

## UNDP GEF APR/PIR 2006

(1 July 2005 to 30 June 2006)

## I. Basic Project Data

**NOTE: Component A, Activity B1.1 and D1 were implemented and executed by UNEP, while rest was by UNDP and UNOPS, respectively (with WB oversight for B1-B2, D1... per org chart).**

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

<b>Country/ies:</b>	Global	<b>PIMS Number</b>	2838
		<b>Atlas Project Number</b>	00039843

<b>Focal Area</b>	IW	<b>Project Type (FSP/MSP)</b>	FSP
<b>Strategic Priority</b>	IW-2 Targeted IW Learning	<b>Operational Programme</b>	10

<b>Date of Entry into Work Programme</b>	21 MAY 2004	<b>Planned Project Duration</b>	4 years
<b>ProDoc Signature Date</b>	12 AUG 2004	<b>Original Planned Closing Date</b>	31 DEC 2007
<b>Date of First Disbursement</b>	28 SEP 2004	<b>Revised Planned<sup>1</sup> Closing Date</b>	14 OCT 2008
<b>Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Date Project Operationally Closed (if applicable)</b>	N/a

<b>Date Mid Term Evaluation<sup>2</sup> carried out (if applicable)</b>	October-December 2006	<b>Date Final Evaluation<sup>1</sup> carried out (if applicable)</b>	
---	-----------------------	--	--

<b>Dates of visits to project</b>		<b>Date of last TPR</b>	N/A
-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------	-----

<sup>1</sup> Please explain any entry here in section V on "Changes in project schedule"

<sup>2</sup> If an evaluation has been carried out in the last 12 months the report should be attached to this document.

by UNDP country office		Meeting	
Date of last visit to project by UNDP-GEF RTA	12 JUL 2006		

**Project Contacts:**

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
National Project Manager / Coordinator	Dann Sklarew	<a href="mailto:dann@iwlearn.org">dann@iwlearn.org</a>	11/09/2006	<i>Dann M. Sklarew,</i> For UNDP-implemented sub-project only
Government GEF OFP <sup>3</sup> (optional)	N/A			
UNDP Country Office Programme Manager	N/A			
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	Andrew Hudson	<a href="mailto:andrew.hudson@undp.org">andrew.hudson@undp.org</a>		

**Project Summary (as in PIMS and ProDoc)**

IW:LEARN aims to strengthen Transboundary Waters Management (TWM) by facilitating structured learning and information sharing among stakeholders. In pursuit of this global objective, IW:LEARN will improve GEF IW projects' information base, replication efficiency, transparency, stakeholder ownership and sustainability of benefits through:

- A. Facilitating access to information about transboundary water resources among GEF IW projects
- B. Structured learning among GEF IW projects and cooperating partners
- C. Organizing biennial International Waters Conferences
- D. Testing innovative approaches to strengthen implementation of the IW portfolio
- E. Fostering partnerships to sustain benefits of IW:LEARN and associated technical support.

The project builds upon the achievements of the experimental pilot phase IW LEARN project, incorporating the findings of its final independent evaluation. In view of the great interest raised by and successes of the UNDP-implemented pilot, all three Implementing Agencies have committed to jointly propose and realize this operational phase IW:LEARN project.

<sup>3</sup> In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

II. Progress towards achieving project objectives

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
Objective: To strengthen Transboundary Waters Management (TWM) by facilitating structured learning and information sharing among GEF stakeholders.	1. From 2006 onward, all waterbodies developing country-driven, adaptive TWM programs with GEF assistance benefit from participating in structured learning and information sharing facilitated by GEF via IW:LEARN.	No waterbodies benefiting	All GEF-supported waterbodies report benefits from structured learning and from information sharing	<p><b>S:</b> Of all ~50 IW waterbodies participating in structured learning, &gt;10 report benefits;</p> <p>Of ~50 waterbodies participating in information sharing, at least 1 reports benefits</p>
	2. From 2008 onward, successful IW:LEARN structured learning and information sharing services will be insitutionalized and sustained indefinitely through GEF and its partners.	No services institutionalized	IW-IMS, 3 regional and 5 water body-specific learning services, plus biennial conferences, Gender and Water Exhibit, and <i>IW Experience Notes</i> series sustained by partners	<b>MU:</b> No services institutionalized at present.

