



Nile Microgrant, Mara Basin, July, Tanzania, 2006

**NILE BASIN INITIATIVE
SHARED VISION PROGRAM**

**NILE TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION PROJECT
JOINT MID-TERM REPORT
THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND
THE WORLD BANK**

MAY, 2007

**NILE BASIN INITIATIVE - SHARED VISION PROGRAM
NILE TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION PROJECT
JOINT MID-TERM REPORT
UNDP AND WORLD BANK
MAY, 2007**

i. Executive Summary

I. Introduction

II. Key findings from independent MTR

a) Implementing agencies' assessment of MTR

III. Project Delivery to date based on MTR and mission findings

a) Monitoring and Evaluation– and the shift to Results Based Framework

b) Institutional Strengthening:

- Strategic Environmental Framework.
- Knowledge Management
- Decision Support System

c) Community Level Land, Forest, and Water Degradation – Microgrants.

d) Environmental Education and Awareness

e) Transboundary Water Quality Monitoring & Awareness

f) Wetlands and Biodiversity

g) National Activities

IV. Project Management Issues

a) Disbursement

b) Procurement

c) HR Management

V. Phase II of the GEF Project

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

Annex 1 Independent MTR Recommendations – Summary Table with responses

Annex 2 Original NTEAP Log-Frame

Annex 3 NTEAP new Results Framework

Annex 4 Overview of disbursement by component, funding source and year; plus cumulative

Annex 5 NTEAP PSC Meeting Results – February 2007

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------------|---|
| ATP | Applied Training Project |
| CAS | Country Assistance Strategy |
| CBO | Community Based Organization |
| CBSI | Confidence Building and Stakeholder Involvement project |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| DSS | Decision Support System |
| EE&A | Environmental Education and Awareness (NTEAP Component 3) |
| ENSAP | Eastern Nile Subsidiary Action Program |
| ENTRO | Eastern Nile Technical Office |
| EWUAP | Efficient Water Use in Agricultural Production project |
| FMR | Financial Monitoring Report |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IW | International Waters |
| LS | Lead Specialist |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MTR | Mid-term Review |
| NBD | Nile Basin Discourse |
| NBI | Nile Basin Initiative |
| NBI-SEC | Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat |
| NBTF | Nile Basin Trust Fund |
| NBTF-C | Nile Basin Trust Fund Committee |
| NELSAP | Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program |
| NELSAP-CU | Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordination Unit |
| NEP | National Eligible Project |
| NGO | Non-governmental Organization |
| NILE-COM | Nile Council of Ministers of Water |
| Nile RAK | Nile River Awareness Kit |
| NILE-TAC | Nile Technical Advisory Committee |
| NMC | National Microgrant Coordinator |
| NPC | National Project Coordinator |
| NSC | National Steering Committee (Micro-grants) |
| NTEAP | Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project |
| OP | Operational Policy |
| PAD | Project Appraisal Document |
| PIM | Project Implementation Manual |
| PIP | Project Implementation Plan |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| RBM | River Basin Model |
| RBO | River Basin Organization |
| RPM | Regional Project Manager |
| RPT | Regional Power Trade project |
| SAP | Subsidiary Action Program |
| SDBS | Socio-economic Development and Benefits Sharing project |
| SVP | Shared Vision Program |
| SVP-C | Shared Vision Program Coordination project |
| SEF | Strategic Environmental Framework |
| TEA | Transboundary Environmental Analysis |
| The Agencies | NTEAP GEF implementing agencies (UNDP and WB) |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNOPS | United Nations Office for Project Services |
| WB | World Bank |
| WQM | Water Quality Management |
| WQWG | Water Quality Working Group |
| WRPM | Water Resources Planning and Management project |

NILE BASIN INITIATIVE
SHARED VISION PROGRAM NILE TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION PROJECT
JOINT MID-TERM REPORT
WORLD BANK AND UNDP
MAY, 2007

Executive Summary

The Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) is a key component in the Nile Basin Initiative's (NBI) Shared Vision Program (SVP). As largest of the SVP's seven regional sectoral projects, NTEAP contributes to enhancing the capacities and capabilities in the basin and to the increased convergence of legal, regulatory and policy frameworks, especially in relation to the environment pillar of sustainable development. Its development objectives are to develop a framework of actions to address high priority transboundary environmental issues in the Nile basin through (a) provision of a forum to discuss development paths for the Nile; (b) improvement in the understanding of the relationship between water resources management and the environment and (c) enhancement of basing-wide cooperation among NBI countries. It aims to do so through 5 interconnected components which are also linked to and expected to work collaboratively with other SVP projects. Those components are:

1. *Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation* – component one includes overall project management, knowledge management and dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, as well as the development of a strategic environmental framework (SEF) for the NBI countries and support to the river basin model (RBM) decision support system (DSS) that is being developed by the SVP Water Resources Planning and Management (WRPM) Project.
2. *Community level land, forest, and water conservation* – component two is primarily focused on identifying and delivering micro-grants to non-governmental organizations (NGO) and community based organizations (CBO), as well as targeted studies on soil erosion.
3. *Environmental education and awareness* – component three works with primary and secondary schools as well as universities to develop educational programs and create awareness of environmental issues facing the Nile Basin.
4. *Wetlands and biodiversity conservation* – component four was launched in late 2006 and focuses on drawing attention to the protection of the basin's unique, globally significant wetlands.
5. *Basin-wide water quality monitoring* – component five identifies key transboundary water quality issues and promotes data sharing and cooperation on those issues among the NBI countries.

NTEAP receives funds through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) via both UNDP and World Bank implemented grants and the multi-donor Nile Basin Trust Fund (NBTF), which is managed by the World Bank. The Nile riparians also make significant in-kind contributions. While the project was designed over five years and most of its funding approved for the same period, the UNDP/GEF funds were split in two due to GEF funding shortfalls. It was agreed that the request for the second tranche of funds would be put in after the 3rd year of implementation of the project.

The implementing agency mid-term review mission coincided with the project entering its third year of implementation, with the mandatory evaluation according to the WB grant agreement and with the preparation period for the submission of the second tranche request to the GEF. This Joint Mid-term Report follows an independent mid-term evaluation and builds on its findings to (i) take stock of the project's progress to date, (ii) assess how developments in basin cooperation need to be reflected in the project and (iii) looks forward to address lessons learnt during the second half of the project.

The agencies confirmed the findings of the MTE in that the project has been a leader in river basin cooperation and represented the NBI when no other action on the ground had started, has set best practices in terms of execution, monitoring and evaluation and procurement, and has progressed well towards the achievement of its outputs. The project has struggled with the suggested working group approach in that maintaining them engaged and active on a voluntary basis has been challenging. The project has also struggled with the concept of the strategic environmental framework with different interpretations of its format, purpose and process being proposed; this has been compounded by the complexity of project design, sources of funds and reference documents (PAD, PIP, Prodoc, Project Brief, Grant agreements, etc.) Finally, being the first SVP project to have started and given the level of interconnections between NTEAP and other SVP projects, NTEAP in its first phase has focused on “easy” activities and only started to tackle policy reform, to engage in serious institutional strengthening and to entertain high level dialogue on key environmental issues.

The mid-term evaluation was the opportunity to confirm NBI commitment to NTEAP and its original development objective: *“the creation of more effective basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the transboundary analysis including:*

- *“Enhancing the analytical capacity for a basin-wide perspective to support the sustainable development, management, and protection of the Nile Basin water; and*
- *“Engaging the full spectrum of stakeholders, from local communities to national policy makers, from elementary schools to universities, from non-governmental organizations to line ministries, in management and protection of the basin’s shared resources.”*

In their review, the agencies focused much more than the independent evaluation on the forward looking aspect of this mid-point; in doing that, the agencies were guided by the following four questions:

- **HOW DOES THE ACTIVITY HELP TO BUILD A PERMANENT NILE INSTITUTION?**
- **HOW DOES THE ACTIVITY HELP TO ACHIEVE THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES?**
- **HOW DOES THIS ACTIVITY HELP TO SUPPORT PLANNED OR FUTURE SAP INVESTMENTS?**
- **WHAT IS THE NEEDED FOLLOW-UP?**

Key Findings of the Implementing Agency MTR

The joint World Bank UNDP MTR mission noted that NTEAP has made significant progress towards meeting the project’s development objectives. Key finding of the MTR include:

- Between MTR and project close, NTEAP should focus on the development of the Strategic Environmental Framework (SEF) for the Nile Countries. Specifically, NTEAP should identify what key environmental functions a permanent River Basin Organization (RBO) should undertake. NTEAP will need a clear exit strategy so that any activities being carried out by the project that do not fall under an RBO’s mandate are either phased out or taken up by the riparian countries.
- The NBI should look closely at the activities planned under the five NTEAP Components and ensure that only those activities that are both in keeping with the Projects Development Objectives and also NBI priorities are continued.
- Clear roles and responsibilities should be defined for the two components “Knowledge Management” and “Environmental Education and Awareness” in doing so avoiding gaps and overlap.
- Monitoring and Evaluations has to be mainstreamed into each component, to ensure results are documented, best practices and lessons are identified and impacts are captured.

- The proposal to continue with National Eligible Projects (NEPs) must be carefully considered by NTEAP and the NBI as NEP selection and implementation has been problematic in many countries.
- A decision on the proposed extension of the NTEAP Grants beyond their initial closing date of September 2008 can only be made after it is clear whether or not the GEF Phase Two funds will be made available.
- Even if the agencies agree to an extension of the NTEAP Grants, it will only be for the continuation of activities that are critical for the planned RBO and future SAP investments. It is expected that some activities, for example the Water Quality component, will close as originally scheduled in September 2008.

During NTEAP's second phase, given recent developments in the riparians, in the SVP, in basin cooperation, and in the GEF focal area strategy for international waters, it is proposed that the project focuses on (i) the Strategic Environmental Framework with specific attention to be given to policy reform; (ii) facilitating a process for the identification of the environment function of the permanent institutions; (iii) capturing impacts and identifying best practices undertaken through its different components and (iv) executing the wetlands component with a specific focus on the water dimension of wetlands.

In conclusion, and based on the MTE report and MTR missions, NTEAP remains highly relevant to the basin, has played a key role in sustaining cooperation while the overall SVP was being initiated and has achieved its outputs in a satisfactory manner. As a result of that, the agencies supported the submission of the second phase request as planned for the June/July work program of the GEF following the preparation of a management response to the MTR and a proposal for the second phase and their submission to the PSC meeting planned for February 2007. The proposal for the second phase request would take into consideration the evolving GEF strategy on international waters.

I. Introduction

Management Arrangements. The Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) is one of eight regional capacity building projects executed through the Nile Basin Initiative's (NBI¹) Shared Vision Program (SVP). The project is financed through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through grants to two implementing agencies, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the World Bank (the agencies), as well as a grant from a multi-donor Nile Basin Trust Fund (NBTF), which is managed by the World Bank. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is one of the key contributors to the NBTF with a specific interest in the environmental dimension of the NBI's vision.

The NBI Secretariat has executed a management services agreement (MSA) with the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) whereby UNOPS provides the NBI with project services for all of the regional SVP Projects. The NTEAP is executed under that MSA through a UNOPS operated Project Management Unit (PMU) based in Khartoum, Sudan². The PMU reports to the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which provides strategic guidance to the project.

The PMU provides technical and managerial support to the NBI Secretariat in overseeing the implementation of the project, with a Thematic Lead Specialist from the region coordinating each major project component. Through UNOPS, the PMU also facilitates local contracting, fund management, local procurement, disbursement, program administration and project level monitoring.

A National Project Coordinator (NPC) in each country provides a critical link between the Thematic Lead Specialists based in the PMU and the national specialists, members of the thematic working groups and organizations involved in implementing the various project components within the respective countries. Project implementation will ensure participation of all relevant stakeholders, including key government ministries, local and traditional communities, NGOs, educational institutions and private sector organizations.

Mid-term Report. NTEAP was formally launched by the President of Sudan on May 29, 2004 and currently has a planned closing date of March 31, 2008. An independent mid-term review (MTR) was conducted during the fall of 2006 and the results were presented to UNDP and the World Bank during an MTR mission in December 2006 and then to the full NTEAP PSC in February 2007. This Mid-term Report has been jointly prepared by the UNDP and World Bank Teams responsible for oversight of the NTEAP Grants based on the results of the independent MTR, their joint MTR mission, and the February 2007 PSC meeting. Subsequent to the February mission, uncertainty in the Phase II UNDP GEF Project (the proposal has now been submitted to GEF for consideration) led to delays in the finalization of this report, though the key outcomes were discussed in detail with the NBI and the Project. The recommendations contained herein are endorsed by both UNDP and World Bank Management.

Due to GEF financial constraints in 2001, the GEF Secretariat split the UNDP GEF grant into two tranches during project appraisal. Therefore, this MTR report also serves as a background justification for the NBI's submission to GEF for the second tranche of the UNDP grant.

NTEAP Objectives and Components.³ The project's development objective is *the creation of more effective basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the transboundary analysis including:*

¹ The NBI's nine member countries are Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda. Eritrea participates as an observer.

² The specific execution arrangements are different for the UNDP and World Bank managed funds – the UNDP GEF Grant is executed directly by UNOPS while the World Bank GEF and NBTF Grants are executed by the NBI through its agreement with UNOPS. The end result is that the PMU executes the entire project as herein described.

³ Annex 1 contains the project's LFA.

- *Enhancing the analytical capacity for a basin-wide perspective to support the sustainable development, management, and protection of the Nile Basin water; and*
- *Engaging the full spectrum of stakeholders, from local communities to national policy makers, from elementary schools to universities, from non-governmental organizations to line ministries, in management and protection of the basin's shared resources.*

NTEAP aims to achieve that objective through the implementation of the following project components:

1. *Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation* – component one includes overall project management, knowledge management and dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, as well as the development of a strategic environmental framework (SEF) for the NBI countries and support to the river basin model (RBM) decision support system (DSS) that is being developed by the SVP Water Resources Planning and Management (WRPM) Project.
2. *Community level land, forest, and water conservation* – component two is primarily focused on identifying and delivering micro-grants to non-governmental organizations (NGO) and community based organizations (CBO); in certain countries this component has also delivered studies on soil erosion.
3. *Environmental education and awareness* – component three works with primary and secondary schools as well as universities to develop educational programs and create awareness of environmental issues facing the Nile Basin.
4. *Wetlands and biodiversity conservation* – component four was launched in late 2006 and focuses on drawing attention to the protection of the basin's unique, globally significant wetlands.
5. *Basin-wide water quality monitoring* – component five identifies key transboundary water quality issues and promotes data sharing and cooperation on those issues among the NBI countries.

II. Key findings from independent mid-term review

A team of four international consultants were recruited by the NTEAP PMU to conduct an independent mid-term review (MTR) of the project during the fall of 2006. The team was lead by Stanislaw Manikowski and consisted of Hassan Abdel Nour, Tarek Genena, and Timothy Hannan. Their full report is available from the NTEAP PMU (www.nileteap.org). The consultant's key findings with regards to NTEAP's progress towards meeting the project development objectives through a set of eight performance indicators (in italics) established during project appraisal are summarized below:

1. *Increased regional cooperation in environmental and water management fields* – the successful initiation of the regional education and awareness, and creation of a collaborative atmosphere among the highest environmental authorities through regional activities is the biggest achievement of the project. The technicians and the authorities of the member countries unanimously acknowledged the importance and pertinence of the project activities aiming at increasing regional cooperation.
2. *Increased levels of regional cooperation and coordination through the seven regional SVP projects* – cooperation with other SVP projects is at an early stage due to SVP implementation delays; however, it is very important that the NBI insure increased cooperation and coordination between NETEAP other SVP Projects at both national and regional levels.
3. *Increased basin-wide community action and cooperation in land and water management* – community actions launched by the project are very well received by their beneficiaries and the

project has made a remarkable and recognized contribution to the capacity building of NGO and CSOs in the identification, development and implementation of projects.

