

MID-TERM EVALUATION IW:LEARN Preliminary Draft Recommendations.

Acknowledgements: I should like to thank everybody who has been interviewed to date for their time and patience. I have no doubt, from these interviews, that all the members of the IW:LEARN family are dedicated to delivering the Overall Project Goal.

Participation: It is important to emphasise that this evaluation should, to the greatest extent possible, result in initiatives that are agreed to, and owned by, the participants. In addition it is possible that some of the conclusions and recommendations presented below are based on factually incorrect information. This is not intended and in this respect several experienced minds are better than one relatively rushed one! This is why these recommendations are presented for the consideration of the Steering Committee prior to preparation of the draft final Report.

This evaluation is not intended to be critical but constructive. However, it is very difficult to emphasise the need for possible correction without implying criticism. Please do not be offended and bear in mind IW:LEARN is not a “bad” project. This is an opportunity to make it better.

Definitions: Customers - GEF International Waters Customers- beneficiaries of IW:LEARN goods and services comprising IW Projects, IAs, PALs, GEF and Private sector partners.

Actions: By 30th November 2006: The Steering Committee, having given due consideration to these draft recommendations, should instruct the PCU to issue comment, if any, concerning the evidence on which the draft recommendations are based and suggested corrections, agreements and disagreements to these draft recommendations.

Conclusions: IW:LEARN (or an equivalent instrument) is critical to both the delivery and the legacy of IW Portfolio Projects. Both the delivery and the legacy are essential to improved transboundary waters management. There is some progress in the contribution of IW:LEARN to achieving this goal. However, IW:LEARN does require adjustment and will not fulfil its potential if business continues as usual.

Option to extend:

Assuming necessary corrections are made then IW:LEARN will need to continue after October 2008 if there is to be any substantive legacy. January through December 2007 should be provided to meet the recommendations presented below. If substantive progress in delivering these recommendations is seen to have been made by the

end of 2007 this will allow the final ten months of the IW:LEARN Project to be used to provide firm foundations for a continuation. Ideally any continuation of core goods and services should use institutional funds and not Project funds although IW Projects should contribute value-added.

Option to close:

If, at the end of 2007, IW:LEARN cannot show evidence of the delivery of the proposed recommendations in a clear and objective way, then IW:LEARN should move to closure. This should be done in a way that minimises adverse impact on Project stakeholders and results in a comprehensive inventory of IW:LEARN tools.

Without a secure future it is difficult to see what significant incentive IW Projects have to invest in building the IW:LEARN knowledge base.

The following recommendations are suggested as a way of improving IW:LEARN Project delivery. The key recommendations comprise recommendation 1 (decision based on a review of progress at the end of January 2008) and recommendation 21 (evidence of a secure commitment from IAs to provide funding for core IW:LEARN goods and services for 2 years from October 2008).

A table is provided at the end of the recommendations to facilitate review.

No	Issue/Comment	Solution/Action
1	Review and adoption of recommendations	<p>1. By end January 2008:</p> <p>During January there should be a review of the status of delivery of the recommendations presented below.</p> <p><u>Option to extend:</u> A critical condition for acceptance of the “option to extend” should be the commitment from IAs concerning future funding specified in Recommendation 21. If this recommendation has been met and the Steering Committee is agreed that sufficient of the other recommendations have been met to justify continuation of the Project then the Steering Committee should recommend and approve the option to extend.</p> <p><u>Option to close:</u></p> <p>If this commitment is not secure then the Steering Committee should recommend and approve the Option to close.</p>

		<p><u>Default to closure:</u></p> <p>In the event that the Steering Committee cannot come to an agreement then the default will be for the Project to move to closure.</p>
--	--	---