<sup>4</sup> This should describe the quantitative indicator

<sup>5</sup> This should be a quantitative numerical value

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
<p>Outcome 1: TWM improved across GEF IW project areas through projects' and stakeholders' access to TWM data and information from across the GEF IW portfolio and its partners.</p>	<p>3. Demand-Driven System Design Protocols and Prototype IW-IMS (linking IAs' project info.) by 2005</p>	<p>No system in place</p>	<p>Protocols in place, IAs' project info. linked</p>	<p><b>MS:</b> IW-IMS system launched and operational 1.3Million plus hits, (Feb 2006-till date) 27,000 plus unique visitors, 10% visitors bookmark URL, 120+ countries  78.000 documents downloaded 55.000 from Projects Database / Publications 23.000 from About IW:LEARN</p>

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
	<p>4. IW-IMS includes at least 4 modules focused on regional, thematic or process-based subsets of TWM information resources by 2008</p>	<p>No IW-IMS modules</p>	<p>4 modules by 2008</p>	<p><b>MS:</b> 5 modules developed. (Project profiles module, Roster of Experts, Contacts database, Website toolkit/ICT kit.)</p> <p>IW projects like DNIPRO, IWCAM, WIO-Lab are already using Website toolkit to support their websites and YSLME and PEMSEA are under implementation for the same.</p> <p>Groundwater module is under implementation with UNESO/IGRAC.</p> <p>GIS module developed and being integrated with Website Toolkit (version 2)</p>
	<p>5. By 2006, help desk (or water-net) responds to at least 4 IW community requests per month, extending IW-IMS contents with demand-driven research</p>	<p>No helpdesk to respond to IW community requests</p>	<p>Helpdesk responds to 4 requests/month</p>	<p><b>MU:</b> At least 25 ICT related request received during 2006 and addressed</p>
	<p>6. At least 2 ICT Training Workshops over 4 years</p>	<p>No training</p>	<p>2 workshops</p>	<p><b>S:</b> 1 ICT workshop for 2 IW projects (WIO-Lab and GCLME)</p>

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
	7. By 2008, 95% of IW projects have developed Web sites, with ICT tools and information resources inter-linked and accessible through IW-IMS (in years 1 (25%), 2 (50%), 3 (75%) and 4 (95%))	No websites inter-linked via IW-IMS, X Websites (~45% of projects?) developed independent of IW:LEARN	95% of IW projects have inter-linked Web sites accessible through IW-IMS	<b>MU:</b> ≥45% of projects' Web sites accessible and linked from iwlearn.net, 0% Web sites <i>interlinked</i> (although several have followed IWL template)
Outcome 2: Enhanced TWM capacity at project- and basin-levels through sharing of experiences among subsets of the GEF IW portfolio, including projects, their partners and counterparts.	8. By 2008, 3 multi-project regional TWM learning exchanges organized to assist total of at least 10 projects: B1.1 Caribbean Inter-linkages Dialog B1.2 Africa IW Network B1.3 Southeastern Europe and Mediterranean	No regional exchanges among IW projects	3 exchanges	<b>S:</b> 1 exchange (SE Europe)
	9. By 2008, 5 multi-project thematic learning exchanges organized on a transboundary ecosystem basis assist at total of at least 15 projects: B2.1 Freshwater B2.1.1 Groundwater/Aquifers B2.1.2 River Basins B2.1.3 Lake Basins B2.2 LMEs (incl. MPAs) B2.3 Coral Reefs	No thematic learning exchanges targeting IW projects (several incl. them – e.g., INBO, ISARM, LakeNet IOC LME mtgs.)	5 multi-project thematic exchange	<b>MS:</b> 4 multi-thematic project exchanges launched, MOU with WorldFish Center to launch 5 <sup>th</sup> in October 2006.
	10. 5-7 multi-week staff/stakeholder exchanges between pairs of 10-14 new (or pipeline) projects and experienced projects, at a rate of 1-4 exchanges per year for 4 years.	No inter-project exchanges	5-7 multi-week exchanges	<b>S:</b> 1 exchange (with 6 GEF projects represented), 1 planned for Moldova in 2006Q4 and 1 for USA in 2007Q1