4. *Increased number of basin-wide networks of environmental and water professionals* – thanks to workshops and exchange of information among NBI countries, the discussion about development of the river and its basin was initiated and took a more professional turn. It is expected that more progress will be achieved once the SVP projects, jointly with NTEAP, will start to develop the decision support system (DSS).
5. *Greater appreciation of river hydrology and more informed discussion of development paths* – NTEAP will contribute to knowledge building about Nile hydrology once the needed equipment is available to the laboratories, the sampling is launched, and the sampling results are shared with the region.
6. *Expanded information and knowledge base on land and water resources available to professionals and NGOs* – NTEAP has been very active in building knowledge base and disseminating it through the Nile River Awareness Kit (Nile RAK).
7. *Greater awareness of the linkage between macro/sectoral policies and the environment* – NTEAP is at the beginning of the awareness building and of link creation between policy decisions and environmental management.
8. *Greater awareness and increased capacity on transboundary water quality themes* – this awareness building will be the combined effect of all the NTEAP activities and delivered outputs. Progress in awareness building will be best evaluated at the end of the project.

The agencies conducted a mission to NTEAP in December 2006 in order to review the findings of the independent MTR and conduct their own review of project delivery. In general, the agencies were supportive of the consultants' findings with regard to project delivery; however, they also found most of the recommendations lacking a strategic vision for NTEAP, particularly in view of the changes in the NBI countries since project design. Annex 1 contains the complete list of MTR recommendations as well as responses to those recommendations from NTEAP management and the two agencies.

III. Project Delivery to date based on MTR and mission findings

Based on the results of the independent MTR, the NTEAP 2006 Annual Report, the February 2007 PSC; and both the December 2006 and February/March 2007 joint UNDP-World Bank missions, the agencies have made the following assessment of NTEAP progress to date.

Overall NTEAP components are delivering well, particularly when looked at individually. As the project moves forward, ensuring stronger linkages to the overall NBI programs (both SVP and Subsidiary Action Programs (SAPs) as well as across NTEAP components is necessary and should be better reflected in each of the components' work plans (e.g. in terms of well formulated deliverables and/or sufficient time and budget allocation). It is noted that the NPCs' work plans are not reflected in the overall project work plan and budgets. While they may be integral and mainstreamed in the component work plans, the importance of the NPCs' work and their significant contributions to project delivery must be made more apparent to both the PSC members as well as other outside observers. By reflecting the NPC's work in the overall project work plans and reports, NTEAP will be able to better ensure coordination between the project (and other NBI activities) with the existing work of the national agencies.

a) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

In line with an NBI-wide effort, the project has adopted a results based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework. This improved M&E concept and resulting update of the NTEAP log-frame helps to better clarify expected deliverables. The agencies duly note that the original project development objectives

and component objectives along with the associated outcome indicators remain the overall parameters against which the project’s success is being measured and therefore welcome this move to better capture NTEAP’s contribution to the overall NBI vision. Table 1, below, illustrates NTEAP’s overall objectives and demonstrates that the shift to a results based framework does not make any shift in the project’s reporting, as the new outcomes correspond to the project’s original 5 components.

The NTEAP has pioneered the development of a monitoring and evaluation strategy, the collaborative development of a training manual on M&E with and for the micro-grants component, the delivery of trainings to micro-grants coordinators, NPCs and other stakeholders of the NBI and NTEAP. In doing so, the M&E has kept with the monitoring of impacts as well as with the progress, stress reduction, and environmental/water indicators as outcome or catalytic indicators identified by the GEF IW focal area.

Table 1 – NTEAP Objectives and outcomes

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Project Appraisal | Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project Development Objectives | | | | | | |
| | The project aims at creating more effective basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the transboundary analysis including: | | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing the analytical capacity for a basin-wide perspective to support the sustainable development, management, and protection of the Nile Basin water; and Engaging the full spectrum of stakeholders, from local communities to national policy makers, from elementary schools to universities, from non-governmental organizations to line ministries, in management and protection of the basin’s shared resources. | | | | | | |
| | Project Appraisal Document Outcome Indicators | | | | | | |
| | <i>Increased regional cooperation in environmental and water management fields</i> | <i>Increased basin-wide community action and cooperation in land and water management</i> | <i>Basin-wide networks of environmental and water professionals</i> | <i>Greater appreciation of river hydrology and more informed discussion of development paths</i> | <i>Expanded information and knowledge base on land and water resources available to professionals and NGOs</i> | <i>Greater awareness of the linkages between macro/sectoral policies and the environment</i> | <i>Greater awareness and increased capacity on transboundary water quality threats</i> |
| NBI Results Framework⁴ | NTEAP Objective | | | | | | |
| | To increase cooperation & capacity in NB countries through the provision of strategic environmental framework and engagement of stakeholders for the management of transboundary waters and environmental challenges in the NB | | | | | | |
| | NTEAP Outcomes | | | | | | |
| | Outcome 1: Institutions strengthened to facilitate regional collaboration | Outcome 2: Improved capacity of the countries in NB on land , forest , and water management | Outcome 3: Environmental education improved and public awareness enhanced | Outcome 4: Enhanced capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity | Outcome 5: Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the NB countries | | |
| | NTEAP Outcome Indicators | | | | | | |
| 1.1 WQ monitoring data exchange agreement (annex to the NBI information sharing protocol) formulated & approved by the WQM WG. 1.2 Recommendations on environmental functions of the NBI permanent institution formulated and submitted for approval. | 2. 1 Pilots identified for up scaling and 10 identified for replication during the project lifetime and proposals formulated. | 3.1 Improved level of public awareness and knowledge of TB environmental issues. | <i>None listed</i> | 5.1 Transboundary water quality monitoring network established and operational. 5.2 Water quality monitoring data exchange agreement to be annexed to the NBI information sharing protocol formulated approved by the WQM WG. | | | |

⁴ From NTEAP 2007 Work Plan

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| NTEAP 2 | Refocused objective for NTEAP 2 | | | | |
| | To protect critical Nile Basin ecosystems from transboundary threats through the provision of a strategic environmental framework and the engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) | | | | |
| | NTEAP2 outcomes | | | | |
| | Regional and national institutions strengthened in addressing transboundary threats to Nile ecosystem resources. | Improved capacity of Nile Basin communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across GEF focal areas | Enhanced environmental education and public awareness targeting Nile basin transboundary issues | Enhanced conservation and management of Nile basin wetlands and their biodiversity in accordance with the principles of IWRM | Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the NB countries |
| | NTEAP 2 outcome indicators | | | | |
| | 1.1 Transboundary EIA guidelines for use by NBI investment programs developed 1.2 Policy recommendations on Basin environment protection formulated and submitted for consideration in at least two countries 1.3 Environment function of the NB permanent institution framework defined and approved 1.4 Nile Basin Development Forum in 2008 defines the environmental issues and priorities for the Basin | 2.1 Best practices addressing Nile environmental threats at community level documented and replicated | 3.1 At least 8 universities in 6 NBI countries approved and adopted the environmental modules based on Nile environmental threats 3.2 Environmental campaigns and schools award programs adopted and institutionalized at national levels in at least 6 NBI countries | 4.1 National level wetlands management networks established and functioning in at least 5 countries 4.2 Process towards the development of a regional wetlands strategy initiated 4.3 Recommendations of policy reforms towards wetlands-friendly policies developed | 5.1 Transboundary water quality monitoring network established and approved 5.2 TB WQM & data sharing annex to NBI data sharing protocol developed |

In its second phase it is recommended that the M&E works closely with the different project components to identify, qualify and quantify impacts to the extent possible. In particular, the M&E LS and KM specialist to codify and document best practices across the different components and to provide the baseline information and set up processes that will facilitate long-term monitoring of the Nile environment as part of the permanent institution.

b) Institutional Strengthening:

Regional coordination. Regional coordination of this complex technical assistance project is accomplished through the Project Management Unit (PMU), which oversees a professional staff consisting of a regional project manager (RPM), five regional lead specialists, a regional finance and procurement officer, nine national project coordinators (NPCs), and nine national microgrant coordinators. The RPM works closely with the NBI Secretariat, based in Entebbe, Uganda, to ensure the NTEAP activities are coordinated with the other SVP regional projects as well as two sub-regional subsidiary action programs (SAPs). Each of the NPCs also ensures coordination of NTEAP activities with other NBI programs at the national level. Despite initial delays in staffing early on during project implementation, the PMU and national staff are now fully functional and delivering a the planned program at both the regional and national levels. Now that NTEAP is operational UNDP and the Bank recommend a focus on deepening coordination among the project’s components, with other NBI activities as well as with similar environmental programs. The NPCs will play a key role in ensuring that NBI’s environmental activities are

well rooted in national programs and priorities, with a special focus to be given to the sustainability of processes and attention related to transboundary water/environmental issues.

Strategic Environmental Framework (SEF). The SEF sub-activity was added at the end of 2005 based on the aim of NTEAP management to equip the future permanent Nile Basin institution with a basin-wide strategic assessment of resource assets and threats. In order to respond to current planning frameworks at sub-basin level and respond to stakeholder requests for support to the SAPs, the initial activities focus on providing an environment advisor to both of the SAPs and conduct capacity building on strategic environmental assessment on the sub-basin levels. This responsiveness is highly appreciated by basin stakeholders.

The SEF component is well positioned to facilitate dialogue to identify and design future support for the establishment of an environment function for a permanent basin-wide institution, while at the same time assuring sound decision making in development planning at the sub-basin level. This is fully in line with the SP-3 goal of the revised international waters operational strategy to *balance overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins*.

Three areas of support have been identified through the joint mission and are supported by the findings of the independent evaluation mission. These activities would be key in the second half of the project in order to assure sustainability of the positive momentum created by the project so far. Appropriate staff time and resource allocation need to be assured. Project management is currently beginning to devote considerable attention to defining activities in consultation with high level involvement of the PSC members and NBI stakeholders.

(i) Strategic dialogue to define the environment function and resulting needs of a permanent Nile Basin institution. This needs to be aligned with and complement overall institutional development of the NBI (and any successor organization). The project should set aside time and funds to allow for a facilitated dialogue among high level stakeholders, involving PSC, TAC members & Nile-SEC, to define a permanent Nile environment function within the future institution. Nile-SEC, the PSC chair and NTEAP management should engage NBI stakeholders as well as ministerial level support for the planned institution in accordance with its vision and anticipated functions. The current Nile-COM chair and leading individuals from countries with strong integration of environment, land and water issues may be engaged in championing this process. Dialogue may include providing an umbrella for emerging subsidiary processes such as on the level to the Lake Victoria Commission and East African Community to e.g. develop minimum environmental standards, harmonize EIA requirements, and foster more intensive information exchange.

This process can be initiated with the Nile Basin Development Forum 2008 focused on environment and for which NTEAP's support has been requested by the COM. The series of paper prepared and submitted in the context of the NBDF can serve as a basis for furthering the dialogue and discussions. In parallel, consultant advice e.g. reviewing international experience could be helpful to provide an overview of (i) institutional set-up/models & experience from other basins; (ii) staffing and cost implications; (iii) and aiding the NBI to formulate necessary follow up support to enable the expected permanent Nile Institution.

(ii) Support to up-streaming environment in Subsidiary Action Programs. The project is now allocating time and resources to provide environment advisors to SAPs to support sustainable development in sub-basin planning; and providing targeted training as needed to SAP/investment program planning (e.g. to include SEA, EIA, environmental flow requirements). The presence of these advisors within the SAPs acts as a vehicle to mainstream the findings, processes and priorities identified by the different NTEAP components – especially for instance the wetlands component as it starts up or the micro-grants component as it identifies best-practices.

(iii) Support to strategic country level and sub-regional dialogue, e.g. environment policy & strategy formulation. Stemming from the macro-policies identified with the PSC during the first phase and building on the focus of the second phase on sustaining the wetlands of the Nile, this

could include strategic involvement of NTEAP. to aid in inclusion of environment and transboundary threats into national environmental action plans, PRSPs, sub-regional protocols (e.g. within the Lake Victoria Commission). It is recommended that high level discussions be initiated by the RPM through in-country visits and further facilitated by the NPC with continued guidance and support from both the PSC and the PMU.

Involvement of NTEAP management to fully engage PSC members and project networks to increase visibility and build political momentum will be key to all these activities.

Knowledge Management (KM). Progress to date the KM specialist has been active and instrumental in designing and setting up the website which is up and running and has set best practice at the level of the NBI; it has developed a template and prepared several issues of the newsletter; produced project communication material, posters, calendars that have helped promote the NBI within and outside the basin.

Recommendations – the MTR and agencies' missions have both highlighted the need to more frequently update the website (particularly French) and to improve the presentation of background documents and publications. Similarly, ramping up the development of the micro-grants, NEP, and school projects database is necessary in line with the provisions of the project document, specifically in liaison with the SGP. This has been previously recommended during supervision missions. And it is expected to have been implemented by the upcoming supervision mission in the fall of 2007. This highlights the importance of KM in linking with other components – in its remaining lifetime, it is proposed that the KM team undertakes consultations with the different LS while preparing its annual workplan and determining its deliverables. Furthermore, in meeting with the different stakeholders in the basin, the agencies' mission has noted a potential for the emergence of gaps and overlaps between the KM, EE&A components of NTEAP and CBSI's information function. It is therefore suggested that the roles and responsibilities of KM, EE&A and CBSI be clearly defined in order to ensure cost-effectiveness of communications and KM at the level of the SVP as a whole.

Technical and infrastructure constraints are a reality within which the KM component and NTEAP have to operate. This has been identified as an obstacle in reaching out to the public on the one hand, but also in ensuring the engagement of the working group members of different components. The KM team should give special attention to alternative media (such as radio) and support the LS and their working group members in identifying their constraints and possible means to overcome them. Ensuring that working groups can communicate at low cost and in an efficient manner could additionally play an important role in ensuring their continued operation after the project closes.

Furthermore, the MTE has recommended that the project should start to communicate on the substance of Nile environment issues as well as on the project and its activities. In the spirit of results based management, such a shift in communications, reporting and KM is supported by the agencies.

In the second phase of the project, the KM component is expected to play a key role in capturing, documenting, archiving and codifying best practices, impacts and results of the NTEAP. It is therefore recommended that the thinking and work with the technical LS and with the M&E LS are initiated as soon as mid-2007 so that the necessary tools, approaches and resources are adequately planned for. In doing so, it is the role of the technical LS and RPM to identify the target audience and purpose so that the KM products are adequately designed to serve their purpose. In working with the M&E lead specialist, the KM team should also consider assessing the usefulness and impacts of its own tools as a way to guide the KM function of the permanent institution. Questionnaires can be developed to identify the impact of the newsletters, most adequate language, format... Web-based tracking tools may also be useful in identifying the extent of visitation of the website, location of visitors and most visited pages. The project's tracking of the number of requested issues of the newsletter, queries received following their circulation are practices which need to be sustained and reported upon.

River Basin Model (RBM). The primary output from the RBM sub-component will be the development of a Decision Support System (DSS) – The DSS is being developed through the SVP Water Resource Planning and Management Project (WRPM) based in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The WRPM has conducted a rapid assessment for the DSS in each NBI Country and is in the process of launching has just launched a detailed needs assessment consultancy (estimated US\$750,000) for the DSS based on the results of the rapid assessment. As part of the training for the DSS, WRMP is also financing a joint post graduate program for water modeling professionals from the NBI countries (estimated at US\$263,000).

At the time of the MTR, little progress had been made on this sub-component due to the later start-up of the WRPM; however, the Water Modeler joined the WRPM staff on July 1, 2007 and the inception workshop for DSS Needs Assessment is expected to will take place in July 2007, at which point the sub-component will be well underway.

The relatively late start-up of this component actually turns out to be an asset in that its start up coincides with the initiation of the wetlands component and with the request from the PSC to develop a strategy for the water quality component. In the second phase of the project, it is important for these two components to work closely and feed into the DSS development process at its onset so that wetlands sustainability and water quality considerations are fully integrated and adequately addressed.

c) Community Level Land, Forest, and Water Conservation – Microgrants

Overall progress. Land and forest degradation have been identified as major threats in the Transboundary Environmental Analysis. The Nile Microgrants enable the NBI to show action on the ground in a visible way. While the activities are local, they represent actions to address common threats as outlined in the TEA and are well designed to pilot innovative approaches. The component is building on and closely cooperating with the successful GEF Small Grants Program in those NBI countries where that GEF program is operational.