2	Links to policy could be clearer:	
2.1	Policy linkages: No clear linkages are evident between the International Waters (IW) Portfolio and the Biodiversity and Climate Change Conventions ¹ .	<p>2. By end February 2007:</p> <p>The Steering Committee should request the PCU to identify, and then approve and submit to GEF in writing, requests for clarification on any GEF policy, strategy or operational issues that are causing confusion to IW:LEARN delivery. GEF should respond. This procedure should be repeated at annual intervals.</p> <p>3. By end April 2007:</p> <p>Based on latest GEF Policies and Strategies and feedback on 1 above IW:LEARN should develop a revised Mission Statement and Service Delivery Agreement/Charter specifying core services to its core customers(as defined above). The Service Delivery Agreement should specify SMART services that will be delivered and complaints procedures in the event that the services are not being delivered. To the extent possible this Statement and Agreement should be developed in consultation with the current IW Projects and GEF Secretariat and approved by the Steering Committee.</p> <p>4. By end June 2007:</p> <p>A public communications and/or branding consultancy should identify and obtain agreement with the Steering Committee for delivering a dissemination strategy for the IW:LEARN brand that specifies simple complementary commitments required from core customers.</p> <p>The agreed dissemination strategy should be</p>
2.2	OP overlap: The GEF IW Operational Programs (OP) overlap. Whilst the root causes of many problems need to be addressed in an overlapping way there should be no need for duplication and confusion between what are supposed to be discrete Operational Programmes ^{2,3} .	
2.3	One OP on project document: The Project Document form apparently allows only one OP to be specified where several are applicable.	
2.4	GEF Policy dissemination: IW:LEARN does not presently appear to disseminate GEF Policies, Strategies and Programs in a clear way.	
3	IW:LEARN focus could be clearer	
3.1	OP-10 Component focus: The Component "Regional or global technical support projects" under Operational Program 10 (Contaminants based operational Program) appears to be viewed as a discrete component, perhaps designed to support delivery of all IW Up's, but certainly not focussed on delivery of the other Components in	

	the relatively pragmatic OP-10.	delivered.
		<p>5. By end December 2007:</p> <p>All eligible IW Projects and GEF Secretariat should have been given the opportunity to sign-up to the Mission Statement and Service delivery Agreement. Links to signatories and non-signatories should be notified on each and every signatory IW Portfolio Project home page and on the IW:LEARN home page.</p> <p>By end December 2007 IW:LEARN should have the systems in place to support the Service Delivery Agreement and complaints procedure.</p>
3.2	<p>Logical framework: The logical framework does not provide a clear roadmap for delivering the overall goal. There is limited vertical logic (there should be clear logical links between one component and the next). I am informed that IW:LEARN mnemonic means <u>L</u>earning <u>E</u>xchange and <u>R</u>esource <u>N</u>etwork. To the extent possible the logical framework should have supported delivery of this simple concept. As it is the statements are difficult to understand (an issue highlighted in the terminal evaluation of the Pilot Phase component 1 that should have been addressed).</p> <p>All these constraints inevitably result in problems in logistics and communications and in delivering a Project that is more than the sum of its parts.</p>	<p>6. By end December 2007:</p> <p>If possible the logical framework should be revised and simplified to contain a clear vertical logic that will contribute to delivery of the overall goal. If practical and appropriate it should re-enforce the Learning and Exchange (LE) and Resource Networking (RN) elements of the LEARN mnemonic and there should be a strong emphasis on developing a long-term institutional home for core goods and services.</p>
3.3	<p>Customer focus: There is a lack of understanding, in fact if not in theory, as to the real customers of the Project - the Projects under the GEF IW Projects Portfolio – or the GEF Secretariat. In fact both groups are important – The Projects and the Global Community which is paying for the GEF IW Project Portfolio. However, practically speaking the global community cannot be</p>	<p>See recommendations 2-6.</p>

¹ For example International Waters is not listed in the COP/SBSTTA search criteria (<http://www.biodiv.org/convention/search.aspx>).

