



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 29 November 2007

Re-submission Date: 21 December 2007

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID:

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS No. 3799

COUNTRY(IES): Global

PROJECT TITLE: Good Practices and Portfolio Learning in GEF Transboundary Freshwater and Marine Legal and Institutional Frameworks

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): University of British Columbia (UBC)

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): Cross-Cutting SO1 & SO2; Strategic Programs 1. Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity; 2. Reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion; and 3. Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins.

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:

Expected Calendar	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	NA
GEF Agency Approval	Feb 2007
Implementation Start	April 2007
Mid-term Review (if planned)	Sept 09
Implementation Completion	Feb 2011

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen international cooperation and development of regional IW governance frameworks

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA**	Expected Outcomes – See Annex A for details	Expected Outputs – See Annex A for details	GEF Financing*		Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
1. Identification and Understanding of Good Practices and Fostering a South-South Dialogue.	STA and TA	Performance measures for good governance, and S-S info. exchange	Analysis, report and review of good Practices, and establishment of S-S Peer Exchange group	\$210,000	43%	\$280,800	57%	\$490,800
2. Development and Validation of Experiential Learning Tools, Field Testing, and Training Local Experts in Tool Delivery	STA and TA	Increased availability for information dissemination and understanding in transboundary water management	Experiential tools for capacity development and training in transboundary water management	\$327,000	46%	\$377,000	54%	\$704,000
3. Validation and Promotion of Tools, and Enhancing Collaboration and South-South Learning	TA	Sustained local capacity for replication and implementation of good governance model development	Cadre of local experts to conduct on-going capacity development; 60 GEF practitioners with experience in tool use	\$256,000	41%	\$375,000	59%	\$631,000
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	Efficient monitoring, evaluation and a replicable proj. model	Audit, reports	\$66,000	87%	\$10,000	13%	\$76,000

5. Project management	91,000	37%	165,000	63%	\$256,000
Total Project Costs	950,000		1,207,800		2,157,800

B. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation*</i>	<i>Project**</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>Total at CEO Endorsement</i>	<i>For the record: Total at PIF</i>
GEF	49,686	950,000	99,969	1,099,655	
Co-financing	59,700	1,207,800		1,267,500	
Total	109,386	2,157,800	99,969	2,367,155	

* Provide the status of implementation and use of fund for the project preparation grant in Annex D.

** Please see Annex E for detailed Atlas Budget and Budget Notes.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING, including co-financing for project preparation for both the PDFs and PPG. (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Amount (\$)</i>	<i>%*</i>
Institute for Asian Research UBC	Academic	In-kind	195,000	16.15%
CRELA, La Rochelle Univ.	Academic	Cash/in-kind	14,000/ 84,800	8.18%
El Colegio de Mexico	Academic	In-kind	75,000	6.21%
Oregon State University	Academic	In-kind	50,000	4.14%
Center for Water Law and Policy, Texas Tech University	Academic	In-kind	40,000	3.31%
Bates College	Academic	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
IAR, Andrew Thompson, UBC	Academic	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
M Power, Chaing Mai University	Academic	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
Peace and Conflict Inst., Uppsala University	Academic	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
Mussa Mohammed Abenso, U of Dundee	Academic	In-kind	15,000	1.24%
Law School, University of Washington,	Academic	In-kind	10,000	0.83%
Institute of Resources, Environment and Sustainability, UBC	Academic	In-kind	10,000	0.83%
Compass Resource Management	Private Sector	In-kind	60,000	4.97%
EcoPlan International	Private Sector	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
Resources Administration and Development. Intl.	Private Sector	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
Holguin, Neira & Pombo, Attorneys	Private Sector	In-kind	25,000	2.07%
Pierce Atwood, LLP, Attorneys	Private Sector	In-kind	25,000	2.07%
Tim Hannan, Consultant	Private Sector	In-kind	10,000	0.83%
John Metzger, Consultant	Private Sector	In-kind	10,000	0.83%
Jerry Speir, Attorney	Private Sector	In-kind	10,000	0.83%

Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide	NGO	In-kind	34,000	2.82%
Network for Environmental and Sustainable Development in Central Africa	NGO	In-kind	30,000	2.48%
Aquatic Resources Conservation Group	NGO	Cash/in-kind	7,000/23,000	2.48%
Canadian Water Research Society	NGO	Cash	25,000	2.07%
Asian American Partnership	NGO	In-kind	15,000	1.24%
Institute of Governance and Sustainable Development	NGO	In-kind	10,000	0.83%
Environmental Law Institute	NGO	In-kind	100,000	8.28%
Richard Paisley and Glen Hearn	Academic	Cash-equivalent	35,000*	2.90%
FAO / WRPM (Nile Basin Organization)	International Organizations	In-Kind (Travel)	15,000**	1.24%
Private Sector Support	Private Sector	Cash	10,000***	0.83%
CIDA	Nat'l Govt	Cash	90,000****	7.45%
Sub-Total Co-financing Confirmed			1,092,800	90%
Sub-Total Co-financing Unconfirmed			115,000	10%
Total Co-financing			1,207,800	100%

*Project proponents together have over 400,000 air line points (equivalent to at least \$35,000 international travel) and have committed these to the project.

** Project proponents are scheduled to be in the Nile Basin in December 2007 at the invitation of FAO to conduct a follow up workshop regarding international waters, good governance and experiential learning which among other things will pay their international travel costs to the region and allow them to do additional work on this initiative while they are there. Project proponents have also just recently been retained by the Nile Basin Organization to spearhead an initiative to negotiate a basin wide comprehensive data and information sharing and exchange agreement for the Nile Basin which among other things will fund international air travel to the region on 5 or more occasions in 2008 alone.

*** This line item refers to not yet fully confirmed funds by private sector donors who have previously supported this initiative including by helping to finance the inaugural meeting of this initiative in Vancouver in July 2006 and who have continued to express strong interest in continuing to be involved. These entities include Powerex, BC Hydro, Lawson Lundell Barristers & Solicitors, Columbia Power Corporation and the Columbia Basin Trust.

**** This line item represents a not yet fully confirmed contribution from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to this initiative through the Conferences and Events Secretariat Fund which supports participation by eligible delegates at conferences that address topics of particular interest to CIDA. CIDA's current program priorities include "governance and environmental sustainability, with gender equality as a cross-cutting theme and seeking to influence sustainable development in developing countries and/or countries in transition" all of which resonate with the objectives of this project. Travel for conferences covered by the Fund may be held in Canada or abroad and the Fund will support up to 33% of total conference costs, to a maximum of \$250,000, towards the participation of eligible delegates. Both CIDA and DFAIT (Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada) have also already lent their support to this initiative including by attending and helping to fund the inaugural meeting in Vancouver in July 2006.

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY FOCAL AREA(S), AGENCY(IES) OR COUNTRY(IES)

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>			
			<i>Project Preparation</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>Total</i>
UNDP	IW	Global	49,686	950,000	99,969	1,099,655
Total GEF Resources			49,686	950,000	99,969	1,099,655

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated staff weeks</i>	<i>GEF(\$)</i>	<i>Other sources (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Personnel*	25.0	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
Local consultants*	22.7	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$25,000
International consultants*	8.3	0	25,000	\$25,000
Contractual Services	14.0	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications		\$0.00	\$125,000	\$125,000
Travel	-	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$16,000
Miscellaneous	-			
Total		\$91,000	\$165,000	\$256,000

* Please see Annex C for detailed information regarding the consultants.

** Please see Annex C for detailed information and justification for these line items.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF(\$)</i>	<i>Other sources (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Personnel	10.0	\$12,000	0	\$12,000
Local consultants*	369.1	\$246,000	\$160,000	\$406,000
International consultants*	177.3	\$130,000	\$401,800	\$531,800
Total	556.4	\$388,000	\$561,800	\$949,800

* Rate for local consultants varies (\$1000/wk for GEF payment and higher for in-kind contributions- average is \$1100/wk)

G. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan and Corresponding Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team Staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop	Project Team, UNDP-GEF, Steering Committee	\$26,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	Project Management Team	None	Immediately following GEF IW Conference
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by GEF/UNDP Technical Advisor and Project Coordinator Measurements Steering Committee	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to APR and to the definition of annual work plans
Quarterly Operational Reports (QOR)	Project Team	None	Quarterly
APR/PIR and IW Results Template	Project Team and UNDP-GEF	None	Annually