First year activities were dominated by setting up the institutional structures, hiring staff, and establishing offices; including setting up decentralized, local set-ups in some of the SGP countries where the distance from the basin to the capital was an issue (Kenya, Tanzania, DRC, Burundi), and entire new set-ups in non-SGP countries or those with SGPs being established at the same time (Burundi, Congo, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Sudan & Southern Sudan). Formulation and adoption of national action plans was another pre-requisite to implementing small scale projects. At the same time the planned erosion study sub-component was successfully completed in all three countries. As expected, the component has picked up in its implementation in 2006 after the initial lag for setting up the institutional structures; it should be recognized that project design has underestimated the required effort for this. Country specific Microgrants targets for 2006 quarters were set to tightly monitor delivery; these have been achieved without compromising quality for quantity. The team is commended for this tremendous progress, which is also reflected by positive feedback from stakeholders during country visits in December 2006. In particular the instrumental role that the micro-grants component has played in strengthening CSOs and NGOs, in addressing priority issues and in furthering the concept of stakeholder participation in the basin was recognized and acknowledged across the countries visited during the mission. This component in particular has played a key role in increasing the visibility of and adhesion to the NBI and basin-wide cooperation as a whole. As a result of this, high level politicians – e.g, president of Burundi – have become more aware of the NBI, more sensitive to its case and more inclined to respond to policy reform recommendations as might be proposed by the NBI.

The funding crisis due to insecure availability of GEF/UNDP second tranche funds has resulted in apprehension by the project management and PSC to allocate sufficient funds for ramping up activities of the component in 2007. 2007 should be a year of high delivery, whereas by mid 2008 a ramp down is expected in terms of larger microgrants activities. GEF commitment to second tranche GEF/UNDP contribution is crucial for project planning, success and delivery of project objectives.

Themes and lessons learned. Now that around 120 projects are under implementation, it gives NTEAP the opportunity to (i) assess if an adequate variety of innovative themes as those highlighted in the

TEA/NAP and required for SAP piloting are being addressed; (ii) draw lessons learned and disseminate experience by major themes across countries (also addresses TB nature of project); and (iii) evaluate impacts, which could range across physical impacts, awareness, learning & innovation as well as capacity building, etc.. The KM & M&E specialists have a very substantive role to play here and their complementary roles should be well determined and defined. It is proposed that M&E develops the tools including thematic evaluations and pilots the use of various media (e.g. short videos) in 2007 to capture the impacts. The KM on the other hand would bring value is archiving, documenting and codifying the findings of the M&E to respond to the needs of different stakeholders within and outside of the NBI.

Aiming at piloting and innovation. The MG program is aimed at piloting approaches and addressing common threats in the basin countries. A move to extracting lessons learned across major themes and evaluating thematic activities could contribute to more proactively transferring innovative approaches to other countries and contexts. For example, analyzing the added learning/innovation value as well as cost/benefit of the high percentage of tree nursery projects to address fuel wood shortage and/or for river bank/buffer zone protection could prompt a shift to look for other means for wood fuel substitution. Specific attention needs to be given to the types of trees being used (the agencies' mission observed the use of eucalyptus seedlings in many instances which might not be appropriate with environmental considerations of exogenous species control). The mid-term evaluation report highlights certain themes to be addressed. The WB and UNDP team is cautious on top-down prescribing "problems & solutions to communities" and decreasing country specific flexibility. Community drivenness should not be compromised under this approach. The underlying cause of why certain themes are not reflected in the community proposals should be evaluated; e.g. is it lack of awareness, lack of relevance or other reasons? On the other had, a *stocktaking by the LS, NSCs and LSCs to see (i) if the main issues identified in the national/local microgrants action plans are still valid and (ii) if the balance of proposals is reflecting the main goals of the action plan would seem very valuable.*

National Action Plans- thematic and geo-graphical focus. The lead specialist recommended a narrower geographical focus (see July 2006 aide memoire). It is not obvious that this is being followed up on the country level. Synergies between SVPs and SAPs, especially the preparation of fast track projects, provide an opportunity and entry point to revise the current geographic & possibly thematic focus in some of the national and local action plans. The initiation of the wetlands component and the submission of the second phase proposal to the GEF could be used to trigger such a reflection and if necessary inclusion of new topics into the national action plans.

Grant ceiling increase. The MTR, stakeholders consulted in the country, and the implementing staff including the GEF- Small Grants Program (SGP) coordinators *all support an increase in grant ceilings to 50 K* that was recommended by the project in last years quarterly reviews and report to the PSC. Furthermore, this was supported by the independent midterm evaluation (MTR). The World Bank and UNDP support this idea based on (i) observed soundness of implementation mechanisms to handle this increase; (ii) decrease of number of projects, yet increase in impacts of a few larger, targeted projects, while maintaining a windows of grants with lower ceilings to prevent the 'crowding out' of smaller NGOs and less experienced groups; (iii) possibility for strategic transboundary activities that often require some additional inputs to allow for transboundary exchanges & collaboration.

Pre-requisite to process this increase. As has been discussed with the project at prior occasions, a *simple Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has to be prepared when applying for an increase in grant ceilings that would include practical guidance/checklists at screening, approval, and implementation and supervision stages of the microgrants.* The ESMF would need to be reviewed and approved by the World Bank and UNDP and disclosed in country (in English and/or French). Even for current level of microgrants funds it was found that additional guidance on potential environmental (incl. social) impacts would be beneficial to local steering committees and others. **Other toolkits** to ease screening and approval processes (e.g. guidance for baseline development) should be prepared by the project in collaboration with the NSCs and SGP. As recommended by the midterm evaluation, these larger project should also address a basic cost-benefit analysis; hence, modules for training NSCs, project staff, and NGOs need to be developed to address this.

Transboundary Projects. Efforts have been made in most countries to move towards projects with larger cross-border significance. National projects (type 1) are by and large relevant to transboundary threats in the basin and find high praise by government officials as well as communities. No project that is of transboundary nature (type 3) has been implemented. Type 3 projects may emerge through technology/experience transfer, but a fixed 50 % does not appear to serve the project and NBI needs. This is underscored by the independent evaluation report. It is *recommended to revise the Operational Manual to change this target*, while ramping up efforts to increase the number of relevant, cross-border and transboundary projects. Specific yearly and country targets should be set and directly related to specific SAP projects to assure relevance and options for upscaling. An increase in funding ceilings would aid to promote relevant projects.

Synergies with SAPs. The cooperation with SAPs has picked up during 2006 and is commensurate with having established the institutional mechanism in the countries. There have been common meetings of all three Eastern Nile country microgrants with the EN watershed project; targets for microgrants in the areas of initial investments of this project in each country have been set. There has been discussion with ENSAP to ensure that increasing cooperation and microgrants targets are included in both annual work plans (SAP and NTEAP). In the NEL region a number of projects have been consciously initiated in the areas of the NEL RBM. Formal work plan inclusion on both sides would be the next step and has been done by NTEAP. In addition, efforts to publicize/show this practice, its synergies and opportunities within and outside the Nile Basin family of projects would benefit the NBI.

Synergies across NTEAP components Within NTEAP itself, the micro-grant component has worked well with the monitoring and evaluation component and should aim at increasing its cooperation with other components, specifically the wetlands component and the KM sub-component. In the second phase, it is felt that the component has a critical mass of projects to start analysis, identification of impacts and their aggregation, as well as the identification of best practices. The KM's support will be crucial to ensure the information is adequately codified and communicated to the SAPs, to the countries and to the broader community.

Gender targets and inclusion of vulnerable groups: Inclusion of women in projects is satisfactory and the set targets for specific grants to women's groups has been achieved. The 10% target is a minimum for grants to 'women only' groups, but participation of women in all grants appears representative. The midterm evaluation is highlighting the need to increasingly target vulnerable and marginalized groups as well as work with groups not so close to larger cities. While this is a commendable goal and indeed usually mandated for larger sector projects, it has to be kept in mind that a relatively *small, yet effective microgrants program should not be overloaded by rules and quotas for specific groups, themes, etc.* while on top dealing with transboundary needs of nine countries. Spreading in remote areas violates recommendations for focus provided earlier. It should be noted that the the project is aiming to pilot adopting SGP tools e.g. for illiterate groups via video proposals and other to enable access to micro-grants by different groups.

Funds usage and budget: the entire component has accelerated tremendously in the last year. Following recommendations for budget revision have been made: increase funds for sub-component 2.1: Country operating budgets were underestimated at project design stage and NGO/CBO capacity building has proven as essential for project success and sustainability (see also midterm evaluation report). Sufficient funds for both are to be moved on this line. Sub-component 2.2: activities have been completed successfully and remaining funds should be moved to component 2.1. Sub-component 2.3: the budget as presented to the MTR mission seriously under-represented presently committed funds at the time of the midterm review as only the first tranche of grants was entered in the accounting system as committed. This has now been addressed and the entire amount signed up for in a microgrants MoA has to be counted as "committed". The Bank and UNDP will continue monitoring FMRs to assure that this is maintained.

Cooperation with country institutions & districts. The independent midterm evaluation indicated reservations about perceived level of coordination and collaboration with district officials. The MTR country visits came to very different results in the countries visited; in most countries district environment

officers are involved in aiding in preparation and monitoring of the grants. NTEAP pays transport costs for them to visit projects as needed. PSC members have institutionalized this collaboration in several countries by tasking district environment officers to aid in supervision and support to microgrants activities. The agencies' mission reports the active involvement of microgrants steering committee members in the monitoring and evaluation process although there are some shortfalls and constraints to sustaining that process beyond the project.

Database: The concept of the project database for microgrants, school projects and national eligible project has been presented at the July supervision mission and appears as an excellent start to enable more easy transfer of experiences among project staff and enhanced synergies. It was recommended to make this database to a large extent publicly accessible for increased transparency as well as visibility of the NBI. It is noted that this has been followed through in the first version of the web-based database which was just enabled. Coordination with and use of the SGP database, as outlined in the PIP and the OM, was discussed with the project and SGP and *is to be operationalized in the next six month*.

Financial management at beneficiary level. the independent evaluation voiced concerns that FM issues may not be sufficiently monitored at NGO &CBO (beneficiary) level. The WB-UNDP mission could not confirm lag of oversight by the NMCs/LMCs. Oversight seems to be regular, transparently agreed in the microgrants proposal, and funds usage and outputs are reviewed prior to releasing next tranches. It is *recommended that the project initiates an independent financial and management audit of the national microgrants programs for two countries each year*. SGP is able to provide sample TORs as well as other technical assistance.

Transparency and accountability to public: part of projects are well marked as funded by NBI/NTEAP; please follow up to mark all projects. The Bank and other development partners have good experiences in improving accountability and in encouraging peer oversight by making it a habit to indicate the funds received on this sign in local language.

Innovative technologies. It is noted that some NMCs/LMCs have been approached to fund waste/waste-water treatment for private companies that may seek NGO partnership. This can be disturbing where companies are simply violating laws; public grant finance cannot engage, where in fact fines are or should be collected by the national environment agencies. The project is *asked to propose a general rule to be included in the Operational Manual on which grounds to encourage cooperation with private companies and cases for which this should be excluded*.

Inclusion of Southern Sudan. the inclusion of Southern Sudan in the NBI has been highlighted at the last NBTf meeting. A local office has been set-up in Juba, which conforms to the present governance system in Sudan. Counterparts much appreciate this proactive move, which establishes the first presence of the NBI in Southern Sudan; a move that has been repeatedly invited by GoSS officials in speeches at both workshops for the development of an National Environmental Action Plan (national eligible project). To assure efficient implementation and coordination of other project components in Southern Sudan, the mission assessed that it could be highly beneficial to consider hiring a Southern Sudan regional coordinator in the Ministry of Environment and Wildlife in Southern Sudan, which is in accordance with the unique "one country- two systems" approach in the Sudan.

d) Environmental Education and Awareness (EE&A)

Background: This EE&A component aims at increasing public awareness and understanding of the community of interest and the common ecospace that the Nile creates. Activities especially target the future generation in the basin countries. Interventions were planned to act on three levels: (i) the general public, (ii) primary and secondary schools, (iii) university environmental education.

Overall progress: Overall the component has been very active and recognized by its stakeholders to have created a momentum and dynamism within the basin. The schools awards, WED celebrations, taking opportunities of high level events, international venues have all contributed to raising the environment agenda within different communities while simultaneously enhancing the image of the NBI... The component has been instrumental in supporting overall project communication, in testing project-

based learning in different settings such as schools, communities and in identifying opportunities and venues for promoting the NBI, NTEAP and its activities... However, both the MTE and agency mission have recorded a lack of focus and spread of activities; in addition to that, communication on the Nile environmental issues – assets and threats – has been limited so far. The component has established a number of networks (journalists, schools, universities) but has not given sufficient attention to nurturing and maintaining their engagement in the processes.

Recommendations:

In focusing its activities in the second phase, it is suggested that the component should set objectives and impacts by mid 2007 giving due attention to retaining only strategic and geographically focused actions. Similarly to the recommendation under KM, it would be important to clarify the roles, responsibilities and relations between CBSI/EE&A/KM. In addition to ensuring cost effectiveness of communications in the NBI, this process will also help strengthen the relations and linkages between these two SVPs.

It has become clear that the communication divide is undermining the originally proposed e-learning network and school networks. The LS should look at alternative ways to network beyond the internet; in doing so creativity and relevance are key and the LS may start by identifying commonalities among the schools, constraints to the establishment of the network and possible ways of overcoming these shortfalls. The assistance of the KM specialist/team may be necessary to identify networking tools. Should this prove to be too difficult to overcome, the network may be dropped from the component.

The ultimate aim of this component being a change in attitude towards the Nile and its environment, in consequence the impacts of public awareness and understanding of Nile transboundary environmental issues needs to be assessed. While awareness and education will remain key after the end of the project, sustaining it might require a mix of options including through the adoption of activities at national levels and through regional NGOs – e.g. NBDF. It is also recommended that. and that there is a need to concentrate on the delivery of an environmental education curriculum/course outline for schools; environment education materials need to be shared among countries through the NPCs; and, NTEAP work plans should include specific outputs for collaboration with specific SAP and SVP projects.

e) Transboundary Water Quality Monitoring & Awareness

Overall progress. The components aims at heightening the awareness for water quality protection, identify major future common or shared/cross-border threats, and needs for cooperation. It is supporting a process for adapting same analytical methods for key water quality parameters in order to enable an assessment and cooperative planning of the basin's water quality in the future. In this view, the component is also strongly related to the SVP Water Resources Management Project, which is supporting the development of a basin-wide decision support system, including data exchange mechanisms.

The component is relevant to the NBI and the basin especially in its move to a permanent basin institution. Country level stakeholders, including the PSC members, TAC members, and working group members have voiced strong overall interest. Shortcomings are related to lack of adaptation by the project to respond to the needs that emerge within country consultations to the extent that a relatively small and experimental component for a basin this size can adapt to country needs. There also has been an overly one-dimensional focus on pushing for a trans-basin station network of scale, without first testing the willingness and sustainability of exchanging already regularly collected information.

Findings and recommendations carried over from 2006 aide memoire, joint midterm review mission and PSC meeting:

Messages from baseline reports. The July aid memoire had recommended that messages from the basin-wide and country reports be extracted in short form and publicized. These could be powerful messages to the Nile policy makers and should identify the three/four main messages from the basin-

wide and country studies that need to reach the NBI (Nile-SEC, TAC, COM) and the country decision makers on water quality issues on (i) basin-wide, (ii) sub-regional, (iii) country specific scale.

Concise strategy – still missing. The findings from baseline studies, working group meetings, upcoming SAP needs, and country level stakeholder interests should inform the lead specialist to adjust component activities to address imminent problems and serve NBI needs. Now that the components have been active for some time, greater ownership of activities across the NBI is urgent.

The 2005/06 PSC requested a short strategy note to clarify component objectives, steps to achieve them, outputs and outcomes in view of NBI/ Nile country needs. The supervision team reminded of this prior to the July 2006 supervision mission, during supervision mission, and prior to MTR mission. This would have been a constructive input to the MT evaluation and MTR mission. Only at the 2006/07 PSC a strategy was presented, which focused on the establishment of a transboundary monitoring network and requested additional funds for a substantial number of transboundary stations. It is recommended that the NTEAP proactively **adapts the component strategy to respond to findings so far (see above) as well as to emerging SAP and NBI needs.** A revised comprehensive strategy note in form and substance similar to the PIP should be circulated to the PSC and observers by midyear.

Partnerships with obvious other regional players (LVEMP, UNEP GEMS, FAO Kagera) are to be explored and followed up on beyond visits in each others offices. This would aid in providing a consistent and synergistic framework for the NTEAP component activity. Some steps have been taken, but more evident collaboration needs to be seen. Specifically, clear collaboration and agreements on building on LVEMP 1 and formal interaction with LVEMP 2 will have to be sought by the time of LVEMP 2 start-up. Both NTEAP and LVEMP are important and Nile relevant efforts that also receive substantial funding from the GEF. Synergies have to be demonstrated and agreements on efficient coordination is required.