² The GEF Operational Programmes need to be reconciled to avoid overlap and duplication. For example the issue of "Invasive alien species" is addressed in "non indigenous species in ballast water" in OP-10 (Contaminants based operational Program) and non-indigenous species in OP-8 (Waterbody based operational Program).

³ It is understood that these are under revision for GEF IV.

	<p>everybody and the focus has to be on the GEF Secretariat as the substantive global customer until such time as IW:LEARN has the systems in place to support broader outreach.</p> <p>IW:LEARN does not appear to be permeated with the philosophy of “Think globally, act locally” but “Think locally, act locally using global funds”. Projects must appreciate the significance of supporting the GEF global perspective.</p>	
--	--	--

4.	Project Cycle deficiencies	
4.1	<p>Pilot phase legacy: There seems to be little objective evidence that key issues (such as overly complex terminology) raised in the terminal evaluation of Component 1 of the Pilot Phase by Mee were addressed in the Project Document for the Operational Phase. In addition evidence that the legacy from the Pilot Phase has been substantively built on is lacking (for example the Projects database from the Pilot phase is not online and some commentators suggest that the legacy of the Pilot Phase website has been lost..</p>	<p>7. By end December 2007:</p> <p>Based on this Mid-Term evaluation the Steering Committee should request the PCU to prepare a communication to GEF indicating the problems with IW:LEARN resulting from deficiencies in the application of Project Cycle procedures. The Steering Committee should approve and transmit the communication to GEF and post the Communication and any response in the Mission Statement and Service Delivery Agreement areas of the IW:LEARN and IW Project toolkit websites.</p> <p>8. By end July 2007:</p> <p>Based on this Mid-Term evaluation and input from the Public Communications consultancy the Steering Committee should request the PCU to commission a study to develop a simple business paper specifying what pre-conditions IW Portfolio Projects, IAs and PALs should meet with respect to IW:LEARN to maximise mutual benefits.</p> <p>The plan should be approved by the Steering Committee and transmitted to GEF for consideration.</p> <p>9. By end December 2007</p> <p>The GEF should respond to the business paper indicating whether it can ensure that new Projects in the GEF IW portfolio will be approved, to a reasonable extent, based on the requirements specified in the simple business plan.</p> <p>One suggested precondition is that <u>new</u> Projects in the IW:Portfolio should have a ring fenced public communications/branding budget. This</p>
4.2	<p>Rushed transition from Pilot to Operational Phase: It is understood that the Operational Phase Project development was relatively rushed. I consider that this has had adverse consequences for IW:LEARN. A more tempered approach would have produced a less complicated logical framework and maximised the legacy of the pilot phase.</p>	
4.3	<p>Operational Phase lacks tools: This is the operational phase of a pilot project. It should, therefore be delivering tried and tested systems. There is little evidence for this even for core services. The key interface between the Projects, Pals, IAs, the GEF, the Private Sector and IW:LEARN should be to help answer the question “How can I do this more effectively?” and not “Why do I need to do it?”</p>	
4.4	<p>STAP review inadequately</p>	

	<p>resourced: It is understood that the STAP roster technical review was done without substantive opportunity to comment on the logical framework. In my view there is no more important milestone in the Project approval process than the STAP roster technical review and it should be resourced accordingly.</p>	<p>budget justified and used to complement the IW:LEARN dissemination strategy and include funds for dissemination and translating of key IW:LEARN disseminated guidelines and toolkits in key project specific stakeholder languages.</p>
4.5	<p>Projects require incentive of sustained knowledge base: Projects within the IW:LEARN portfolio have little incentive or requirement to interface with IW:LEARN. To some extent this is because IW:LEARN is a project with an end date. Its core (improved) services need to be ongoing if Projects (and their legacies) are to have confidence in using them. In addition there must be clear pre-conditions for future GEF IW project approvals that there is project level justification, and resources, for the continuing development and use of the IW:LEARN facility.</p>	
4.6	<p>ToR for the final evaluation: ToR for the Final Evaluation. The process of procurement for the Mid-Term Evaluation was relatively rushed⁴. The procurement for the Terminal Evaluation should not be rushed.</p>	<p>10. By end January 2008:</p> <p>Six months before Project end date: Unless the terminal evaluation is to be done ex-post (after the end of the Project) the Terminal Evaluator(s) should be selected and the evaluation scheduled over the three months before the end of the Project.</p> <p>In either case the evaluation should be <u>electronic</u> to maximise cost-effectiveness. Up to date accounts should be provided and the PCU should allocate up to 10% of its staff time in its workplan to supporting the evaluation.</p> <p>Serious consideration should be given to a substantive increase in the budget for the final evaluation.</p> <p>The ToR for the evaluation should be fine tuned dependent on whether IW:LEARN is likely to continue or not. Consideration should be given to including the following in the ToR:-</p> <p>i. A review of the extent to which the recommendations specified in the Mid-Term</p>