Steering Committee Meetings	Project Team	None	Following Project IW; subsequently at least annually
Advisory Panel Meetings, or review	Project Coordinator and Advisory Panel members	None	Periodically TBD at inception meeting
Periodic status reports	Project team	None	To be determined by Project team and UNDP HQ
Technical reports	Project team, Hired consultants as needed	None	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-HQ
External Evaluation (including possible mid-term reviews)	Project team, SC, AP, UNDP-GEF, External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	\$31,000	At the end of project implementation
Final Project Report	Project team	None – subsumed under project management	At least one month before the end of the project
Dissemination of M&E outcomes at workshops, forums (i.e. IWC4, WWF5 prep coms, etc.)	project team and GETF	Part of project dissemination	Year three and beyond
Audit	UNDP, Project team	\$9,000	Annually
TOTAL indicative COST (Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)		\$66,000	

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

SUMMARY

The objective of this project is to strengthen international cooperation and enhance the development of regional international waters (IW) governance frameworks with a view towards increasing the social, economic and environmental benefits of GEF International Waters projects globally.

The three components of this project and what they will do are:

Component # 1: (less than 1/4 of co-finance resources and 1/4 of GEF resources) synthesizes key lessons learned and experiences regarding the governance of international waters in various targeted areas. Component # 1 is based in part on previous work done by IW LEARN together with additional syntheses of the collective experience of selected IW practitioners including the project proponents. These analyses and critiques of what worked/did not work in previous GEF funded experiences provide the basic information bank from which the future work of this project springs. Responding directly to the demand of IW practitioners through preliminary surveys and anecdotal evidence these

syntheses of lessons learned and experiences will likely include but will not necessarily be limited to such areas of interest as:

- Data and information sharing and exchange
- Dispute resolution
- Benefit sharing
- Finance
- Negotiation skills

Component # 2: (3/8 co-finance resources and 3/8 of GEF resources) results in the production of a major problem solving leading edge experiential learning “tool kit” that will be available for use during the project and after the project ends. Component # 2 is at the heart of the project. Component # 2 is where the lessons learned and experiences with IW governance to date are transformed into innovative experiential learning tools to help ensure that these lessons learned and experiences are assimilated and acted upon. To cite one example various specialized tools, including custom designed case studies and custom designed negotiation simulation exercises, will be developed to solve the recurring dilemma of how best to negotiate and successfully implement sustainable data and information sharing and exchange agreements between nations sharing freshwater, groundwater and / or marine international waters. Surveys and anecdotal evidence confirm that this dilemma continues to be a major issue everywhere from the Nile River Basin to the Guarani Aquifer to the South China Seas and that lack of knowledge and understanding in this area is a major impediment to portfolio learning and the implementation of best practices.

The experiential learning tools developed for various target areas as part of this component will likely include but will not necessarily be limited to:

- custom designed case studies
- custom designed negotiation simulation exercises
- interactive learning modules directed towards the acquisition of enhanced negotiation, facilitation and mediations skills
- an interactive CD-ROM “text book” (based in part on a series of interactive CD-ROMs already developed for other aspects of IWRM by project proponents and partners)

Component # 3: (3/8 of co-finance resources and 3/8 of GEF resources) focuses on ensuring the sustainability of the tool kit through use and adaptation. Component # 3 is particularly crucial to the testing, verification and adaptation of the outputs of the project and the verification of the project as a whole. The tool kit developed as part of this project will be continuously adapted and refined throughout the life of the project and then made available and heavily promoted after project termination to IW:LEARN and other information exchange mechanisms.

This project is the first ever initiative to seriously: 1. bring together IW practitioners from all three IW realms (marine, surface and groundwater) from all over the world; 2. assist them to work together to identify lessons learned and experiences; 3. work with them to design and implement an experiential learning tool kit, and 4. ensure sustainability of the tool kit through use and adaptation.

In direct response to the demands of various IW practitioners the outputs / deliverables of this project are:

- A sophisticated and adaptable experiential learning “tool kit” likely including but not necessarily limited to: 1. various syntheses of lessons learned and experiences in various target areas related to the good governance of international waters; 2. custom designed case studies; 3. custom designed negotiation simulation exercises; 4. interactive learning modules directed towards the acquisition of enhanced negotiation, facilitation and mediations skills by IW practitioners; and 5. an interactive CD-ROM “text book”;
- A suite of legal and institutional performance measure indicators for measuring good governance in international waters;
- Improved knowledge and understanding by various IW practitioners throughout the IW world of various legal and institutional performance measure indicators for measuring good governance in international waters;

- A significant number of workshops held for various IW professionals throughout the IW world a significant proportion of who will be women;
- A cadre of knowledgeable and trained IW professionals throughout the IW world who will work continuously to improve, modify and adapt the tool kit to help ensure sustainability;
- A cadre of knowledgeable and trained IW professionals throughout the IW world who are ready, willing and able to train others in the implementation of the tool kit to help ensure sustainability;
- Various platforms including web sites produced by the project that will facilitate the dissemination of project results to help ensure sustainability;
- Measurably enhanced media awareness and appreciation of strategies and techniques for the good governance of international waters.