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
	11. Training for a least 15 projects (5 government-NGO partnerships trained each year for 3-4 years) to jointly develop, refine and/or implement activities to increase public access and involvement in IW decision-making		At least 15 projects receive training	<b>U:</b> Zero (0) projects trained (over 10 invited to 1 <sup>st</sup> of 3 scheduled workshop, to be held in December 2006)
Outcome 3: GEF IW portfolio-wide increase in awareness and application of effective TWM approaches, strategies and best practices; numerous new and enhanced linkages and exchanges between GEF IW and other TWM projects with shared TWM challenges	12. 2 IWCs, with biennial needs assessments and portfolio-wide interactions, in 2005 (C1 in Brazil) and 2007 (C2 in South Africa)  13. Documented recommendations from GEF IW portfolio to CSD-13 Policy Session (Spring 2005)	Only 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> GEF IWCs	2 IWC's	<b>S:</b> 1 IWC (2005 Brazil), contract in place with GETF as conference coordinator for another IWC (2007 in South Africa)
Outcome 4: A widely available suite of tested and replicated ICT and other tools and approaches for strengthening TWM.	14. In 2004, SEA-RLC established to address regional TWM project needs (as identified during PDF-B)	No SEA RLC	SEA-RLC established	<b>MS:</b> SEA-RLC established
	15. SEA-RLC Web site launched (by 2005), addressing project needs through roster of IW experts (>100 by 2007) and other information resource (>1000 by 2008)	No regional IW experts roster nor information resource clearinghouse	Website launched, with roster of >100 IW experts and >1000 information resources	<b>MS:</b> Website launched, but without new experts on roster
	16. Regional IW GIS database operational online by 2006, with at least 3 prototype GIS-based decision support applications featured by 2007 and applied by SEA projects by 2008	GIS not used to support any decisions @ GEF IW projects in SEA	3 prototype GIS-based applications featured, 3 applied	<b>MU:</b> webGIS, Meta-Database, and website established, hosting SCS project

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
	17. Five (5) 3-day Southeastern Europe Transboundary Waters Roundtables for senior officials and experts by 2006.	No roundtables	3 roundtables (+2 100% co-financed)	<b>MU:</b> 1 roundtable done, 2 planned for 2006Q4.
	18. Internet-based targeted information exchange network on Transboundary Waters (for Southeastern Europe Transboundary River Basin and Lakes Management Program) launched by 2005, sustained through regional partners by 2006.	No network	Network launched	<b>S:</b> Network launched and operational w/GWP-Med hosting (watersee.net)
	19. Network for dissemination of Mediterranean experience in transboundary aquifer management [for Mediterranean Shared Aquifers Management Program] – realized in conjunction with Activity B2.1	No network	???	<b>S:</b> Network launched
	20. One global roundtable meeting to clarify the role of IWRM or related IW issue of common priority to the CSD and the GEF (in 2004) – e.g., bringing together select nations to build IWRM capacity to meet Millennium Development Goal for national IWRM strategies in 2005 and to support water-focus of CSD-12/CSD-13 biennium (2004-05)	<i>Ad hoc</i> regional IWRM Roundtables (not explicitly involving GEF IW) in lead up to CSD-12/CSD-13	1 global IWRM meeting	<b>S:</b> 1 global IWRM meeting (Tokyo) in 2006
Outcome 5: TWM learning and information sharing mechanisms mainstreamed and institutionalized into GEF IA and ongoing projects, as well as transboundary	21. By 2008, Sustainability Plans implemented, including 1 transfer of various services to appropriate organizations, SC acceptance of associated financing and personnel TORs, etc.  22. By end of project, IW:LEARN products and services are maintained and enriched in perpetuity through a network of partners	No plan to continue.	Implemented plan	<b>MU:</b> Plan not yet finalized.



Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator <sup>4</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>5</sup>	Target Level <sup>4</sup>	Level <sup>4</sup> at 30 June 2006
institutional frameworks of completed projects (e.g., Regional Seas and freshwater basin secretariats)	23. Side events at TWM meetings (e.g., CSD, WWF4, IUCN Assembly): 2 GEF IW presentations, information kiosks, or side events per year for 4 years; 2-3 GEF IW projects/year receive cost-sharing to participate;  24. outreach &/or learning products disseminated	No GEF IW outreach at side events, learning products, etc.	2 side events per year; 2-3 gef project/year get cost-sharing to participate; ; 1-2 outreach &/or learning products disseminated per year	<b>HS:</b> 5 side events; 15 GEF projects supported; 5 <i>IW Bridges</i> newsletters disseminated to all GEF IW projects, (50+ <i>LME Governance Handbooks</i> disseminated in 3 <sup>rd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> Q 2006), 12 <i>IW Experience Notes</i> disseminate on- line and at side-events.

#### Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective<sup>6</sup>

	2005 Rating	2006 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A	MS	Progress for UNDP-implemented activities has varied from U (B4) to HS (E2). Net balance is MS. (Note: Progress on all UNEP-implement activities, in green font above, ranged from MU to MS.)
Government GEF OFP <sup>7</sup> (optional)	N/A	N/A	
UNDP Country Office	N/A	N/A	
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	N/A	??	

<sup>6</sup> Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

<sup>7</sup> In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

**Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating**

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<b>Action to be Taken</b>	<b>By Whom?</b>	<b>By When?</b>
(For item 5) Improving help desk outreach, functionality, outreach, responsiveness and M&E, focusing specifically on IT (not IW) issues	TCC (UNEP-IW:LEARN)	TBD
(For item 7) Interlink at least 25% of projects within 6 months via 2006Q4 workshop process	TCC (UNEP-IW:LEARN)	June 30, 2007
B4 Public Participation Handbook v1.0 will be drafted, translated into Spanish, and provided as backbone for first workshop, involving >5 GEF IW projects in LAC region in 2006, at least as many in Africa in 2007 (item 11)	CTA w/ELI partner	Dec 15, 2006 (LAC), Jun 2007 (Africa)
(For item 16) Reassess customer satisfaction at SCS project, revise TORs and re-deploy SEA RLC as more driven by project demands and feedback	TCC (UNEP-IW:LEARN)	March 31, 2007
E1 Following MTE, sustainability plan will be drafted around those activities deemed worthy of continuing, and presented to SC for approval. (items 2, 21 and 22)	IW:LEARN CTA w/TCC and Deputy Director	June 30, 2007

### III. Progress in Project implementation

List the 4 key outputs delivered so far for each project Outcome:

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs
<p><b>MS:</b> Outcome 1: TWM improved across GEF IW project areas through projects' and stakeholders' access to TWM data and information from across the GEF IW portfolio and its partners.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IW-IMS system (<a href="http://www.iwlearn.net">www.iwlearn.net</a>) launched and operational, launched with new content and searching features (1.3M+ hit, 27,000+ unique visitors, 10% visitors bookmark URL, 120+ countries).</li> <li>2. At least 50% of IW projects with websites are accessible, searchable and linked from IW-IMS</li> <li>3. 1 ICT workshop executed in July 2005 for 2 IW projects</li> <li>4. At least 5 modules developed to aid IW projects in data and information management, and have been deployed by various IW projects.</li> </ol>
<p><b>MS:</b> Outcome 2: Enhanced TWM capacity at project- and basin-levels through sharing of experiences among subsets of the GEF IW portfolio, including projects, their partners and counterparts.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delivered Socio-economics and Governance workshop to 21 participants from 10 LME's and sponsored the production of a governance and socioeconomics manual.</li> <li>2. Delivered workshop to 65 people to advance public participation and information management for IW issues in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia</li> <li>3. Launched 4 freshwater and marine learning exchanges using electronic forums, with more than 250 participants</li> <li>4. Supported peer-to-peer workshop to improve project-level IW communications among a dozen people from 6 GEF IW projects (with a jointly produced guide as its primary output).</li> </ol>
<p><b>S:</b> Outcome 3: GEF IW portfolio-wide increase in awareness and application of effective TWM approaches, strategies and best practices; numerous new and enhanced linkages and exchanges between GEF IW and other TWM projects with shared TWM challenges</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delivered 3rd GEF International Waters Conference in Brazil, with 291 participants from 84 countries</li> <li>2. Published proceedings and presentations from 3<sup>rd</sup> IW Conference on <a href="http://iwlearn.net">iwlearn.net</a></li> <li>3. Selected (South Africa) location, dates for 4<sup>th</sup> GEF IW Conference</li> <li>4. Hired contractor (GETF) to coordinate 4<sup>th</sup> GEF IW Conference</li> </ol>
<p><b>MU:</b> Outcome 4: A widely available suite of tested and replicated ICT and other tools and approaches for strengthening TWM.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Launched Southeast Asia Regional Learning Centre Web site and model on-line GIS at <a href="http://www.iwsea.org">www.iwsea.org</a></li> <li>2. Conducted study of TDA/SAP processes in Southeast Asia</li> <li>3. Conducted first of three roundtable dialogues on Protection and Sustainable Use of Transboundary Water Resources in South-Eastern Europe and launched transboundary waters information network <a href="http://www.watersee.net">www.watersee.net</a> (with GWP-Mediterranean, Germany, Greece, World Bank)</li> <li>4. Organized day of sessions at the Japan Water Forum-hosted Integrated Water Resource Management international conference (Tokyo). 9 projects presented national and transboundary management and financing experiences to a global audience of over 60.</li> </ol>
<p><b>MU:</b> Outcome 5: TWM learning and information sharing mechanisms</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Produced 5 issues of Bridges newsletter conveying reports on IW:LEARN outputs and articles highlighting knowledge products emerging from GEF projects;</li> </ol>

mainstreamed and institutionalized into GEF IA and ongoing projects, as well as transboundary institutional frameworks of completed projects (e.g., Regional Seas and freshwater secretariats)	2. Produced 12 IW Experience Notes conveying knowledge on a variety of topics emerging from GEF IW projects
	3. Coordinated delivery of Gender, Water and Climate exhibit at 1 global water event in 2005, 2 global water events in 2006; and 7 events in Gender and Water exhibit in 2005.
	4. Recruited and supported 15 projects to deliver GEF IW outreach at 5 IW-related side events.

**Rating of Project Implementation<sup>8</sup>**

	<b>2005 Rating</b>	<b>2006 Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A	MS	Lack of coherency across the project's variegated deliverables and partners, along with emerging mandates, have limited ability to fully excel in all areas; though several instances of excellence exist.
Government GEF OFP <sup>9</sup> (optional)	N/A	N/A	
UNDP Country Office	N/A	N/A	
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	N/A	??	

**Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating**

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<b>Action to be Taken</b>	<b>By Whom?</b>	<b>By When?</b>
Outcome 4: Revise TOR for SEA RLC to ensure more responsiveness to regional projects expressed needs.	UNEP TCC	March 31, 2007
Outcome 4: Expedite delivery of workshops 2-3 in Southeast Europe in 2006	Dep. Director w/Progr. Assoc. & GWP-Med	November 30, 2007
Outcome 5: Develop and present draft sustainability plan to SC	CTA	June 30, 2007

<sup>8</sup> Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

<sup>9</sup> In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

**IV. Risks**

1. Please annex to this report a print out of the corresponding Atlas Risk Tab (please use landscape format and only print the frame).