⁴ The evaluator had to buy his own ticket and also take (and pass) the UNOPS "Basic Safety in the Field, - Staff Safety, Health and Welfare (to facilitate mobilisation) two days before he was due to mobilise to the first field mission to Nairobi.

		<p>evaluation have been delivered;</p> <p>ii. A review of percent delivery of IW:LEARN goods and services using objectively verifiable deliverables posted/linked on the IW:LEARN web site map (or equivalent logical framework based structure) and with active links to the electronic source documents.</p> <p>iii. A simple electronic/telephone survey of the satisfaction of core customers (as defined above) concerning the relevance, impact and sustainability of the material goods and services they have received. The survey should also request respondents to identify any key electronic documented materials they will continue to use.</p> <p>iv. An assessment of the utility of the IW:LEARN web site in exchange of information between IW:LEARN and core customers including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a review of objectively verifiable deliverables linked to IW:LEARN deliverables present on the link areas of ten IW Projects that are using the web toolkit. - an assessment of the extent to which IW:LEARN is delivering a common vocabulary to support its dissemination and to ensure interoperability of the products produced by its core IW:LEARN customers. <p>v. A listing of what and where the electronic documented legacy from IW:LEARN is.</p> <p>vi. Recommendations based on lessons learned from the IW:LEARN Project particularly with respect to Project Cycle Management.</p>
--	--	---

5.	Technical delivery	
5.1	Operational Phase lacks tools: The Project still has to mature into an operational phase. There is too much trial and error in delivery of services.	
5.2	Web site and web based toolkit improvement: The web site and toolkit are central to IW:LEARN. The web site has not been working well and there are adverse comments concerning the toolkit and associated level of "help". These deficiencies have alienated a	<p>11. By end August 2007:</p> <p>The IW:LEARN website and toolkit should be independently reviewed to determine how they can be made fit for purpose. The criteria should be that they are:</p>

number of stakeholders. In defence these activities were late in starting and it has been indicated that there is a strong commitment from UNEP to resolving them. However, there is no worse outcome, for a business using web based technology for marketing purposes, than a website that fails to work properly and is intuitively not easy to use. Once customers are lost it is very difficult to get them back.

Good concept: The concept of using the toolkits to allow Projects to manage their own information and, without additional effort, to interface with IW:LEARN and other Projects is a good one. However, a great deal of thought still needs to go into the process. The public communication of this networking philosophy is not strong. For example Projects should be able to clearly see that particular information on their website is accessible through the IW:LEARN web site and to the greatest extent possible the IW:LEARN web site should be a clear “higher level” and “branded” reflection of web toolkit sites.

No common thesaurus/glossary: The web site and toolkit has no thesaurus and/or glossary. There are plans to develop these. A dictionary of common terms and definitions is critical to effective information communication and especially so to support non-English speaking stakeholders. Without a common terminology there is no common language with which to communicate.