Link with other SVP projects it is absolutely crucial that this component links with the WRPMP DSS and water policy components as well as with the EWAP project in introducing water quality considerations in the best practices and guidelines planned for.

Link with other project components still weak. Supervision missions have repeatedly recommended stronger linkage and seeking opportunities for synergies with the Environmental Education and Microgrants components. The MTR mission verified that stakeholders within and outside the project support such an approach. Results so far have been limited, while there is some attempt in the 07 work plan to work with community groups and schools, a real integration with the other components is not obvious.

Sustainability. Field based methods, e.g. including the development of bio-indicators and system to relate to WQ, are one way to leave behind skills that even often under-funded national WQ labs, district officers, as well as civil society groups can embark on without much associated costs. It is also an excellent way of rolling out such methods in collaboration with the EE&A and microgrants component. Yet, methods that need to be still adapted to the Nile countries/environmental conditions should be piloted first in one country with good analytical capacity for water quality to provide the necessary back-up for method development. Only then, it is recommended to expand such pilot activities to other countries.

Protocols. The joint midterm review mission strongly recommends rethinking engagement on transboundary pollution protocols in the present project. Working with the SVP WRPMP project on an annex on water quality within the planned data sharing mechanism (to be developed by the SVP WRM project) is a well thought out shift in focus in that regard.

At the PSC meeting, the Water Quality LS was requested to revise his work plan with greater emphasis on consolidating and using results from previous work; greater emphasis on deliverables especially with relation to SAPs and/or other NTEAP project components; and better linkage to country systems and agency staff. All activities should show clear objectives, timeline, and deliverables; this also includes all training and workshops. For the latter, comments from PSC members on mode of delivering training should have been considered, e.g. by whom and for whom; location; content; and link to identified needs

and gaps. Disseminating manuals through basin-wide workshops as planned is less likely to succeed. The current revised work plan still lags the desired major shift to output orientation and progress of the component should be tightly observed.

Recommendations:

It should be noted, that feedback from country visits differentiate between feedback on the component itself and feedback on the approaches taken by the Lead Specialist.

- An updated component implementation strategy should be formulated and circulated by mid-year. This should in format similar to the PIP and update the PIP strategy. A focus on deliverables is needed and a reasonable budget reallocation with the sub-component budget should be suggested.
- Suggested collaborations with the SAPs have been incorporated in the component work plan, yet with very small budget allocations; furthermore, progress has been slow. Implementation of at least one of the planned collaborative actions should be initiated by mid-year.
- The component work-plan and its achievements will be reviewed at the next joint supervision mission. Adjustments may have to be requested and circulated to PSC to assure desired outputs by the end of the year.
- Based on a revised strategy, PSC inputs, and performance, decisions need to be made on component implementation, continuation, and location. The option to build on synergies with the WRM project should be explored by the NBI during the SVP review exercise. This may include transfer of component activities to the SVP WRM PMU by end of 2007 and until the remainder of the project, in case the PSC and SVP review will largely call for SAP and technical output focused activities. If, on the other hand, activities are decided to awareness raising, wetlands, and community engagement location at NTEAP should remain.

f) Wetlands and Biodiversity

The PIP saw this component as improving the understanding of wetlands function in sustainable development and improving management at selected transboundary wetlands sites. The ultimate aim of the component is the sustainability of wetlands.

Work on this outcome component had only just started at the time of the MTR which noted that its implementation should benefit from the experience gained by NTEAP over the past two years. It advised that NTEAP should work with SAPs and accept specific recommendations which should be treated as priority actions.

The work planned for the Second Phase covers all three sub-components under which four outputs are targeted, namely, a wetlands network will be established, ecological and economic studies on wetlands role. The immediate outcome of the Wetlands Component is to enhance cooperation and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity. This outcome aims at improving the understanding of wetlands function in sustainable development will be undertaken, wetlands education, training and awareness programmes will be implemented, and pilot initiatives in management planning, and inventories will be carried out.

The phase-out from the Second Phase into the permanent institution that will take over from the transitional mechanism of the NBI should include regional dialogue focused on the future management of the Basin's globally significant wetlands and ecosystems.

The Wetlands component of the NTEAP should seek close collaboration with national initiatives improving wetlands management at selected transboundary sites. The activities are designed to build on nationally focused wetland and biodiversity conservation and management initiatives in the Nile Basin, using networks of existing centers of knowledge and experiences to provide a transboundary overlay to

complement them and will strive specifically at identifying and proposing measures for the conservation of key wetland sites. The Component has three sub-components namely: Enhancement of regional cooperation and capabilities; Better understanding and broader awareness of the role of Wetlands in supporting sustainable development; and, More effective management of wetlands and transboundary protected areas.

The first sub-component establishes the regional wetlands working group through which collaboration will be the aim. The second sub-component deals with the advancement of knowledge on wetlands and biodiversity and making the information available for management purposes. This will be done through a mixture of research and gathering of baseline information throughout the region at national level using national experts. Acting on the advice of the MTR, the component has developed a plan of action to share data with NELSAP, ENSAP and LVBC.

The third sub-component comprises two main thrusts - wetlands education, awareness and training; and pilot initiatives in practical wetlands management. As part of the practical work, environmental flow assessments will be carried out in selected wetland areas where management plans will also be prepared. The work will include a rapid assessment of wetland fauna, flora and socio-economic aspects. Transboundary management plans will be prepared according to guidelines provided under the Ramsar and the Biodiversity conventions. Sites that have been identified include the Sudd, Dinder Aletash, Sio Malaba, Cyohoha, and Kaya-Koboko. In addition, an inventory of wetlands in the Basin will be carried out using a GIS platform. Wetlands will be mapped and categorized and their size will be determined. The criteria for classification will be determined regionally so that a harmonized approach will be applied for the development of the Regional Wetlands Map. The principles of IWRM will be applied both at the level of key wetland sites (*i.e.* balancing conservation and sustainable use) and at the level of the Basin in a way that the hydrological model and DSS being developed by the WRPMP, will enable the identification of necessary policy reforms and other measures to secure minimum environmental flows into for the wetlands. Maintaining wetland regulating – *i.e.* for flood control – and provisioning functions – *e.g.* fodder and fish – will also be given due consideration in raising recommendations for investment and development options in the basin. In that sense finally, this component should seek linkages with the SDBS, CBSI, WRPMP as well as with ENSAP and NELSAP.

g) National Activities

The concept of including national eligible project (NEPs) was seen as attractive by the PSC and initially met no objection from UNDP and the World Bank as a way of speeding up delivery and further engaging national actors. However, NEP execution has proven extremely problematic and provided little real value added to either the Project or the member countries. One major lesson for the SVP should be that such changes in project set-up need more careful assessment of implementation arrangements prior to approval by PSCs and subsequent no objection from implementing the agency(ies).

After careful review of the NTEAP NEPs, the agencies have the following recommendations to the NBI:

1. NEPs that have already been approved should be completed with the following exceptions:
 - a. *Burundi*: It has been noted that that significant mistakes were made with regards to disbursement under all three Burundi NEPs; therefore, those projects should be suspended pending the outcome of an audit of each grant. The issues of concern include the apparent conflict of interest due to three members of the selection panel being directly involved with beneficiary organizations; the fact that payments are made directly to the government agencies under all three cases; and the large amounts of daily subsistence allowance (DSA) paid to two technicians under the Lake Rwihinda and Murehe Forest projects.
 - b. *Egypt*: Unfortunately, in the case of the two Egyptian projects, neither should have been approved to begin with based on the criteria established by NTEAP. Both the Reduction in Thermal Pollution in Kom Umbo and the Pilot Sanitation System in Menia NEPs

involve works, which is not allowed under the grant agreements between the NBI and the Bank governing NTEAP. Additionally, the Reduction in Thermal Pollution in Kom Umbo NEP, valued at US\$63,000, exceeds the NEP limit of US\$55,000. Therefore, both NEPs should be cancelled immediately.

- c. *Kenya*: It has been noted that each of the two Kenya NEP agreements state that funds will be provided directly to an individual, namely the District Officer for the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). Only one of the two NEPs, the Education in the Nzoia River Basin, has disbursed any funds to date. Prior to resuming activities, NTEAP should amend the implementation modalities for the two NEPs to clearly spell out proper disbursement procedures to ensure that no future disbursements go through government employees or other individuals.
2. While the agencies acknowledge the views expressed by the PSC at the February 2007 meeting about the importance of continuing the NEP initiative in order to ensure NTEAP achieves results on the ground in each of the NBI countries, neither UNDP nor the Bank can endorse further expenditure without the development and formal review of selection criteria and implementation mechanisms. It should be noted that NBI countries can still approach NTEAP for similar activities either through the micro-grants program or individual component activities at the national level.

IV. Project Management Issues

The Mid-term Review mission reviewed the overall project management of NTEAP, which is executed by the NBI and funded by the grants from the GEF through grants from both UNDP and the World Bank as well as a grant from the World Bank managed multi-donor Nile Basin Trust Fund (NBTF). Given the complex nature of NTEAP's management structure, as with all of the SVP Projects, the mission reviewed the management responsibilities and reporting structure at the regional, national, and local levels.

The NTEAP Regional Project Manager (RPM) finds himself in the midst of a complex management structure involving national staff in nine countries and multiple reporting levels for the Project and NBI as a whole. Table 2, below, provides summaries of relationships amongst NTEAP key actors - brief summaries of their roles and responsibilities with regards to the NTEAP Project follow:

- **Nile Council of Ministers of Water (Nile-COM)** – The Nile-COM is responsible for the overall governance of the NBI. Nile-COM sets priorities for all of the NBI Programs, including the SVP. Nile-COM is the direct link between the NBI and its member governments.
- **Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-TAC)** – The Nile-TAC assists the Nile-COM in oversight of the NBI. The individual Nile-TAC members are also the heads of the national NBI Offices, which are responsible for coordinating NBI activities at the national level.
- **Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat** – The NBI Secretariat is the administrative arm of the Nile-COM and is responsible for direct supervision and oversight of NTEAP. The Secretariat supervises UNOPS in the delivery of project services. NBI Secretariat also ensures coordination among NBI projects and activities at all levels.
- **Subsidiary Action Programs (SAPs)** – The Eastern Nile Subsidiary Action Program (ENSAP) and the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP) are responsible for identifying and preparing sub-regional investment projects. They are managed by the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) and the NELSAP Coordination Unit (NELSAP-CU).
- **United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)** – UNOPS has been contracted by the NBI to provide project services for the SVP Projects. UNOPS reports directly to the NBI Secretariat. UNOPS supervises the NTEAP RPM on matters of financial management and procurement and is responsible for ensuring the project prepares quarterly financial management

reports (FMRs) acceptable to the World Bank. UNOPS also directly executes the UNDP/GEF funds in close consultation with the NBI.

- **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** – The PSC is responsible for reviewing and approving NTEAP annual reports, work plans, and budgets. The PSC reports to the Nile COM for the setting of NBI priorities and liaises directly with the Nile-TAC and the NBI Secretariat. The National PSC members also act as hosts (within the national environment agencies) to the NTEAP NPCs.
- **NTEAP Regional Project Manager (NTEAP RPM)** – The NTEAP RPM represents the overall project management function. He reports to the PSC for work plan and budget approval and strategic guidance. He is responsible to the NBI (via the NBI Secretariat) for delivering the substance of the project based on the priorities set by the Nile-COM. He and his staff hold UNOPS contracts and UNOPS provides direct supervision for financial management and procurement issues. The RPM is also the key focal point for UNDP and the World Bank in their supervision of NTEAP. The NTEAP RPM is responsible for supervision of all NTEAP Staff, both at the PMU and National levels.
- **Project Management Unit (PMU) Lead Specialists (LS)** – there are four lead specialists posted to the PMU for Monitoring and Evaluation, Micro-grants, Environmental Education and Awareness, and Water Quality. They are responsible for carrying out the NTEAP results framework and delivery of project results at three levels – basin-wide, sub-regional, and national. PMU LS report directly to the RPM and liaise with the NPCs, and NTEAP Admin Staff.
- **National Project Coordinators (NPCs)** – the NPCs are the country face of NTEAP – each is posted to the national environment authority in the NBI Countries. They coordinate NTEAP' programs, both those originating at the PMU and specific national activities. They also provide support to the Nile-TAC and PSC members as necessary. They report directly to the RPM and liaise with the NMCs, PMU LS, and NTEAP Admin Staff.
- **National Microgrant Coordinators (NMCs)** - the microgrants coordinators are responsible for oversight of the microgrants program in each of the NBI Countries. They are hosted by a national NGO and are based in the Nile Basin (for those countries where the Capitol is outside the basin). They report to the RPM through the Microgrants LS and liaise with NPCs, other PMU LS, and NTEAP Admin Staff.
- **Nile Basin Trust Fund Committee (NBTF-C)** – the NBTF partially finances NTEAP and, as such, the NBTF-C is responsible for overall oversight and ensuring that the project focuses and delivers activities in keeping with the NBI's priorities. UNDP sits as an observer on the NBTF-C as a co-financer of NTEAP.
- **UNDP** - UNDP, as manager off the UNDP GEF Grant, provides project supervision and fiduciary oversight to NTEAP along with the World Bank.
- **World Bank** – the World Bank, as manager of the NBTF and the World Bank GEF Grant, provides project supervision and fiduciary oversight to NTEAP along with UNDP.

Recommendations for more efficient project management - The very nature of a multi-country, cross-cutting, “process oriented” project like NTEAP only adds to the overall complexities inherent with the multi-level management structure herein described. It is vital that all parties clearly understand their own roles and attempt to keep their interventions to the appropriate level. Clear and concise communications must flow in all directions. The mission identified a few key areas that both NBI and NTEAP Management should address to ensure the efficiency of project deliver. These include:

- **Setting clear priorities and strategies** – Both the senior project staff and management at the NBI Secretariat have clear views on the overall priorities and strategies that NTEAP should be following to meet its development objectives.

Table 2 – Relationships of Key NTEAP Actors

| Actor | Direct Supervision | Direct Report to | Liaise with | MTR Comments |
|-----------------|--|---|--|--|
| Nile-COM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ SAPs ▲ PSC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBI Governments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBTF-C | |
| Nile-TAC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NPCs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-COM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBTF-C ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ World Bank ▲ UNDP ▲ PSC ▲ NTEAP RPM | Regular formal communication with RPM required re: NPC work plans/priorities. |
| NBI Secretariat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM ▲ UNOPS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-COM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ SAPs ▲ NBTF-C ▲ World Bank ▲ UNDP ▲ PSC ▲ Admin Staff | Regular schedule of formal face to face meetings with RPM needed. |
| SAPs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ SAP LS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-COM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ NBTF-C ▲ World Bank ▲ NTEAP RPM | Regular formal communication with RPM required re: SAP LS work plans/priorities. |
| UNOPS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ UNDP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ World Bank | Involve RPM fully in all budgetary reports and decisions. |
| PSC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-COM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NBI Secretariat | |
| NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ PMU LS ▲ NPCs ▲ NMCs ▲ Admin Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ PSC ▲ UNOPS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ SAPs ▲ UNDP ▲ World Bank | RPM is pulled in several directions, particularly wrt reporting. |
| PMU LS | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ SAP LS ▲ NPCs ▲ NMCs ▲ Admin Staff | |
| NPCs | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ PMU LS ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NMCs ▲ Admin Staff | |
| NMCs | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Microgrant LS ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ PMU LS ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NPCs ▲ Admin Staff | |
| Admin Staff | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NTEAP RPM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ PMU LS ▲ NPCs ▲ NMCs ▲ NBI Secretariat | |
| NBTF-C | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ World Bank | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Development Partner Governments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-COM ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ SAPs | |
| UNDP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ UNOPS | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ SAPs ▲ World Bank ▲ NBTF-C | |
| World Bank | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ NBTF-C | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Nile-TAC ▲ NBI Secretariat ▲ SAPs ▲ UNDP ▲ UNOPS | |

- **Strategic Supervision** – Both the NBI Secretariat and NTEAP RPM need to work together to develop modalities for providing strategic supervision of project activities and staff commiserate with the complex nature of the project.
- **Provision of project services** – While UNOPS delivery of project services to the overall SVP has improved significantly in the past year, with their re-location to Nairobi, NTEAP has suffered delays in program delivery due to UNOPS management. Due to the fact that UNOPS was unable to produce acceptable financial monitoring reports (FMRs) until late 2006, the NBI Secretariat, NTEAP RPM, the World Bank, and UNDP have had difficulties obtaining an accurate view of project expenditure rates. The situation is improving; however, requires close monitoring from all involved, particularly the NBI Secretariat. The mission recommended that the NBI Secretariat continue to push UNOPS to ensure that the NTEAP PMU, as with all other PMU's, be equipped and trained to prepare and deliver FMRs for their respective projects, as has been recommended by the Bank on numerous occasions since project launch.
- **Use the Subsidiarity Principle** – Actors should be empowered to make decisions, based on clear priorities, at the lowest possible level. For example, NPCs each work in very different environments so a one size fits nine approach is not the best strategy for efficient project delivery. NPCs should be given the authority to decide how best to implement NTEAP priorities at the national level. In turn, they should communicate actively with senior project staff in order to ensure priorities are being met.

b) Disbursement

After some initial start-up delays, NTEAP reached mid-term on track for delivering the project, with the proposed one year extension for some components being tentatively agreed to by the World Bank and UNDP, pending confirmation of the availability of the second phase UNDP GEF funds.