The project will also contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation in relation to IWRM and reform in the water sector.

A thorough review, including both product and process evaluation indicators, will indicate the success of the project.

A. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT RATIONALE AND THE EXPECTED MEASURABLE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:

1. The Goal of this project is to strengthen and promote international and multi-country cooperation, and enhance regime development of regional governance frameworks in order to increase the economic and environmental benefits of GEF International Waters (IW) projects. Through adaptive management decision-making methodologies and collaboration with local experts and practitioners, the project develops, promotes and delivers innovative and targeted experiential learning tools for transboundary water governance, with a unique focus on replicable tools, good practices and lessons learned in the delivery of “on-the-ground” reforms in the governance of transboundary fresh (surface and ground) and marine waters. A central pillar of the project is the development and delivery of management tools by local experts to enhance livelihoods and ensure continuous replication.

The project has three principal components: (1) To identify and analyze legal and institutional beneficial practices in advancing effective governance of transboundary water resources, creating South-South peer learning groups for collaboration; (2) To develop and validate new experiential learning tools and teaching/implementation guides, preparing local experts to apply water governance tools; and (3) most importantly, to deliver and consistently refine those tools through "hands-on" programs involving at least 60 GEF IW practitioners, at least 20% of whom will be women, and thus to create a cadre of local experts in each GEF region to sustain on-going refinement and delivery of tools beyond the term of this project.

2. Nearly half of the world’s population will soon live within one of the planet’s 261 international river basins and will be dependent upon their surface and groundwater resources. Increasing migration to the world’s coastal areas continues to place growing demands on adjacent marine ecosystems which are crucial to livelihoods, health and food security of coastal states. This project is based on the proposition that good governance of international waters is crucial to meeting the challenges of prosperity building, public health and environmental sustainability set by the Millenium Development Goals. Moreover, there is a pressing need for more effective and adaptive legal and institutional frameworks to address the complexities associated with managing international waters and, in particular, to resolve challenges relating to priority transboundary issues such as land and marine based pollution, competing and conflicting uses of water resources, sustaining fisheries, mitigating invasive species and developing adaptive decision-making structures to meet the challenges associated with global climate variability and change. Regrettably there continues to be a dearth of knowledge regarding the quality and efficacy of transboundary legal and institutional arrangements in GEF IW projects. No large scale review has been conducted regarding their effectiveness in meeting management goals. Moreover, there are differing levels of institutional and legal arrangements in various projects: some projects have agreements and protocols, while others lack formal agreements between the states. After 15 years of funding, it is an opportune time to review and assess the functionality of formal and informal legal and institutional arrangements within, and beyond, the GEF IW portfolio. This review and assessment transcends ecosystem classification to cover both marine and freshwater systems while addressing widespread historical failures to integrate surface and groundwater management and also to integrate governance of freshwater and coastal/marine water resource systems. Programs like GEF’s IW:LEARN have assisted greatly in promoting peer learning among GEF projects. However, key

gaps persist, especially in the areas of reporting, collecting and adapting beneficial practices, and in strengthening local delivery of targeted experiential learning. Among other things, there is a lack of knowledge gained from the application of gender mainstreaming in the management of water. Gender mainstreaming is defined by the UNDP as "the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels" as the principal means to achieve these objectives. UNDP endorses this approach, and includes the advancement of women as a core thematic area within its Sustainable Human Development (SHD) framework.