*(UNOPS does not use Atlas Risk as it is for substantive comments, not really UNOPS issues.)*

2. For any risks identified as “critical” please copy the following information from Atlas:

<b>Risk Type</b>	<b>Date Identified</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Management Response</b>

## V. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the logical framework matrix, since the Project Document signature:

Change Made to:	Yes/No	Reason for Change
Project Objective	TBD by IW:LEARN SC following 2006 MTE	Recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluator
Project Outcomes	TBD by IW:LEARN SC following 2006 MTE	Recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluator
Project Outputs/ Activities / Inputs	Yes	IWRM Roundtable followed CSD-13, due to late project start.

## Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

Change	Reason for Change
Extending UNDP sub-project close date by ~2 months (to Oct 2008), rephrasing deliverables accordingly	UNOPS Personnel hired ~2 months after Aug 2005 ProDOc signature.
Extending UNEP sub-project by 1 calendar year (2009), re-phasing deliverables accordingly	UNEP Personnel hired ~1 year after Aug 2005 ProDoc signature.
Activity B3: No inter-project exchanges in project year 1	Difficulty soliciting interest and organizing effective exchanges during project start-up period; GEF IW projects' demand leaning more towards shorter study tours and inter-project workshops.
Activity B4: Training materials to be prepared for first workshop in Dec 2005	Training manual development and first workshop required more research and securing of more co-sponsorship than anticipated, including to provide simultaneous English-Spanish translation.
Activity D2 extended over 2005-2008 period	Overly ambitious schedule to deliver 3 regional workshops in original (2 year) timeframe
Activity E1 Sustainability plan to be finalized in project year 3	Unable to finalize draft of initial sustainability plan in project year 1-2 due to extended period for recruiting partners and limited staff time for strategic planning.
Activity E2 Timing of event vs. products re-aligned	SC decision to front load IW:LEARN support for outreach events in project year 2-3 (2006); extensive delays in editing, transcribing, and re-editing LME Video script; post-ProDoc addition of <i>IW Experience Notes</i> series (12+ publications to date) in project year 2; need for additional involvement in G&W exhibit after project year 1, as (Gender & Water Alliance) partner underwent transition to independent organization,

## VI. Financial Information

Please present all financial values in US\$ millions to 2 decimal places only (e.g. \$3,502,000 should be written as \$3.50m)

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor <sup>10</sup>	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document <sup>11</sup>	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization <sup>11</sup>	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2006	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
<b>GEF Contribution</b>	GEF	\$0.35m	\$4.93m			\$4.93m
<b>Cash Cofinancing – UNDP Managed</b>						
IISD/IIED/ Environment Canada+B55	NGO/Government			\$0.006m	\$0.003m	\$0.003m
<b>Cash Cofinancing – Partner Managed</b>						
UNEP (and associated divisions)	UN Agency	\$0.03m	\$0.47m		Value not reported	\$0.47m
World Bank Institute	Other Multilateral	\$0.025m	\$0.10m		\$0.02m	\$0.10m
GETF	Private Sector	\$0.015m	\$0.35m*		\$0.10m	\$0.35m
GETF targeted sponsors	Private Sector			\$0.08m	\$0.04m	\$0.08m
<b>In-Kind Cofinancing</b>						
UNDP Cap-Net			\$1.40m		Value not reported	\$1.40m
UNEP (and associated divisions)	UN Agency		\$0.73m		Value not reported	\$0.73m
World Bank Institute			\$0.41m		Value not reported	\$0.41m
UNECE	Multilateral		\$0.22m		\$0.04m	\$0.22m
IUCN-WANI	NGO		\$0.350m	\$0.108m	\$0.458m	\$0.458m
IUCN-GMP	NGO		\$0.30m		Value not	\$0.30m

<sup>10</sup> Specify if: UN Agency, other Multilateral, Bilateral Donor, Regional Development Bank (RDB), National Government, Local Government, NGO, Private Sector, Other.

<sup>11</sup> Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. These may be zero in the case of new leveraged project partners.