As of June 30, 2007, the three active NTEAP grant's have disbursed as follows:

- ▲ UNDP GEF: US\$8.8 million out of the total US\$8.8 million grant.
- ▲ World Bank GEF: US\$3.1 million out of the total US\$4.8 million grant.
- ▲ NBTF: US\$4.7 million out of the total US\$8.9 million grant.

The proposal for the second phase UNDP GEF Grant of US\$7.0 million is currently being reviewed by the GEF Secretariat and a final decision is expected by the fall of 2007. Full disbursement tables are attached as Annex 4.

c) Procurement

The Bank has carried out a procurement post review of the project, the final report will be issued separately. In general, the review found that the project is following Bank guidelines; however, the procurement filing system should be improved to ensure that all NTEAP contracts (even those issued by UNOPS directly or other SVP PMUs) are filed at the PMU in Khartoum. UNDP and the Bank also recommend that the project (with support by UNOPS) considers hiring a consultant to aid the project in reviewing all expenditure allocations and assure allocation to correct budget lines from start-up to midterm. This is based on repeated staff reports on difficulties to understand budget reports and track expenditures as provided to them. The new FMR format is expected to improve this in future.

V. Phase II of the GEF Project

In the spirit of adaptive and results based management, the submission for phase 2 gives the project an opportunity to rethink its approach, mainly based on (i) the results of the mid-term evaluation; (ii) the changes in the GEF IW focal area strategy and (iii) the changes in the context of the NBI. Given its relevance to and support from the riparians, it is recommended that NTEAP maintains the original development objective designed and agreed by the 9 riparians, namely, “*to create more effective Basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the Transboundary Environmental Analysis.*” However, for the Second Phase, it is suggested that the project focuses on the following:

To protect critical Nile Basin ecosystems from transboundary threats through the provision of a strategic environmental framework and the engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM)

All project components also remain relevant, their main thrust in this second phase should be oriented towards: (i) identifying, documenting and communicating impacts, best practices and lessons learnt; (ii) laying the grounds for the conservation of key wetlands in the Basin and (iii) paving the way towards the proposed permanent institution.

Key issues to be addressed in maintaining relevance to the GEF focal area strategy include:

Cooperative work on the Nile, as fostered by the Nile Basin Initiative, corresponds to both of the Strategic Objectives of the IW focal area strategy for GEF-4: Strategic Objective 1: *To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority transboundary water concerns through more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approaches to management*, and Strategic Objective 2: *To play a catalytic role in addressing transboundary water concerns by assisting countries to utilize the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed.*

The scope of the project should continue to span the entire Nile Basin and activities continue to target multicountry, national interministerial, and subnational/community levels. The new focal area strategy addresses the identified global concern of overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in the globally significant; to remain relevant to GEF funding in phase 2, the project should work on enhancing its integration within the broader SVP project and be more proactive in feeding information and linking with the WRPMP.

The GEF IW focal area strategy for GEF 4 supports the adoption and implementation of IWRM as advocated by the global community through the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation and this is expected to lead to improved water security for communities, reduce conflicts among states, improve ecological flows in basins, and enhanced resilience to fluctuating climatic regimes. In its second phase, NTEAP needs to highlight the role it plays and linkages it helps create in this respect. Other indicators identified for SP 3 which should be targeted by the project include the setting up of national inter-ministry committees, ministerially-agreed action programmes and contribution to the adoption of national water resource and IWRM reforms/policies with evaluations to show their effectiveness.

Similarly NTEAP's contribution to policy reform with a focus on wetlands sustainability should be pursued and its contribution towards regional/basin agreements and ensuring environment functions are instituted within the permanent Nile Basin institution increased.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

UNDP and the Bank are pleased to note the significant progress towards meeting NTEAP's development objectives made to date. After careful review of the independent mid-term review and project progress to date, the agencies' findings include the following:

- Between now and project close, NTEAP should focus on advancing the development of the Strategic Environmental Framework (SEF) for the Nile Countries. Specifically, NTEAP should identify what key environmental functions a permanent institution should undertake, as well as support up-streaming environmental considerations in investment planning at the SAP level.
- Development of a clear exit strategy so that any activities being carried out by NTEAP that do not fall under an RBO's mandate are either phased out or taken up by the riparian countries. The Bank strongly recommends that the process to define and agree on the environment functions of a permanent Nile basin institution should be a focus during the remainder of the project. This should be translated into a format of a draft proposal outlining such functions and their implementation (including staffing and budget) integrated within an anticipated framework of a future permanent institution.
- The project has been successful in creating a move towards a more integrated view of the basin's resources. To realize the SEF and support the NBI institution, the project needs to increase its engagement with policy makers to advance a process and common view on the benefits and concrete steps for greater collaboration on environment and natural resources among the basin countries. It is also timely for a greater visibility of the NBI environment and sustainability agenda in other African regional fora such as NEPAD, the EAC, AMCEN, and others with which the NBI is presently collaborating.
- Clearer goals and a concise strategy to achieve these within the remaining time of the second half of the projects should be defined for the "Knowledge Management (KM)" function, for the "Environmental Education and Awareness (EE&A)" and the "Transboundary Water Quality" components.
 - The KM function needs to support all project components in analyzing and documenting lessons learned and dissemination of findings.
 - The EE&A component has successfully contributed to awareness raising on the NBI across the basin countries through piloting approaches in school settings, public media, and public events as well as universities; the remainder of the project now needs to take stock on successful avenues to disseminate and mainstream the use of materials developed, and aim at greater focus of activities and enhanced collaboration with the SAPs and other SVP projects.
 - The component has been slow in revising its work plans to emerging needs and opportunities. The Transboundary Water Quality component should clearly articulate activities based on its findings so far and demonstrate the exchange of information from existing country based stations prior to an expansion of a network. A final implementation strategy is long overdue and the current draft recommended to be revised to clearly reflect specific deliverables in line with the time frame of the project.
- Monitoring and Evaluations and documentation of outcomes has to be improved to ensure results are documented and accessible to NBI stakeholders, best practices and lessons are identified and shared among countries, and impacts of project supported interventions are captured. This includes the otherwise successful Nile Microgrants component.
- The second half of the project should aim for a greater focus of project activities based on an analysis of achievements and impacts, as well as gaps that have not been sufficiently addressed. Enhanced linkage across components and with the SAPs should be demonstrated. It is noted that this year's work plan includes a greater emphasis on SAP collaboration, as for example demonstrated in the plans of the recently initiated wetlands component.
- The proposal to continue with National Eligible Projects (NEPs) must be carefully considered by the NBI as NEP selection and implementation has been problematic in many countries and

requires significant time commitments of the project staff. It is suggested to rely on implementation through regular project component implementation mechanisms for delivery of country based activities (e.g. direct implementation by staff, sub-contracts to other entities, and Nile microgrants).

- A decision on the proposed extension of the NTEAP Grants beyond their initial closing date of September 2008 can only be made after it is clear whether or not the GEF Phase II funds will be made available. In looking at the trigger indicators, findings of the MTE and agencies' mission, the agencies find that the project has been adequately implemented, has fulfilled its trigger indicators therefore warranting the submission of the phase 2 funds from the GEF.
- The Bank will consider an extension of the NTEAP Grants for the continuation of activities that are critical for the planned RBO and future SAP investments. It is expected that some activities, for example the Water Quality component, will close as the current grant agreement.

Annex 4 NTEAP management response and IAs comments

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|---|---|--|--|
| Component 1: Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation - #s 1-8 | | | |
| 1 | <p>To address the frequently expressed concern by national authorities about the impact of its outputs, during the second phase, the project should put more resources into demonstration of the practical effects of its activities.</p> | <p>On ground activities such as Microgrants (MG), schools projects (SP) and national eligible projects (NEP) are included in the 2007 work plan and will continue in 2008.</p> | <p>In doing so, NTEAP should ensure that outputs are in keeping with the regional nature of the project and the GEF IW OP. NTEAP, like all SVP outputs should help attain the project's development objectives, support the establishment of a permanent Nile institution, and, whenever possible, facilitate ongoing or potential SAP investments.</p> <p>In approving further on ground activities, NTEAP should give special attention to the pilot nature – i.e. how will this activity help address transboundary threats and how will its impact be captured for future replication and upscaling. In monitoring previous ones attempts need to be made for the use of simple tools for monitoring such impacts. Spill-over and unintended effects of all NTEAP activities need also to be tracked and monitored as there is a lot of value in that e.g. interministerial national committee in Ethiopia and Rwanda; the debates triggered on national policy, the national level dividends of activities such as awareness and education benefiting both the national and basin levels.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Since the project has no agenda for periodic financial auditing, the project, in consultation with the UNOPS and the World Bank, should organize each year an independent financial audit.</p> | <p>UNOPS has prepared and circulated internal audit program for SVPs for 2007, including NTEAP.</p> | <p>UNOPS does conduct annual audits of NTEAP Grants, as required by the grant agreements. The agencies do not understand how the consultants came to this erroneous conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>Ad Hoc audits at the national level could also be conducted.</p> |
| 3 | <p>To ensure full success in improvement of environmental and natural resource information management the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Expand the scope of the Environmental Information Network; o Undertake a capacity needs assessment of the institute libraries to facilitate effectively targeted training; o Complete provision of equipment, training and network linking; and o Increase the knowledge base by preparing technical and environmental materials and identifying documents and manuals that may be needed by other project components. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The scope of the Environmental Practitioners Network is being expanded to increase the knowledge base. o Due to budgetary constraints these recommendations will not be implemented by the project o The project will continue to improve and increase the production of awareness and out reach materials | <p>These actions should only be undertaken with clear guidance from and in close coordination with the NBI Secretariat Knowledge Management Team to prevent any duplication of efforts and to ensure sustainable coordination through a permanent river basin organization. The agencies concur with the project that no additional budget should be here allocated.</p> |
| 4 | <p>It is unclear what is meant by the term "Decision Support System" to be based on the RBM, who the decisions makers may be and what decisions are to be made using the model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It is recommended that the project clarify the scope of the model and identify the stakeholders to whom it is addressed. | <p>The scope of the model and stakeholders to whom is addressed will be defined in collaboration with the Water Resources SVP project as this out put is expected to be executed by the WRPM project</p> | <p>The consultant focused on NTEAP and did not spend adequate time with the WRPM Project, which is leading the DSS. WRPM has identified stakeholders and is working closely with them in the development of the model.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|---|---|--|--|
| 5 | <p>To demonstrate importance of environmental policy reforms, the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use its experience and incentives it possesses to encourage the countries to test, at first in a small scale, the social and economic utility of sound environmental policy, environmental policy reforms and enforcement of environmental laws; this demonstration may be achieved by translating the Nile basin protection policies into laws, by well orienting investment policies, by diversifying fiscal policies and enforcing taxation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desk Studies are planned in all NBI countries on the impact of Macro policies on the Nile environment. The supplement paper on "NTEAP's contribution to policy making" submitted by the MTR team is highly appreciated and has been circulated to relevant partners. Some of the suggestions provided in the paper have been incorporated in the planned macro-policy studies. | <p>NTEAP and in fact the broader SVP program has a variety of support and analytical capacities to provide technical assistance for policy reforms to countries. Yet, one should be cautious to not be overly ambitious in the project scope; 'testing economic utility of sound environmental policy' is likely beyond the time span of the current project; yet post-facto analysis of experience in a range of countries could be a valuable tool in NTEAP's and the NBI's basin-wide engagement on policy level. Furthermore, the project has already been requested to support the government of Sudan as a host of the 2008 Nile Basin Development Forum. This provides an excellent forum for the discussion of such studies and the impacts of macro-policies on Nile Environment. The discussions during NBDF 08 and its proceedings can serve to better target the work of the proposed permanent institution on national policies and their impacts on the basin's environment.</p> |
| 6 | <p>To support the Strategic Framework, more efforts must be made in further building of effective links and networks among institutions that are partners of NTEAP. The PMU will lead this effort:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Project Manager should propose the best approaches to building the networks; ○ NTEAP must integrate with the partner institutions (ministries of Education, Environment and Water) and other interested agencies; and ○ NPCs must develop networks at district and community levels to involve community leaders, district councilors and district officers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Networks and working groups related to components (EE&A, WQM, Wetlands) have already been established and functional. ○ NTEAP will exert efforts to ensure that its activities are integrated into the plans of line ministries. Counterpart staff for NPCs have been assigned in all environment agencies of NBI countries for better integration of NTEAP activities in host institutions ○ Project resources will not allow establishing more networks. However NPC are closely coordinating their work with relevant district level agencies and NGOs. | <p>The project has a unique position in itself and as a part of the broader SVP program to access high level policy makers across key development sectors of the NBI. Strategic use of these networks could be enhanced to ensure sustainability considerations have broad sectoral support in the future institution. Targeted support to the current sub-basin institutions to upstream sustainability considerations in sub-basin investment planning is an excellent start and is already undertaken. Sustainability will be the key to success for such networks; therefore, when developing networks, a clear plan for sustainable financing of activities is paramount.</p> |
| 7 | <p>In the past, both the PSC and the PMU have given too little attention to documenting the project's progress towards achievement of CAS goals and project development objectives. It is recommended that in the second half of the project's execution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The PSC and PMU monitor closely and quantitatively the project's progress towards achievement of the CAS goals and development objectives and adjust the work plan to ensure achievement of the project objectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Different M&E techniques will be used during 2007 to measure progress towards achieving project objectives based upon indicators agreed upon in the revised log frame. | <p>From reading the full report, it is not clear that the consultants understood the definition of Country Assistance Strategy – it is likely that they are discussing the PAD and UNDP Project Document here. With that in mind, it is agreed that NTEAP Staff, both at national and regional levels, should focus on delivering the projects development objectives as detailed in the project appraisal documents and updated through the NBI's new results based M&E framework.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|---|--|--|--|
| 8 | <p>Moreover, to ensure an accurate (M&E), it is recommended that the subcomponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Continues to monitor the project achievements through the established reporting system; o During the last semester of the project evaluate the social, environmental, financial and economic impact of the microgrants; and o Before the end of the project, repeats the baseline M&E study and evaluates the project induced changes in the beneficiary countries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o NTEAP will adopt the result based reporting system established by the NBI. o Social, environmental, financial and economic impact of the microgrants aspects will be integrated in the TOR of the final evaluation of the project. o Baseline studies on certain indicators will be repeated in 2008/9 | <p>Concur. NTEAP should accomplish these recommendations in close coordination with the NBI Secretariat's M&E Team. In the second phase of the project it is recommended that the NTEAP M&E lead specialist works closely with the different components and with the NBI M&E structures to better capture (i) the impacts of the different project components and their achievement and (ii) the contribution of NTEAP to the broader SVP.</p> |
| Component 2: Community-level Land, Forest and Water Conservation - #s 9-17 | | | |
| 9 | <p>In the first phase, most of the microgrants were implemented within individual countries and addressed community concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The NTEAP should address these deficiencies and increase the number of the transboundary projects. | <p>All projects addressing a common environmental problem are considered as transboundary. However the project will endeavor to have at least two cross border project in each country in 2007.</p> | <p>Agreed as a goal; however, care must be taken in identifying activities that are transboundary in nature – the SAPs and large NGOs might be able to help show-case eligible projects. The quota of 50 % for type 3 (transboundary activities) should be substituted for country or basin specific realistic targets and the definition of transboundary as proposed in the micro-grants manual adopted⁵; differentiating between cross-border and transboundary projects is of utmost importance. The proposed increase in microgrants ceiling would help to make these higher transaction costs/higher impact activities possible.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Very few microgrants addressing invasive water weeds are being implemented. It is recommended that NTEAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Finance more microgrants concerning invasive water weeds. | <p>There are three projects in three countries that are working in the areas of invasive water weeds. Countries will be encouraged to approve more projects on invasive water weeds.</p> | <p>The WB and UNDP team is cautious on top-down prescribing “problems & solutions to communities” and decreasing country specific flexibility. Community driven-ness should not be compromised. The underlying cause of why certain themes are not reflected in the community proposals is to be evaluated and could be addressed in ways other than prescription of themes. This is especially important since national level action plans and strategies for the micro-grants have been prepared through broad consultations and with input from different stakeholders. For the sake of national ownership it is important to maintain these as the guiding documents for the identification, selection and approval of micro-grants.</p> |

⁵ The following is definition of the term transboundary issue as reflected in the Micro-grant Regional Strategy developed in January 2005. Attached is the entire strategy document.