- intuitively simple to use;
- support the Mission Statement, Service Delivery Agreement and Business Plan;
- be supported by key words/phrases from existing sources (glossary/thesaurus) that facilitate the labelling of and search for information;
- support the automatic upload and dissemination of key **information links** from IW Project web pages through IW:LEARN;
- support the upload, archiving and dissemination of key **electronic documents** from IW Project web pages through IW:LEARN;
- support the download to IW Project web sites of key information from IW:LEARN.

12. By end December 2007:

A repeat independent review should show that the substantive deficiencies identified in the July/August review have been resolved.

5.3	<p>M&E and Sustainability Plan. The Project still has to deliver an approved monitoring and evaluation plan and a sustainability plan. It does not set a good example to Project level practitioners who are faced with the same requirements and who would benefit from complimentary good guidelines and practices developed and exemplified by IW:LEARN.</p>	<p>13. By end June 2007:</p> <p>The PCU should have prepared, and the Steering Committee agreed, a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and a Sustainability Plan. To the extent possible these Plans should be a model that can be used by IW Projects and include “how do I” guidelines to facilitate replication.</p> <p>Objective evidence of delivery of the M&E plan should be posted as links to electronic verifying documents on the IW:LEARN web site map (or equivalent logical framework structure) with a clear link from the M&E site on the home page.</p>
5.4	<p>Good practice guidelines and toolkits: There seems to be a lack of “good practice” tools. IW:LEARN seems to be asking and answering the question “Why do I need to do it?” rather than “How can I do this more effectively?”. This is contrary to the relatively pragmatic guidance provided in OP-10. It should also not be necessary to spend time identifying issues when there is already a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis or a Strategic Action Plan to work from. If the analyses and plans exist then IW:LEARN should be facilitating delivery by providing good practice tools. If the analyses and plans do not exist then the focus should be on using existing good practice TDA/SAP tools to develop them.</p>	<p>14. By end December 2007:</p> <p>The PCU and Steering Committee, in consultation with IW customers should agree a list of key documented tools and/or guidelines. (These may already exist within IW:LEARN or elsewhere but need to be mainstreamed).</p> <p>By end December these tools and/or guidelines should have been produced in at least draft form, be labelled using the IW:LEARN glossary/thesaurus to facilitate searching, and be clearly accessible on the IW:LEARN website and through the Web toolkit.</p>
5.5	<p>E-Fora: It has been indicated that the E-Fora have not been an effective tool for finding common solutions to common problems in the IW Project family. It is certainly evident that the number and pro-activity of participants in the E-fora have been small and the objectively verifiable deliverables have been limited. However, in theory E-fora should have value where the participants have a strong vested interest in the outcome.</p>	<p>15. By end June 2007:</p> <p>Consideration should be given to scheduling and providing “surgeries” using roster experts where IW Projects can access a particular area of relevant expertise at particular times (perhaps using skype or equivalent). This would provide an opportunity for the IW community to get advice and for the expert to communicate key good practice guidelines and toolkits. The outcome of each surgery should be questions and answers appended to a relevant “surgery toolkit” clearly labelled using the IW:LEARN glossary/thesaurus to facilitate searching and posted in a “surgery area” of the IW:LEARN website and IW Projects web toolkit sites.</p>