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor <sup>10</sup>	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document <sup>11</sup>	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization <sup>11</sup>	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2006	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
					reported	
NOAA	Bilateral Donor		\$.20m		Value not reported	\$.20m
UNESCO	Multilateral		\$.03m		Value not reported	\$.03m
LakeNet	NGO		\$.04		Value not reported	\$.04m
WorldFishCenter	NGO			\$.004	\$.004	\$.03m
ELI	NGO		\$.30m		\$.146m	\$.30m
SEA-START	NGO		\$.29m		Value not reported	\$.29m
GWP	NGO		\$.10m		Value not reported	\$.10m
GWP-Med	NGO		\$.02m	\$.01m	\$.03m	\$.03m
Germany MoE,NC,NS	National Government		\$.15m		\$.13m	\$.15m
Greece MoA	National Government		\$.15m		Value not reported	\$.15m
Francois Odendaal Productions – EcoAfrica	NGO		\$.17m		\$.009	\$.17m
Japan Water Forum	NGO			\$.35m	\$.35m	\$.35m
<b>Total Cofinancing</b>		<b>\$.08m</b>	<b>\$5.78m</b>	<b>\$.56m</b>	<b>\$1.33m</b>	<b>\$6.33m</b>
<b>Total for Project</b>		<b>\$.43m</b>	<b>\$10.71m</b>	<b>\$.56m</b>	<b>\$1.33m</b>	<b>\$11.26m</b>

\* - Cash and In-Kind

### Comments

Please explain any significant changes in project financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement:

IA contributions have yet to be fully realized and enumerated, many other co-finance partners have not been forthcoming in reporting co-finance to PCU, despite repeated solicitations.





**VII. Additional Financial Instruments used in the Project - N/A**

This section only needs to be completed if the project provides funds to any Financial Instruments such as: Trust Funds, Sinking Funds, Revolving Funds, Partial Credit Risk Guarantees, Microfinance services, Leasing or Insurance mechanisms.

If this project does not use any Additional Financial Instruments skip this and go to Section VIII.

Financial Instrument	Financial Institution Responsible for Management	Basis for Selection of Financial Institution

For Each Financial Instrument please complete the following two tables:

Name of Financial Instrument:

Source of Funds (add rows for each source)	Funds Committed in Project Document	Amount Disbursed to Date	Issues or Comments
GEF			

**Rating of Performance of Financial Instrument<sup>12</sup>**

	2006 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator		
Government GEF OFP		
UNDP Country Office		
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor		
<b>Overall Rating</b>		

<sup>12</sup> For ratings, use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

**Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating**

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

**End of Project Situation**

What is to happen to any funds remaining in the Financial Instrument at the end of the project?

### VIII. Procurement Data

Note: For projects or project components executed by UNOPS this section *must not* be filled in - data will be provided by UNOPS headquarters.

Please report the **US\$ value** (*in Thousands, e.g. 70,000 = 70*) of UNDP/GEF Payments made to GEF Donor Countries for Procurement. Please enter Project **expenditure accumulated** from project start up to the date of this report into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project. Please report only on contracts over US\$ 2,000.

Supplying Donor Country	Personnel (US\$ thousands)	Sub-contracts (US\$ thousands)	Equipment (US\$ thousands)	Training (US\$ thousands)	Total (US\$ thousands)
USA	575	1219			1794
Germany		100			100
Greece		160			160
S. Africa		37			37
Russia		47			47
Netherlands		8			8
UK	3				3
Switzerland		350			350
<b>Total</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>1,924</b>			<b>2499</b>

**IX. Lessons**

Are there any lessons from this project that could benefit the design and implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three and indicate which one/s could be worth developing into case studies of good/bad practice.

i) Implementation and execution arrangements should be finalized in advance of Council review, with direct and distinct lines of responsibility for implementation and oversight.
ii) Recruitment and contracting of project personnel and NGO partners may take from 3-12 months each, after project start-up.
iii) Used strategically, the Internet can be a useful tool to increase project transparency and coordination;* not all email or Web interventions are appropriate for every circumstance.*

\* Worth developing into Case Study

**X. Project Contribution to GEF Strategic Targets in Focal Area**

Project is flagship for GEF Strategic Priority (IW-2) for targeted IW learning. Contributions to other strategic targets are described in IW:LEARN's Annual Project Performance Results Template, Section V.