Interpreting and Applying the Transboundary Concept

26. Within the NTEAP, a *transboundary* issue is an environmental threat or challenge to sustainable development that is shared by at least two Nile Basin countries. The principal transboundary issues are identified in the TEA Report. All

Micro-grant-supported projects must address at least one transboundary issue and they must be physically located within the Nile Basin.

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|----|--|--|---|
| 11 | <p>NTEAP can cluster future microgrant activities into a few thematic groups targeted as Nile basin environmental threads, and allocate funds so as to equitably address all thematic groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that NTEAP allocate funds to all categories of important transboundary environmental problems identified in the preceding studies. | <p>Clustering of activities in few thematic areas will be revisited. Countries will be encouraged to review gaps and take action accordingly.</p> | <p>The MG lead specialist recommended to narrow (geographical) focus (see July aide memoire). It is not obvious that this has been followed up on the country level. Synergies between SVPs and SAPs, especially the preparation of fast track projects, provides an entry point to revise the current geographic & possibly thematic focus in some national and local action plans. Reporting on micro-grants at the national and regional levels can also be used as a tool to determine the main focus and thematic areas where additional projects can be identified.</p> |
| 12 | <p>There are hardly any implemented projects that serve the interest of marginalized groups or minorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that NTEAP encourages allocation of microgrants that address the needs of minority groups. | <p>Given the budget constraints and the pilot nature of the Microgrant activities the project can not spread itself thin to target and address the needs of all minority groups.</p> | <p>While this is a commendable goal that is indeed usually mandated for larger sector projects, it has to be kept in mind that a relatively <i>small, yet effective microgrants program should not be overloaded by rules and quotas for specific groups, themes, etc.</i> while trying to support the transboundary needs of nine countries. Furthermore, extending the program in remote areas violates earlier recommendations for focus. The project plans to pilot adopting SGP tools e.g. for illiterate groups via video proposals and other. (Note: women's participation is good and overall gender targets have been exceeded).</p> |
| 13 | <p>In the past, there has been no attempt to analyze the economic feasibility or returns of the implemented microgrant projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that NTEAP trains NGOs in financial and economic analysis of implemented microgrant projects. | <p>Training will be conducted for NGOs to analyze economic feasibility of micro-grant projects.</p> | <p>This seems to be most relevant and realistic for 'larger' interventions, i.e. if grant ceilings increase to 50 K. These larger microgrants (US\$25 – 50K) should be subject to a basic cost-benefit analysis; hence, modules for training NSCs, project staff, and NGOs needs to be developed to address this. This undertaking would seem reasonable had the micro-grants component been designed as a lasting endeavor. This aspect might be included in the identification of best-practices and possibly in the selection of initiatives for upscaling through the SAPs and replication at the national level (see below).</p> |
| 14 | <p>It is expected that from the microgrants program will emerge good practices on mitigation of transboundary environmental threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that NTEAP fosters emergence of good practice and use them as models for other microgrants; and ○ It may also request countries to give them academic and professional recognition as Nile-basin specific practices. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plans are underway to identify and document good practices for dissemination and possible replication in 2007. ○ Based on emerging good practices strategy will be developed to ensure academic and professional recognition as Nile-basin specific practices in 2008 | <p>Agreed. Now that around 179 projects are under implementation, it gives NTEAP the opportunity to (i) step back and assess if adequate variety, innovativeness as well as themes highlighted in the TEA/NAP or required for SAP piloting are addressed; (ii) draw lessons learned and disseminate experience by major themes across countries (also addresses TB nature of project); and (iii) evaluate impacts, which could range from physical to awareness to learning & innovation and the strengthening of CSO/NGOs and their practices in terms of project development and implementation.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|---|---|--|--|
| 15 | <p>Numerous stakeholders requested increasing the micro grant ceiling to US\$50,000 arguing justly that the present US\$25,000 ceiling too frequently limits the utility of the project to the community and management costs of a larger grant will not substantially increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that when justified, NTEAP considers the possibility of raising the micro grant ceiling to US\$50,000. It can be made compulsory to support the requests by economic and financial analysis. | <p>In light of the fact that over 60% of the Microgrants resources have already been committed and half of the project life time has elapsed this recommendation does not seem feasible.</p> | <p>The World Bank and UNDP support this idea based on (i) observed soundness of implementation mechanisms to handle this increase; (ii) decrease of number of projects, yet increase in impacts of a few larger, targeted projects, while maintaining a window for grants with lower ceilings to prevent the 'crowding out' of smaller NGOs and less experienced groups; (iii) possibility for strategic transboundary activities that often require some additional inputs to allow for transboundary exchanges & collaboration. It should be noted that an increase in the micro-grant ceiling will require NTEAP to develop clear environmental and social screening criteria to ensure all activities are fully in line with World Bank Safeguard Policies.</p> |
| 16 | <p>One of the reasons for slow implementation of the transboundary microgrants is lack of NGOs located in the provinces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that the NTEAP seeks to build capacity of the NGOs located outside capitals and urban centers and encourages them to help communities to formulate and manage the transboundary microgrant projects. | <p>Work is already underway in numerous rural areas for activities to build capacities of NGOs. However, the focus of the microgrants is based on the National Action Plans which dictate the geographical coverage of the activities.</p> | <p>This is a good goal and should be pursued; yet it needs to be weighed against pragmatic considerations especially in countries with large distances and only seasonal road access of many rural areas. The NTEAP approach to local MG programs in some of the countries where basin areas are remote appears adequate to reach out to areas outside of capitals; this is building on the successful COMPACT and other SGP models.</p> |
| Component 3: Environmental Education and Awareness (EE&A) - #s 17-20 | | | |
| 17 | <p>To increase impact of public information and awareness campaigns, the MTR recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revitalize the Regional Journalists' Network and propose them specific objectives and targets; ○ Provide training on Nile basin environmental issues; journalists should contribute to training program design to ensure it is properly directed; ○ Provide funds for journalists to cover NTEAP activities, such as World Environment Day; ○ NPCs and Local Microgrant Coordinators need to establish networks of environment activists and organizations at the community level; the PMU should assign a specific budget for networking; and ○ EE&A working group members should become more involved in M&E of schools environmental programs so that they can contribute more effectively to their design improvement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ During the 2nd phase of the project NTEAP will assist the Journalist Network to update its objectives taking into account sustainability options and the project remaining life time. Provision of Information will be done through the website and funds will be allocated for activities for journalists to cover events. ○ Due to budgetary constraints, available networks will be used to cover all events both at national and district level. ○ M&E funds have been allocated within FY07 budget to facilitate working group members where appropriate. | <p>Agreed, with the exception of providing financing to journalist for reporting on project events. The agencies do not condone the use of project funds to pay for media coverage. While it is understood that this is common practice in many countries, it blurs the line between ethical journalism and advertisement without giving NTEAP editorial control. Support to the network and for training of regional journalists in Nile environment issues is the cleaner course of action.</p> <p>In revitalizing the regional journalist network, NTEAP should try to identify the reasons why it has not been as active as expected. These causes need to be taken on board while giving proper considerations to the potential conflicts of interest flagged above. Also given that the Confidence Building and Stakeholder Involvement project of the SVP is now up and running, close coordination with this project is necessary to ensure complementarity and avoid overlaps. It is therefore recommended that the NTEAP's media-related activities focus on the environment issues and threats.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|--|---|---|---|
| 18 | <p>The school networking should be thoroughly reconsidered, namely the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Define a clear objective for the schools environmental programs; o Increase the number of schools projects and expand the eligibility criteria to encompass primary, secondary and vocational schools and schools outside the e-learning program; o Organize schools awards competitions on an annual basis and exploit their awareness potential; o Link microgrant projects to schools where possible to build awareness; and o Establish a budget for district and community linkages and ensure formal agreements between NTEAP and the schools involved in the program. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The objectives will be sharpened further. o Due to budgetary constraints no more schools will be added. The component will consolidate the 10 schools currently participating in the program and come up with a replicable model. o It has been transformed into an annual event o Encourage NGOs to apply MG funds for schools. This has been piloted in Tanzania and will be expanded to other countries in 2007 and 2008. o Formal agreements will be established with Schools. School projects has community linkages within it, however there is no budget for district linkages | <p>Concur that the networking should be thoroughly reconsidered; however, in doing so the option of cancellation should also be included. As has been stated earlier, in continuing activities like school networking, NTEAP should ensure that outputs are in keeping with the regional nature of the project and the GEF IW OP in order to attain the project's development objectives and support the establishment of a permanent Nile institution.</p> |
| 19 | <p>Concerning the universities and research institutions, the EE&A Lead Specialist should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o With support from NPCs and EE&A working groups propose the universities program objectives; o Ensure formal linkages between NTEAP and top level administration in the universities involved in the exchange and lecturers' Network programs; and o Expand the scope of the Lecturers' Network introducing: (i) an exchange among lecturers of their biographies outlining research and teaching interests; (ii) a program of exchange between lecturers to facilitate developing joint research and extension projects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o During the 2nd phase of the project NTEAP will assist the Network to up date its objectives taking into account sustainability options and the project remaining life time. o Workshops and meetings have been planned in 2007 to both involve the administration and enhance assimilation of the courses o Modalities will be discussed in 2007 and implemented in 2008. | <p>As with school networks, the agencies concur that the networking should be thoroughly reconsidered; however, in doing so the option of cancellation should also be included. If after three year's into the project's implementation the network and activities have not picked up, it would not be expected to leverage strong mileage within tow years. As has been stated earlier, in continuing activities like school networking, NTEAP should ensure that outputs are in keeping with the regional nature of the project and the GEF IW OP in order to attain the project's development objectives and support the establishment of a permanent Nile institution. Furthermore, the Applied Training Project of the SVP is working along the same lines of this component although with a broader mandate linked to IWRM. All efforts should be undertaken for stronger coordination and re-focusing the activities towards environmental considerations and threats in the Nile Basin.</p> |
| Component 4: Wetland and Biodiversity Conservation - # 20 | | | |
| 20 | <p>To avoid the past ambiguities around the working groups and network activities the MTR recommends that the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Obtain official consent of institutions whose employees participate in working groups and networks; o Ensure that the work plan of the work groups or networks correspond to the work plan of the institutions involved; o Prior to start any training, carry out a training needs assessment for the group members; and o Clearly state goals and tasks of the component and the component's working groups. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Official consent will be obtained prior to the establishment of working group and networks. o Harmonize national work plan with that of NTEAP o Training needs assessment will be carried out during the 1st regional workshop. o Concept stating the roles and goals of the component working group and their contribution to outcomes of the component is being developed. | <p>Concur; however, given the short time remaining, NTEAP should focus on strategic issues for Component 4 in keeping with the needs of a permanent RBO.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|--|---|--|--|
| Component 5: The Basin-wide Water Quality Monitoring - #s 21-24 | | | |
| 21 | <p>To clarify the objectives and precise a work plan the component Lead Specialists and the work group members should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decide about the content of the final outputs of the component and propose an agenda to achieve them by the end of the project and present them to the PSC for approval. | <p>A Draft WQ Component Strategy has been prepared and presented to the 4th PSC meeting. Comments will be incorporated and the strategy will be finalized in early 2007.</p> | <p>Agreed. An updated component implementation strategy should be formulated and circulated by mid-year. This should be done in a format similar to the PIP and update the PIP strategy. A focus on realistic and timely deliverables is needed and a reasonable budget reallocation with the sub-component budget should be suggested.</p> |
| 22 | <p>The project should take steps to enhance ownership of the component by WQWG and by the institutions they represent. To this effect, the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarify roles and responsibilities of the WQWG and establish linkage among the WQWG, the institutions with which they work and the project; ○ Identify tools and mechanisms to support the WQWG members in their duties; and ○ Involve the WQWG in activity planning and decision making for group activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The TORs for the WQWG was prepared, discussed and agreed on ○ WQWG members have reviewed the WQ Component W/plan for 2007 to enhance/ensure integration of NTEAP activities in their national plans. Final approved plans have been circulated. ○ Due to budgetary constraints no funds will be allocated to support the WQWG, however letters of commendation will be issued to WQWG annually, with copies to the Heads of their institutions. Moreover the work of the WQWG members will be recognized in our newsletters and website. | <p>Agreed. A greater emphasis on deliverables with relevant impact to advance SAP investments and/or other NTEAP project components; as well as better linkage to country systems and agency staff should be shown this year.</p> |
| 23 | <p>To increase capacities of persons involved in water quality monitoring the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tailor training programs to address the specific needs of participants ○ Utilize capabilities from national institutions within the NBI countries to conduct training and share experiences. | <p>Due to budgetary constraints these recommendations will not be addressed.</p> | <p>Agreed. A greater emphasis on deliverables with relevant impact to advance SAP investments and/or other NTEAP project components; as well as better linkage to country systems and agency staff should be shown this year.</p> |
| 24 | <p>The component needs to widen its circle of influence and become more visible. This would require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improving the quality of its products and widening the range of its distribution; and ○ Raising awareness of decision makers and other target groups about transboundary water quality issues. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documents will be translated and sent to more stakeholders. Printing and translation and dissemination of materials are planned in 2007. ○ Water quality documentations will be summarized and key issues published in 2007. A regional workshop to discuss transboundary issues by the WQWG will be conducted in 2007. | <p>While the component has few resources, it is well placed to create basin-wide policy dialogue. It has started to analyze issues (or lack thereof) in terms of transboundary threats as well as pointing out common threats in various basin countries. Greater efforts need to be taken to identify and broadcast pertinent findings from studies and to translate these into policy recommendations on country or basin level.</p> |
| Project Management - #s 25-27 | | | |
| 25 | <p>To improve the overload problem faced by the project staff on administrative and technical activities the PMU should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organize an evaluation of the workload of the project staff expressed in person/days per task and propose adjustments. | <p>The project has adopted strategy to recruit assistants for NPCs whenever there high work load. Moreover, the project performance over the past years indicates that a detailed workload assessment of staff may not be warranted.</p> | <p>Concur with the recommendation to evaluate current staff workloads, particularly those of the NPCs. However, the agencies do not view staff overload as a problem for NTEAP.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|--|--|--|--|
| 26 | <p>To increase initiative of the field staff and the members of the working groups and provide them cleared guidelines, the PMU should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Allocate more time for communication and technical information exchange between the PMU lead specialists and the field personnel, and between the lead specialists and the working group members. | <p>The RPM and Lead Specialists are in constant communications with the field personnel and working group members. Reports and information are also exchanged. However more efforts will be exerted to enhance communication and exchange of information.</p> | <p>Concur.</p> |
| 27 | <p>To ensure smooth financial management in some country offices, it is recommended to the Finance and Procurement Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To identify the origin of the current finance management difficulties, propose solutions and consult on the proposals with UNOPS and NBI Secretariat. The PMU should give this recommendation a high priority. | <p><i>NTEAP Management made no comments.</i></p> | <p>Concur. The smooth and efficient flow of funds at the country level continues to be a major issue facing all of the SVP Projects. While it should be noted that the NBI Secretariat and UNOPS have made some improvements, the issue requires continued close supervision until it is fully resolved.</p> |
| Challenges and Emerging Issues - #s 28-35 | | | |
| 28 | <p>To reinforce the cooperation among the NTEAP components, the MTR recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PMU Lead Specialists prepare a list of activities and outputs that will benefit the other components and the list of fields of cooperation among the components; o During a joint session the PMU should identify the most promising and most profitable fields of cooperation; o PMU assigns a complementary budget and allocate work time to implement the collaboration; and o M&E evaluate the impact of the collaboration on the timeliness of activities and quality of outputs in terms of realization of the project's development objectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The 2007 Work Plan was prepared jointly by Lead Specialists and Coordinators and discussed at the December 2006 Staff Retreat to ensure integration and coordination. o All awareness relating activities under the WQ and Wet lands and Biodiversity components will be coordinated by the EE&A LSs. o Awareness, Knowledge Management and Monitoring of activities are identified as cross cutting issues between components. Monitoring and compilation of best practices will be done jointly by LSs and field coordinators o Evaluation of collaboration between components will be carried out at the end of each year. | <p>Concur. These recommendations are in fully keeping with those made by past implementation review missions and PSC meetings.</p> |
| 29 | <p>To reinforce the cooperative network among the SVP, the NTEAP should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Request the NPCs to establish close working relations with those responsible for the SVP projects operating in their countries; o Jointly with the NBI-SVP coordinator, create formal links among the projects and allocate budget for collaboration and reporting systems; o Demonstrate to the PSC and NBI Secretariat the financial and technical advantages of this collaboration in terms of money saving, increase in output delivery and impact; and o Modify the project's work plan to include emerging cooperative activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o NPCs will be encouraged to work closely with sister SVP projects. o The NTEAP will work with Nile SEC in strengthening national NBI coordination offices. o National assessments of NBI national level coordination has been conducted by local consultants including costs and benefits of national level coordination under the CBSI. o The 2007 work plan includes activities and budget for NTEAP collaboration with SAPs. | <p>Concur; however, the demonstration of financial and technical advantages should be undertaken jointly with the NBI Secretariat, in close coordination with Nile-TAC members and the national NBI offices, for all SVP Projects.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|----|--|---|---|
| 30 | <p>To mobilize the SVP projects to collaborate with NTEAP, the PMU should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On the basis of the NTEAP experience, prepare a set of recommendations and advice to help other projects accelerate implementation of their activities ○ Inform the projects about technical and methodological achievements of NTEAP that may create a base for the future collaboration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monthly, annual reports, NTEAP staff retreat reports are forwarded to other SVP projects to promote exchange of experience. During the formative periods of SVP projects NTEAP has provided advise and documentations which supported better implementation. ○ Concept notes, work plans, PSC rules of procedures, strategy papers have been transmitted to SVP projects. This will be followed up as opportunities permit. | Concur. |
| 31 | <p>To take advantage of this environment and further motivate regional cooperation the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inform the stakeholders about the opportunity of regional networking and about the steps needed put their activities in place; ○ Create incentives that will reinforce the motivation of stakeholders to take part in regional cooperation; and ○ Congratulate authorities for their support for regional cooperation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lessons from other regional cooperation shall be featured in NTEAP newsletter, website, communications with stakeholders ○ This requires coming up with demonstrable benefits to stakeholders on account of regional cooperation. The NTEAP's cross border activities may assist in realizing this recommendation ○ The NTEAP has issue the first such congratulatory and thank you letter to the water quality working group members and will follow suit for other stakeholders also. | Concur, but note earlier comments on the importance of sustainability in establishing regional networks specifically in relation to the need for regional networks, their drive and the financial aspects of their operations. |
| 32 | <p>To increase the level of expertise in the regional cooperation, the PMU should provide the groups and networks of stakeholders including working groups, networks, participating communities, schools and universities with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knowledge building materials such as books, technical journals, films, extension materials, simple tools to measure and evaluate environmental parameters; and ○ Tools to create and disseminate information such as printing and photocopying equipment or TV and radio emission aids. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not enough resources to fully address this recommendation. However, the project website, quarterly newsletter, Nile RAK are availing such information to a wide range of stakeholders ○ Due to budgetary constraints this recommendations will not be implemented | The agencies do not support this recommendation; it is outside the scope of NTEAP; however, they do concur with NTEAP that the Nile RAK, website, and newsletters can be enhanced to make some progress in the recommendations direction. |
| 33 | <p>The PMU may also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the individuals who introduced the original approach to the Nile basin environmental management, provide incentives such as grants, study tours or information letters to their superiors; ○ Encourage and support group/network members to publicize their work through the local press, technical reviews and NTEAP's Newsletter (encouragement may include subsidizing publication or assisting with contacting journalists or other aspects); and ○ Encourage dissemination of regional approaches by supporting implementation of those actions that are the most promising. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ .Schools and public award schemes have been initiated. NTEAP newsletter and website will post such innovative approaches and will write recognition letters. ○ Implementation of activities related to regional approaches beyond that are catered for through the components have not been looked in to. | Concur with the concept of promoting regional approaches towards addressing common environmental problems. NTEAP should do all it can to promote and publish work undertaken by the project or independent work undertaken by members of NTEAP working groups. Any such activity should be relatively budget neutral; therefore, the agencies caution against providing incentives to individuals without careful cost benefit analysis and the concurrence of the NBI. Any such recognition of the contribution of network members could be highlighted on the website and in the newsletter of NTEAP/NBI. |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|---|--|---|--|
| 34 | <p>Pertinent information should be provided to all levels of stakeholders but with priority to communities that participate in microgrant activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Jointly with other SVP projects, the Knowledge Management Specialist should initiate production of information documents adapted to all educational levels of stakeholders; o For communities it should contain basic, practical information about the local rivers, their hydrology, fauna, flora, ecology, links with fisheries, agriculture and forestry; o For schools, it should contain extension and demonstration materials for teachers and students; o For technical schools and universities, the project may provide technical documents produced by consultants and by project staff; o For vocational schools and universities, the project should disseminate information about employment opportunities for environment technicians and specialists; o The project should interview the beneficiaries about their needs for documentation and the test impact of the documents provided; however, o The beneficiaries at the communities can be not mere consumers of the knowledge. They may also assist in its production and use it for their own purposes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Agreement to produce customized outreach and awareness materials from the Nile RAK was established with CBSI. o Effect of different materials will be assessed through the overall M&E process of the project. o Observation will be addressed wherever feasible. | <p>Concur with the concept; however, it should be noted that such publication should be focused on NTEAP outputs, respond to real demands among stakeholders, and be easily and economically reproduced (i.e. small numbers should be produced to begin with and then reproduced if demand arises). In doing so, NTEAP should be aware or could highlight opportunities and venues emerging from parallel regional processes such as the African economic communities, IGAD, and existing regional networks.</p> |
| 35 | <p>In the future, the project should contribute to knowledge building about the Nile River, and this knowledge may be used as a support for political and economic decisions making within the basin. To this effect it is recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o That the NETAP in collaboration with other SVP projects popularize simple environmental testing and probing methods and train the interested persons in their application. | <p><i>NTEAP Management made no comments.</i></p> | <p>The agencies find this recommendation to be too vague for implementation.</p> |
| Transboundary cooperation - #s 36-38 | | | |
| 36 | <p>Toward this end the project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Gradually orient attention of the project's collaborators and partners towards specific priority issues of the Nile basin transboundary environment essential to social and political stability and economic prosperity | <p>This may be treated in the envisaged strategic environmental framework and also in the project phase-out plan.</p> | <p>A noble concept. A practical suggestion would be for NTEAP to provide either a half or whole day seminar on an issue from the TEA at every PSC meeting. Such short seminars could then be replicated by NPCs and lead specialists for networks and other stakeholders.</p> |