6	Project Management	
6.1	Line of Authority: The lack of a single line of Authority and accountability (command and control structure) is detracting from Project delivery. Whilst the Steering Committee should, in theory, be able to address multiple lines of command it is not an efficient or effective use of its time.	<p>16. By end March 2007:</p> <p>The Steering Committee should request the PCU to identify and all IAs to agree a single line of management authority for PCU Management of the Project.</p>
6.2	Co-financing commitments: It appears that there are some problems with delivery of certain co-financing commitments ⁵ .	<p>17. By end December 2007:</p> <p>The IW:LEARN Steering Committee should instruct the PCU to write a letter by end April 2007 copied to the GEF secretariat to all partners who still have outstanding commitments asking them to provide a clear statement as to the status of the commitment. The letter should also indicate that if co-financing commitments cannot be met by end July 2007 then it will not be possible to partner with IW:LEARN.</p> <p>By end December 2007 PCU should have a firm indication of the status of the co-financing commitments.</p>
6.3	Steering Committee Structure and function: Following on from 5.1 the Steering Committee could be better focussed on maximising integration between Project components. To some extent this reflects the fact that particular Implementing Agencies (IAs) are responsible for particular deliverables. Individual members of the Committee may feel that they are responsible for these deliverables rather than for the project as a whole.	<p>18. By end March 2007:</p> <p>Excepting for at least two representatives from IW Projects the Steering Committee should comprise the IAs and GEF. It should not contain persons who are actively involved in the technical or financial implementation of the Project and who may have a conflict of interest with respect to delivery of particular components. Such persons may be represented on the Steering Committee Secretariat.</p> <p>19. By end April 2007:</p> <p>The mode of operation of the Steering Committee, agenda, minutes and opportunity to raise items should be publicly available to the IW Projects.</p>
6.4	Adequate time for Steering Committee duties: It must also be noted that the Steering Committee members do not seem to have been allocated sufficient time by their line managers to maximise the likely	<p>20. By end June 2007:</p> <p>The PCU should have identified, and the Steering Committee, agreed a reasonable amount of time that each and every Steering Committee member should allocate to</p>

⁵ For example ELI is still seeking 35% of its co-financing commitment and it is suggested that if this commitment is not met then it will be difficult to deliver technically.

	effectiveness of their contributions.	<p>IW:LEARN.</p> <p>Each Steering Committee member should have obtained written agreement from respective IA/GEF line Managers to allocate this amount of time.</p>
--	---------------------------------------	---

7	Sustainability of Web Services	
7.1	<p>Sustainability plan: At present there is no secure plan for delivering IW:LEARN goods and services beyond October 2008. It is understood that UNEP is making efforts to institutionalise the web components of IW:LEARN as a module in EcoMundus.</p>	<p>21. By end December 2007:</p> <p>The PCU should draft a letter to be approved by the Steering Committee requesting the IAs to commit separately or severally to cover management costs for the IW:LEARN website and toolkits, including a help desk within their recurrent budget(s) after October 2008.</p> <p>The IAs separately or severally should have provided a written response to the Steering Committee indicating a commitment to funding after the end of the Project. The commitment should be from October 2008 for at least two years.</p>
8	Lessons learned	
8.1	<p>Public communications: Many of the interviewees to date have not had a clear knowledge and understanding of the IW:LEARN Project. This is hardly surprising in view of the overly complicated and obscure text in the logical framework.</p>	<p>A Project which is prejudiced on communication should have a clear public communications strategy and an easily grasped conceptual framework (see earlier recommendations).</p>
8.2	<p>Evaluation criteria: The evaluation criteria originally developed by the OECD of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability are difficult to grasp as discrete concepts.</p>	<p>There should be some effort to reconcile and simplify core evaluation criteria and provide guidance on how objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification can be developed for Project logical frames to facilitate evaluation.</p> <p>22. By end December 2007:</p> <p>The PCU should prepare and the Steering Committee approve a letter to be transmitted to GEF and IAs indicating that guidelines should be developed as to how to incorporate core evaluation criteria into the logical framework of future Projects and review whether the five criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability could be reconciled into a simpler more easily understood framework for use by practitioners.</p> <p>There should be a written response which</p>

