TABLE										
<p><b>Project Managers</b> will use this table to summarize risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflect also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <b>Notes</b> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (<b>PM</b>) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (<b>TM</b>). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The <b>UNEP Task Manager</b> should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.</p>										

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating									
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined				
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																				
<b>Project management</b>																				
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems		X						PM									
											TM									
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	X							PM									
											TM									

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment		X											
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation		X											
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize	X												
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	X						Changes to support efficient execution. However process to finalize allocation of funds needs improvement						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds			X				PM: disbursement of funds to the sub project have been slow and frustrating for the executing teams.						
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting				X			Reporting on PIR in particular, needs improvement.						
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders	X												

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident	X						Demonstrated through increased demand for services and survey results						
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X						The PCU has been working hard to ensure longer term continuity, replication and sustainability.						
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties	X												

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives	X												
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary																

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project context</b>																
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile	X												
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	X												
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X												
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of	Weaknesses exist but have been identified	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners													

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project context</b>																
	institutions and other project partners	and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	require constant support and technical assistance													
Others, please specify																

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the **Task Manager** should be provided below*

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN	
Rank – importance of risk	
Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)	
Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk	
Who – person(s) responsible for the action	
Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed	

Rank	Risk Statement <sup>25</sup>		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY.. rating	FY.. rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
		<b>If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation</b>

<sup>25</sup> Only for Substantial to High risk.

## RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes
- Terminal evaluation Yes
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

A part of the regular operations, routine surveys (see [www.iwlearn.net/website/toolkit/survey](http://www.iwlearn.net/website/toolkit/survey)) are conducted in addition to regular monitoring of usage statics reported in each issue of the IW:LEARN eBulletin and obtained from two statistical gathering tools (awstats and google analytics)

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

Based on the particularities of this project it is currently difficult to measure impact of its services on projects as most users access information resources of IW:LEARN as “anonymous users”. However, aiming to address this, we have employed the use of a feedback mechanism to improve accessibility to relevant information store on iwlearn.net and at the same time serve to encourage input and feedback from the target users. In addition the method now fully deployed in this PIR cycle provides a direct measurement of information resources actually accessed by the target group. In turn this technique has help close a gap that many knowledge management projects and online information systems accessible find difficult to address (i.e. “is the intended audience actually using the resource ?”)

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

N/A

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

Data collection for this project is an inbuild mechanism to IW:LEARN’s operations as most indicators are part of the information service and infrastructure monitoring. However, user feedback tend to be time consuming with a response rate of 25% considered good.

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions<sup>27</sup> are still valid

As explained in 4.5 above, there it is difficult to know for sure and measure how knowledge captured is being accessed and recycled. In the design of the project little attention was given to addressing this gap. In deed effects of the benefits of this project may not be realized in its duration. However, we have adopted a feedback mechanism to close the gap and improve measurement of effectiveness of information sources. This method has served as a good indicator. A future phase may consider the use of indirect and catalytic results (for example, replication as a result of this project, policy , enquires and so on).

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

As with any information technology initiative, reliance on bandwidth and infrastructure to support ICT are key factors that impact uptake and effectiveness. At the same time and as demonstrated in the project, cultural factors are also a key factor . The project has adjusted its use of technology to cater for both technology limitations at the regional levels (e.g. Africa vs. North America) and cultural characteristics (e.g. use of wiki’s vs email, working offline vs online ) to provide solutions that meet the need and comfort level of the target user.

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

N/A

<sup>27</sup> Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (i.e. *the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

#### 4. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design and implementation. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

o Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.

# The project has worked hard to be able to substantiate its service value to its stakeholder. Perceptions by projects regarding the GEF's interest to sustain IW:LEARN as proven to be an issue which could affect the uptake of the project's services which contribute to the overall objective anticipated. During this FY in particular, the planned closer of the project, compounded with the delay of approval of projects in the GEF pipeline has raised many questions among the primary user of IW:LEARN (i.e. GEF IW projects) on the sustainability of the benefits of IW:LEARN. In addition, hesitation from the Executing Agency has also served to reinforce this perception. At the same time, the enforcement of the "fee for service" policy on the part of the GEF Secretariat, and the strong advocacy of the website toolkit on the part of UNDP has helped to counter this perception. A strong institutional ownership and advocacy of that ownership is a key element to be considered in similar service oriented projects.

o Institutional arrangements, including project governance;

# This project has helped to assert UNEP as a key contributor in knowledge management and UNDP as the capacity building agency. The delineation of roles and responsibilities in this manner in a jointly implemented project has resolved many institutional challenges faced at its inception. Synergy and trust has evolved from the delineation of roles and responsibilities and greater cohesion and coordination has resulted among the teams involved. Reporting, monitoring and bi-lateral support/backstopping has resulted. Governance on the other hand has seen varying levels of commitment across all entities involved.

o Engagement of the private sector;

o Capacity building;

o Scientific and technological issues;

o Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;

o Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;

# While a 3rd phase of the project (currently pending approval) helps to convey interest at the management level for continuation/extension of services, supporting policy and institutional ownership are key factors. In the case of IW:LEARN, its target group (projects) seek cost effective mechanisms to meet its goals. With many alternatives available through the private sector, social and political factors steer decisions regarding services IW:LEARN could offer to a project. Policy at the Agency and GEF Secretariat level help the decision making process, however advocacy and marketing has been demonstrated as critical factors.

o Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;

o Financial management and co-financing.