| # | Conclusions and Recommendations made by MTR Consultants | NTEAP Management Response and Proposed Action | UNDP/WB Comments |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 37 | <p>To reduce the risk of investment in actions that are not well adjusted to the beneficiaries' expectations and to the project objectives it is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All major project activities are accompanied by pilot testing that, if successful, can be extended across the region. These tests may cover implementation of policy adjustments, river environment monitoring, water quality monitoring or introduction of environment management improvements. | <p><i>NTEAP Management made no comments.</i></p> | <p>It isn't clear to the agencies that such an effort will provide benefit for the second half of NTEAP.</p> |
| 38 | <p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project documents national and regional differences in environmental management and be sensitive to local solutions to the common problems; the project may incorporate the accumulated experience into activities planning and output production. | <p><i>NTEAP Management made no comments.</i></p> | <p>The agencies feel that much of this recommendation was accomplished through the TEA. A more practical suggestion would be for NTEAP to undertake an update of the TEA prior to closing the project; however, such a decision would have to be endorsed by the NBI and PSC.</p> |
| Project extension - #39 | | | |
| 39 | <p>Taking into account the one year delay in commencement of many of the project activities, and seeing the promising implementation and accomplishment of project activities, the MTR recommends extension of the project duration until the end of 2009.</p> | <p>The project needs the five years duration stipulated in the project document and may be a little over the five years to deliver and consolidate the planned outcomes of the project. If this is compromised for any reason the activities so far implemented will not produce the expected outcomes and stakeholders will lose confidence not only with NTEAP but with NBI as a whole.</p> | <p>The agencies concur, pending the receipt of the second tranche of the UNDP GEF Grant or similar supplemental financing from the NBTF. Final decision should be made no later than October 2007.</p> |

Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) Original Log Frame

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Key Performance Indicators | Monitoring and Evaluations | Critical Assumptions |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Sector Related/CAS Goal</p> <p>The vision of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) is to achieve the sustainable socio-economic development through the equitable utilization of, and benefit from, the common Nile Basin water resources.</p> <p>The NBI's Shared Vision Program aims to support the establishment of an enabling environment for cooperative development.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM</p> <p>The Transboundary Environmental Action project aims to develop a framework for basin-wide environmental action linked to transboundary issues within the context of the Nile Basin Initiative's (NBI's) Shared Vision Program under the GEF's International Waters Program.</p> | <p>Sector Indicators</p> <p>Increasing levels of regional cooperation and coordination through the Shared Vision Program's seven regional projects.</p> | <p>Sector/Country Reports</p> <p>Nile Secretariat's Annual Report.</p> | <p><i>(from Goal to Bank Mission)</i></p> <p>Continued political and financial commitment to the Nile Basin Initiative by the ten riparian states.</p> <p>Continued donor support.</p> |
| <p>Project Development Objective</p> <p>The project aims at creating more effective basin-wide stakeholder cooperation on transboundary environmental issues by supporting the implementation of a subset of the actions prioritized by the transboundary analysis including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing the analytical capacity for a basin-wide perspective to support the sustainable development, management, and protection of the Nile Basin water; and | <p>Outcome/Impact Indicators</p> <p>Increased regional cooperation in environmental and water management fields</p> <p>Increased basin-wide community action and cooperation in land and water management</p> <p>Basin-wide networks of environmental and water professionals</p> <p>Greater appreciation of river hydrology and more informed discussion of development paths</p> | <p>Project Reports</p> <p>Nile Basin Initiative Transboundary Environmental Action Project reports that clearly document basin-wide cooperation on environmental action.</p> <p>Project monitoring and evaluation reports.</p> | <p><i>(From Objective to Goal)</i></p> <p>The Nile riparian governments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree on the planning, implementation and monitoring of the project; and Establishes the Project Steering Committee to guide project operations. <p>Project component work plans and financial arrangements for the project are in place.</p> <p>Stakeholders from both the public sector and civil society at large are</p> |

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Key Performance Indicators | Monitoring and Evaluations | Critical Assumptions |
|--|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging the full spectrum of stakeholders, from local communities to national policy makers, from elementary schools to universities, from non-governmental organizations to line ministries, in management and protection of the basin's shared resources. | <p>Expanded information and knowledge base on land and water resources available to professionals and NGOs</p> <p>Greater awareness of the linkages between macro/sectoral policies and the environment</p> <p>Greater awareness and increased capacity on transboundary water quality threats</p> | | <p>willing to actively participate in and collaborate with the project.</p> <p>Full GEF Financing for all planned project components.</p> |
| <p><u>Output by Component</u></p> <p>1. Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation (WB & UNDP).</p> <p>1.1 Regional Capacity Building for Transboundary Environmental Management (GEF/UNDP – Phase 1 &2).</p> <p>1.2 Communications and Knowledge Management (GEF/Bank –Phase 1).</p> <p>1.3 River Basin Model (RBM): Regional River Basin model, coupled with human capacity and institutional support, developed and facilitating water resources planning at a regional level</p> | <p>Outcome/Impact Indicators</p> <p>1.1 Establish PMU and Project Steering Committee, including hiring of staff (UNDP).</p> <p>1.2 PMU and National Coordinator offices connected to Internet (UNDP).</p> <p>1.2 Newsletter published regularly and distributed widely with best practices, lessons learned, workshop announcements and links to additional resource material of interest for all project areas (Bank).</p> <p>1.2 Basin-wide environmental web site established and used as knowledge portal to access NBI related environment reports and for distributing newsletter (Bank).</p> <p>1.3 Functioning river basin planning model jointly developed (Bank).</p> | <p>Project Reports</p> <p>Annual Project Report – including project monitoring and evaluation, and workshop reports.</p> <p>1.2 Project newsletter</p> <p>1.2 Regularly updated website</p> <p>1.3 Annual progress, technical and financial reports to Steering Committee and Nile-SEC.</p> | <p><i>(From Outputs to Objective)</i></p> <p>1.1 Qualified and motivated staff and other resources are available in the region.</p> <p>1.2 The parallel Shared Vision Program Communications Project becomes operational and provides planned support to the newsletter and website.</p> <p>1.3 Adequate regional-level management capacities to ensure effective basin-wide coordination.</p> <p>1.3 Adequate national level institutional capacity and cooperation</p> |

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Key Performance Indicators | Monitoring and Evaluations | Critical Assumptions |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>(GEF & NBTB/Bank – Phase 1).</p> <p>1.4 Macro and sectoral policies and the environment (WB - Phase 1).</p> | <p>1.3 Greater appreciation for river systems behavior among the riparians (Bank).</p> <p>1.3.1 River Basin Model developed and staff trained (Bank)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model developed and calibrated based on participatory development process. • Core riparian staff understand and able to use model. <p>1.3.2 Linkages between regional Unit and national network of users established (Bank)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-sectoral network of DSS/RBM users solidified at national level through awareness building. • National staff capable of using model. • Technical troubleshooting and country visits by regional DSS/RBM unit staff conducted. <p>1.3.3 River Basin Model refined and applied (Bank)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Basin Model applied on riparian selected test cases. • Modeling results facilitate dialogue among riparian staff on options for water resources management and development. <p>RBM use and training consolidated (Bank)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term training plan, including overseas training programs, implemented. • RBM integrated into Nile DSS. | <p>1.3 External review and evaluation reports at critical milestones and project completion.</p> <p>1.3 RBM performance and training program evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users guides and technical manuals; Model test and calibration results. • Workplans and training logs/reports documenting in-basin on-the-job training, in-basin seminars and workshops; international study tours, etc. • Interviews during visits to focal points and network nodes • Technical papers documenting process, model results, and use of test applications • Course certificates or degrees for overseas training • Independent evaluations. • Report on institutional and financing options | <p>to implement and sustain project.</p> <p>1.3 Riparians are willing to share information and collaborate in the design and maintenance of the River Basin Model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus reached on model needs and approach to describing river basin system • Accuracy of river basin model description useful • Input data adequate and consistent • Partners in other sectors and institutions can be motivated to actively cooperate • Data exchanges take place to level necessary for meaningful analysis • Model results credible • Combinations of short-term, long term training plans, twinning with international institutions, and involvement of local universities sustain and update needed expertise • Critical data gaps filled • Acceptable means to ensure long-term financial sustainability instituted |