		should be posted on the M&E sites of IW:LEARN and IW Project Web toolkit sites.
9	Resources for the changes	
	<p>Re-allocation of resources: Implementing the recommendations will require the re-allocation of some resources from existing budgets. To some extent it is up to the Steering Committee with help from the PCU to make these difficult decisions. The first call on funds has to be the IW:LEARN web site and web toolkit. These tools have to be improved to support inventory and dissemination of core IW Project legacies. The second call has to be the development of good practice guidelines and toolkits that will reduce the need for IW Projects to re-invent the wheel.</p>	<p>23. By end April 2007:</p> <p>The International Conference should be postponed to a future phase (if any) of IW:LEARN. IW:LEARN should focus on developing and delivering its core services rather than on another of the many Conferences on the global environment calendar.</p> <p>There seems to be little benefit in continuing with the development of the SEARLC web site and associated activities until the IW:LEARN website and toolkit are fully operational.</p> <p>Participation by PCU Staff in international “side” events should be minimised. IW:LEARN should get its house in order and, to the extent possible, service its core customers before it attempts to market its (still to be improved) services to the wider community.</p> <p>Workshops, cross-visits and exchanges designed to “identify” needs should be dropped in preference to a reduced number of workshops, cross visits and exchanges that will deliver shared and transferable solutions in the form of documented good practices and toolkits.</p> <p>A revised budget for the remainder of the Project based on the above suggestions should be prepared for and approved by the Steering Committee and (if necessary) IAs and GEF by 30th April 2007.</p>
	End	

RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE

Name, position:

Date and signature:

No	Issue	Recommendation		By when	By who	Agree?	Comment
		No	Recommendation			Yes/No	
1	Review and adoption of recommendations	1	1. Agree to option to extend or option to close based on the status of the recommendations presented herein.	31/01/08	SC		
2	Links to policy should be clearer	2	Policy and strategy clarification from GEF	28/02/07	PCU/SC/GEF		
3	And IW:LEARN focus should be clearer	3	Revised Mission Statement and Service Delivery Agreement/Charter	30/04/07	PCU/SC and core customers		
		4	Dissemination strategy delivered	30/06/07	Consultancy/SC/PCU		
		5	Customers sign-up to Mission Statement and Service delivery Agreement.	30/12/07	Core customers		
		6	Logical framework revised	30/12/07	PCU/SC		
4	Project cycle deficiencies	7	Project cycle deficiencies identified to GEF	30/12/07	MTE/SC/PCU/GEF/ Web sites		
		8	Business plan study	31/07/07	SC/PCU/Consultant/ GEF		
		9	Business plan recommendations mainstreamed into GEF IW Project cycle procedures	31/12/07	GEF		
		10	Select terminal evaluation	30/01/08	PCU/SC/Terminal Evaluator		
5	Technical	11	Independent review of	31/08/07	Consultant/PCU		

	delivery		IW:LEARN website and web based toolkit				
		12	IW:LEARN and web based toolkit deficiencies substantively resolved.	31/12/07	Consultant/PCU, IA (UNEP)		
		13	Approved Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Sustainability Plan	30/06/07	PCU/SC		
		14	Key list of tools and/or guidelines to be disseminated by IW:LEARN.	30/12/07	PCU/SC/Customers		
		15	"Surgeries" strategy for IW:LEARN E-fora to be tested.	30/06/07	PCU/SC/Customers		
6	Project management	16	Agree single line of management authority	31/03/07	PCU/IAs/GEF		
		17	Resolve co-financing commitments	31/12/07	PCU, SC, IAs, PALs, GEF		
		18	Steering Committee composition resolved	30/03/07	PCU, SC		
		19	Steering Committee information publicly available	31/04/07	PCU/SC Customers		
		20	Steering Committee member commitments approved by line Managers.	31/06/07	PCU/SC/IAs		
7	Sustainability of web services	21	IAs separately or severally agree to fund IW:LEARN web site and toolkit for 2 years from October 2008	31/12/07	PCU/SC/IAs		
8	Lessons learned	22	Guidelines for introducing core evaluation criteria into logical framework	31/12/07	PCU/SC/IAs/GEF		
9	Resources for the changes	23	Revised budget agreed to support delivery of recommendations taken from specified activity areas.	30/04/07	PCU/SC/IAs/GEF		