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Key Performance Indicators | Monitoring and Evaluations | Critical Assumptions |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 1.4 Transboundary studies of macro and sector policies and environment (including root causes) completed in 4 countries, including at least one in each of the two NBI sub-regions (Bank). | 1.4 Studies on relationships between macro and sector policies and environment, including root causes. | 1.4 Necessary economic and environmental data available over periods necessary to develop trends and sound hypotheses. |

| Hierarchy of Objectives | Key Performance Indicators | Monitoring and Evaluations | Critical Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>• Output/ Component</p> <p>2. Community-level Land, Forest and Water Conservation – Microgrant Fund. (CIDA through NBTf/Bank & GEF/UNDP)</p> <p>2.1 Enhanced basin-wide capabilities and cooperation (UNDP).</p> <p>2.2 Improved understanding of transboundary soil erosion (UNDP).</p> <p>2.3 Nile Transboundary Microgrant Fund to support local-level land, forest and water conservation initiatives (CIDA through NBTf/WB – Phase 1 and 2)</p> | <p>2.1 Regional training workshops designed and conducted for NGO capacity building in technical and organizational skills related to transboundary environmental management (UNDP).</p> <p>2.2 Transboundary assessments and studies of soil erosion completed in Ethiopia, Sudan & Rwanda (UNDP).</p> <p>2.3 Transboundary Microgrant Fund established and functioning in NBI Countries (Bank)</p> <p>2.3 Microgrants disbursed to CBOs and grassroots groups across the broad base of stakeholder communities (Bank).</p> <p>2.3 Country specific targets for percentage of the microgrants to be awarded to women’s NGOs or community organizations reached (Bank).</p> <p>2.3 Identification of promising or viable approaches to transboundary environmental issues that can be scaled up or replicated (Bank).</p> | <p>Annual Project Report – including project monitoring and evaluation, and workshop reports.</p> <p>2.1 Workshop reports (including reporting on participation disaggregated by gender)</p> <p>2.2 Reports on assessments and studies of transboundary soil erosion.</p> <p>2.3 Transboundary Microgrant Fund reports on institutional arrangements, organization and management.</p> <p>2.3 Regional Microgrant Strategy, including eligibility criteria, and National Action Plans)</p> <p>2.3 Monitoring and evaluation reports for Microgrant Fund, including monitoring and evaluation for individual grants (tracking % of grants disbursed to women’s groups and % of grants for transboundary grants involving at least two countries)</p> | <p>2.1 National and international NGOs are willing to share experience and collaborate with the project.</p> <p>2.1 Active women’s participation in component activities is achieved in all countries.</p> <p>2.2 Studies provide usable insights on transboundary soil erosion to guide grant-making emphasis of Microgrant Fund in countries concerned.</p> <p>2.3 Adequate institutional arrangements can be made in each country to house, manage, safeguard and administer the Transboundary Microgrant Fund in a transparent and open manner.</p> <p>2.3 Community-level stakeholders are ready to submit proposals and implement grants dealing with transboundary issues.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Output/ Component</p> <p>3. Environmental Education and</p> | <p>3.1 National Working Groups established in 10</p> | <p>Annual Project Report – including project</p> | <p>All Nile countries ready to participate</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Awareness (GEF/UNDP- Phase 1 & 2).</p> <p>3.1 Enhanced public awareness and understanding of Nile transboundary environmental issues UNDP).</p> <p>3.2 Networking of secondary schools for project-based learning (UNDP).</p> <p>3.3 Piloting enhanced networking among universities and other research institutions.</p> | <p>countries (UNDP).</p> <p>3.1 National Environmental Education and Awareness Reviews carried out in 10 countries (UNDP).</p> <p>3.1 At least two environmental awareness programs designed by transboundary teams and delivered in 5 countries (UNDP).</p> <p>3.1 Enhanced public awareness of transboundary environmental issues (UNDP).</p> <p>3.2 Teachers trained in project-based collaborative learning (1-3 teachers per school, a total of 80-100 schools from 6-10 countries) (UNDP).</p> <p>3.2 Environmental modules developed and offered to teachers in 10 countries(UNDP).</p> <p>3.2 Transboundary school environmental projects designed and carried out collaboratively (a total of 80-100 schools from 6-10 countries) (UNDP).</p> <p>3.3 Two junior faculty or graduate students in exchange programs from each of 10 countries (UNDP).</p> <p>3.3 University course in Nile Transboundary Environmental Issues developed collaboratively between universities in at least 6 Nile countries (UNDP).</p> | <p>monitoring and evaluation, and workshop reports.</p> <p>3.1 Environmental Awareness Program Materials.</p> <p>3.1 Survey of environmental education and awareness program users to evaluate impact of activities.</p> <p>3.2 Environmental education and awareness program materials.</p> <p>3.2 Surveys of users, including participation rates.</p> <p>3.2 Assessments of student learning, teachers' ability to integrate environmental education.</p> <p>3.3 Project reports on student/faculty exchanges and resulting research.</p> | <p>in component.</p> <p>3.1 Transboundary communications can be established for teams to work together in designing awareness programs.</p> <p>3.2 At least one real champion per country can be identified for developing and teaching environmental education modules.</p> <p>3.2 National Working Groups are willing to work jointly and share information with counterparts from other riparian countries.</p> <p>3.2 Institutional arrangements for development and delivery of environmental education programs can be made within each country – i.e. with the Ministries of Education.</p> <p>3.3 Willingness of relevant institutions to participate in exchange programs and commit staff resources.</p> |
|---|--|--|--|

| Output/ Component | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>4. Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation (NBTF/Bank & UNDP-Phase 2).</p> | | <p>Annual Project Report – including project monitoring and evaluation, and workshop reports.</p> | |
| <p>4.1 Regional cooperation is enhanced and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity is improved (UNDP).</p> | <p>4.1.1 Basin-wide wetland management network of stakeholders and experts established and functioning effectively (UNDP).</p> <p>4.1 Wetland education, training and awareness programs have been developed in 3 languages(UNDP).</p> | <p>4.1 Survey of users of wetland management network to evaluate impact of activities.</p> | <p>4.1 Wetland management stakeholders and experts are willing to participate in and share information through a network facilitated by the project.</p> |
| <p>4.2 Understanding and awareness of the role of wetlands in supporting sustainable development is improved (Bank).</p> | <p>4.2 Ecological and economic studies of the role of wetlands in sustainable development completed in at least one southern and one northern Nile country (Bank).</p> <p>4.2 Wetland education, training and awareness programs developed in 4.1 and completed by studies mentioned above, delivered (Bank).</p> | <p>4.2 Reports on studies on the role of wetlands in sustainable development.</p> <p>4.2 Workshop reports; surveys assessing awareness among target audience.</p> | <p>4.2 Minimal level of trained staff available for training in countries.</p> |
| <p>4.3 Key wetlands are managed more effectively (WB & UNDP).</p> | <p>4.3 Pilot initiatives completed in support of capacity building and management at 3 key transboundary sites, involving at least one southern and one northern Nile country (Bank).</p> | <p>4.3 Progress reports on pilot initiatives.</p> | <p>4.3 Wetlands and other priority transboundary sites selected for studies and for pilot initiatives are accessible.</p> |

| Output/ Component | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5. Basin-wide Water Quality Monitoring (GEF/Bank – phase 1).</p> <p>5.1 Enhanced national capacities for water quality monitoring.</p> <p>5.2 Transboundary water quality awareness raising and information sharing.</p> | <p>5.1 Regional Working Group established (Bank)</p> <p>5.1 Existing national capacities assessed, including documentation of sampling points in each country (Bank).</p> <p>5.1 Existing information on water quality aggregated in Nile water quality report (Bank).</p> <p>5.1 Common analytical methods selected and agreed for basin-wide use by Working Group (Bank).</p> <p>5.1 National training workshops held and methods pilot tested (Bank).</p> <p>5.1 Two regional workshops on water quality management issues conducted (Bank).</p> <p>5.2 International Study Tour to raise awareness on need for transboundary cooperation (Bank).</p> <p>5.2 Information on sampling points and parameters of special transboundary significance exchanged on regular basis based on priority threats (Bank).</p> <p>5.2 Study on biological diversity indices conducted and pilot tested (Bank).</p> <p>5.2 Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow-up action formulated (Bank).</p> | <p>Annual Project Report – including project monitoring and evaluation, and workshop reports.</p> <p>5.1 Reports on national water quality monitoring activities and capacities.</p> <p>5.1 Nile water quality report (may be combined and a chapter in the 'Nile Atlas' planned in the SVP- Water Resources Management Project).</p> <p>5.1 Manual for common Nile Basin water quality analytical methods.</p> <p>5.1 Workshop reports.</p> <p>5.2 Study tour report.</p> <p>5.2 Progress reports on basin-wide water quality information and exchange of information developed by Working Group and Water Quality Lead Specialist.</p> <p>5.2 Report from study available.</p> | <p>Commitment among the riparians to agree on common monitoring approaches and to share water quality information.</p> <p>Where functioning labs exist, the project will rely on these and provide additional financial resources during the course of the project; where labs do not exist, basic capacities are built.</p> <p>Adequate arrangements, including staff time and computers, are made available to continue to record national data and engage in regional exchange of information.</p> <p>Technical institutions and their trained staff ready to engage in regional effort.</p> <p>National monitoring efforts and capacity exist to support basic field methods for water quality analysis.</p> |

| PROJECT COMPONENTS/SUB COMPONENTS | PROJECT COMPONENTS/SUB COMPONENTS | Project Reports | <i>(from Component to Outputs)</i> |
|--|---|-----------------|--|
| <p>Component 1: Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation 1.1 Regional Capacity Building for Transboundary Environmental Management 1.2 Communications and Knowledge Management 1.3 River Basin 1.4 Macro and sectoral policies and the environment</p> <p>Component 2: Community-level Land, Forest and Water Conservation 2.1 Enhanced basin-wide capabilities and cooperation 2.2 Improved understanding of transboundary soil erosion 2.3 Microgrant Fund to support local-level land, forest and water conservation initiatives at transboundary sites</p> <p>Component 3: Environmental Education and Awareness 3.1 Public awareness and understanding of Nile transboundary environmental issues 3.2 Networking of secondary schools for project-based learning 3.3 Enhanced networking among universities and other research institutions</p> <p>Component 4: Wetlands and Biodiversity Conservation 4.1 Enhanced regional cooperation and capabilities 4.2 Better understanding and broader awareness of the role of wetlands 4.3 More effective management of wetlands</p> <p>Component 5: Basin-wide Water Quality Monitoring 5.1 Enhanced national capacities for water quality monitoring 5.2 Transboundary water quality monitoring established</p> | <p>Component 1: US\$14.6 1.1 US\$6.9 1.2 US\$1.0 1.3 US\$6.3 1.4 US\$0.4</p> <p>Component 2: US\$11.1 2.1 US\$3.4 2.2 US\$0.3 2.3 US\$7.4</p> <p>Component 3: US\$3.4 3.1 US\$2.2 3.2 US\$0.8 3.3 US\$0.4</p> <p>Component 4: US\$7.1 4.1 US\$1.8 4.2 US\$2.7 4.3 US\$3.2</p> <p>Component 5: US\$2.9 5.1 US\$1.5 5.2 US\$1.4</p> | | <p>Pledged donor financing, including second phase GEF financing, and riparian in kind financing is provided at expected levels.</p> |

**Nile Basin Initiative
Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project
Final Results Based Logical Framework**

| Results | Indicators | Assumptions & Risks |
|--|---|--|
| Goal: <i>To ensure efficient water management and the optimal use of the resources</i> | | |
| Impact: <i>Improved quality of the environment in the Nile Basin</i> | Frequency /density of indicator species | Political leadership and economic stability of riparian countries will favor development and cooperation |
| | Water quality of the Nile (measured by levels of pesticide pollution ,volume of invasive species and turbidity) | |
| | Soil erosion rate (tons per hectare) | |
| Overall project objective : to develop a framework of actions to address high priority transboundary environmental issues in the Nile basin through: (a) provision of a forum to discuss development paths for the Nile; (b) improvement in the understanding of the relationship between water resources management and the environment; and (c) enhancement of basin-wide cooperation among NBI Countries | | |
| Specific Project Objective for phase 2 | | |
| <i>To protect critical Nile basin ecosystem and water resources from transboundary threats through a framework of actions and engagement of stakeholders according to the principles of IWRM</i> | | |
| Outcome 1. Regional and national institutions strengthened in addressing transboundary threats to Nile ecosystem resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transboundary EIA guidelines for use by NBI investment programs developed • 2.Policy recommendations formulated and submitted for approval in at least 2 countries • Environment function of the NB permanent institution defined | NB countries are willing to reach consensus and share information and stakeholders are willing to collaborate with the project |
| Outputs | | |
| 1.1 Institutional setup for project implementation established | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSC,PMU & 9 national offices managed & functioning • Proposal on environment function of NBI submitted for approval | |
| 1.2 Knowledge management and communication tools produced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly newspapers published in 5 languages, • Website and updated regularly • library established, equipped and connected to the NBI cyber library • multimedia communication tools developed • Good practices documented and disseminated | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1.3 River basin model (RBM) system developed (to be developed by WRPM) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RBM developed & integrated in the Decision Support System(DSS) | Adequate institutional arrangements are available in each country to manage TB microgrants program in a transparent manner |
| 1.4 Strategic Environment Framework provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transboundary guidelines for EIA produced & submitted for approval | |
| 1.5 Transboundary studies of macro & sector policies & environment completed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy recommendations approved by at least 2 countries | |
| 1.6 M&E system in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly, quarterly, semi annual, annual, field visits , surveys and review reports produced and disseminated to respective partners M&E strategy updated as per Results Based System | |
| Outcome 2. Improved capacity of Nile Basin communities to demonstrate and adopt viable approaches to integrated natural resources management across GEF focal areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best practices on land degradation and water management documented and replicated | National working groups are willing to jointly and share information with counterparts from other riparian countries |
| <i>Outputs</i> | | |
| 2.1 Viable options for community level actions to address Nile environmental threats (in accordance to the relevant GEF focal areas) produced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum of 200 projects implemented by communities across the basin | |
| 2.2. Capacities of NGOs and CBOs on addressing environmental threats enhanced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1 regional and 10 national training workshops conducted | |
| Outcome 3 Enhanced environmental education and public awareness targeting Nile basin transboundary issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 8 universities in 6 NBI countries approved and adopted the environmental modules based on Nile environmental threats Environmental campaigns and schools award programs adopted and institutionalized at national levels in at least 6 NBI countries | |
| <i>Outputs</i> | | |
| 3.1 Public awareness on Nile environmental threats enhanced in NB countries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 environmental awareness programmes delivered in at least 5 countries Awareness material on 5 selected Nile Environment threats produced and disseminated across the basin Environmental campaigns and schools award programs adopted and institutionalized at national levels in at least 6 NBI countries | |
| 3.2. Networks of secondary schools for projects based learning established and functioning in NB countries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 60 % of the participating schools adopt project based learning (environmental modules and school projects) | |
| 3.3. Capacities of and networking among universities and other research institutions enhanced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 junior faculty or graduate students exchanged in at least 6 countries Training modules developed in at least 6 universities | |
| Outcome 4. Enhanced conservation and management of Nile basin wetlands and their biodiversity in accordance with the principles of IWRM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands training and awareness modules developed and adopted in at least 3 countries Management plans for at least 3 selected wetlands developed and approved | |
| <i>Outputs</i> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 4.1 Regional cooperation is enhanced and capacity for conservation and management of wetlands and their biodiversity improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 network at regional level established and functioning • Training program in 3 languages developed | Commitments among the riparians to agree on common monitoring approaches and to share water quality information |
| 4.2. Understanding and awareness of the roles of wetlands in supporting sustainable development is improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological& economic studies on wetland roles in sustainable development conducted Study completed in the two SAP regions • Over 50 officers on wetlands management trained across the basin • Awareness programs conducted in 9 NBI countries | |
| 4.3 Management capacity of selected wetlands strengthened | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps of wetlands in the basin developed • 3 pilot wetlands management plans developed • At least 2 pilot wetlands management implemented through microgrants | |
| Outcome 5. Increased capacity and awareness on water quality monitoring in the NB countries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transboundary water quality monitoring network established and approved • TB WQM & data sharing annex to NBI data sharing protocol developed | |
| <i>Outputs</i> | | |
| 5.1 Regional working group functional | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality monitoring strategy developed and finalized | |
| 5.2 Awareness on WQ issues increased in Nile Basin countries at all levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness materials on water quality monitoring produced & disseminated in all Nile basin countries | |
| 5.3 Data exchange mechanism developed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional WQ manuals and uniform data reporting formats developed and used in at least 4 countries | |
| 5.4 Capacity in WQM improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality testing kits provided and training in WQ measurements provided to focal laboratories | |
| 5.5. Biological monitoring tools pilot tested in the Nile basin | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 biological monitoring demonstration sites selected and tools pilot tested in at least 2 countries | |
| 5.6. Critical evaluation of progress undertaken and recommendations for follow up action formulated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way forward in transboundary WQM developed | |

See attached excel file (draft).

See attached file for PSC results.