3. GEF is the world's largest financier of multi-national fresh and marine water related transboundary cooperative arrangements, having invested almost a billion dollars in international waters since 1991. After supporting 115 international water projects, this is a critical time to collect and profit from past experiences, to analyze, evaluate facilitating modalities and best practices, and to recycle the benefits of this experience through iterative yet novel experiential learning techniques. The project will take advantage of the momentum created during GEF 2 and 3 for policy, legal, and institutional reforms through the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices emphasizing the use of South-South dialogues to both create and apply targeted learning tools. While respecting the differences in various ecosystems, this project is innovative in that it disregards traditional views of focusing on specific ecosystem management, such as marine or river waters, to distill and disseminate the key elements of effective governance of any transboundary waters. The results of this project will be reflected in strengthened policy and institutional reforms across the GEF portfolio, and in individual and programmatic lending operations supported by the GEF, World Bank Group, FAO and other implementing agencies. African operations in the GEF portfolio (and those of other funders) will be a priority due to that continent's vulnerability in terms of climate variability, as well as the significance of harnessing the benefits of shared water resources to achieve Millennium Development Goals and ongoing and future need for environmentally sustainable governance tools in building prosperity in that region.

4. This project's efforts will directly address gaps identified above by assessing the GEF IW portfolio, identifying successful and replicable regional governance approaches (legal, policy, institutional) that are being effectively piloted, and by developing and demonstrating iterative locally adaptable experiential learning tools for greater success in transboundary waters governance. These tools then can be used by GEF for enhancing current projects and new GEF project proposals. Moreover, by emphasizing close collaboration with local experts and practitioners in the development and the delivery of the learning tools, local capacity will be developed and endure well beyond the project itself. In addition to strengthening the capacity of local partner institutions achieved by this project, through fostering a network of local experts capable of delivering learning tools, a culture of good governance will be cultivated even as individual IW practitioners change. This project cuts across all bio-physical IW systems in focusing on institutional and legal mechanisms necessary for good governance and wise decision-making in all transboundary water management arenas. The project will research and develop performance measurement criteria for institutional development and appropriate decision-making methods, including incorporation of stakeholder values and public consultation processes. Methods such as structured decision making and trade-off analysis are powerful tools in combination with an understanding of the principles of international law and adaptive management. These methods are particularly useful when confronted with a variety of differing values and opinions as occurs in integrated water resources management, particularly at the transboundary level. Essential to the sustainable management of these complex socio-ecological systems is the ability to make effective and efficient decisions that capture the multifaceted stakeholder interests associated with them. This project will establish decision support mechanisms and, through the creation of a network of local trainers, will ensure that there is replicability at local and regional and national levels.

5. The initial application for this project (a PDF A Grant for \$50,000 USD) was approved in June, 2006. This funded a workshop of international experts in Vancouver in July, 2006. The participants, representative of all GEF regions, outlined the substantive contributions which this project could make to strengthen multi-state waters governance. Subsequent to the meeting, a comprehensive survey was conducted among attendees and current GEF IW portfolio managers soliciting their input on priority areas for enhancing governance. The findings of the workshop and responses from the survey converged on the need for better understanding and institutional capacity in trans-boundary waters governance in the following priority areas: basic and advanced legal principles of shared waters; institutional aspects of managing shared waters; methods of increasing the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement; and sustainable management decision-making practices. The project has encompassed those needs as expressed by experts in the field.

A list of attendees, summary of the proceedings and of the results of the survey accompany this proposal in the PDF A Report.

A.2. OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES:

The overall project goal is to foster good governance and effective decision making in international waters management through identification, collection, adaptation and replication of beneficial practices that focus on effective and functional legal and institutional frameworks for cooperation.

Objectives

The objective of this project is to strengthen and promote international and multi-country cooperation, and enhance regime development of regional waterbody governance frameworks in order to increase the economic and environmental benefits of GEF International Waters (IW) projects globally.

The project is comprised of three interdependent components.

Component 1

Component 1 has the following goals:

- i) Increasing understanding and knowledge of key elements of legal and institutional frameworks for good governance and decision-making.

This will be achieved through the identification, analysis and codification of successful approaches of international waters (IW) within and beyond the GEF portfolio, and the determination of performance measures. The output of this will be a report on the identification of performance measures for good governance of international waters. Activities will include desk analysis, interviews, extensive interaction with field practitioners and field visits to selected areas for detailed analysis. This component will investigate up to 25 waterbodies including travel to a lesser number of locations to allow for more in-depth analysis. These could include: Rivers -- the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, the Dnieper, the Okavango, the Kagera, the Senegal, the Bermejo, the Mekong, the Syr Darya, the Amu Darya, and the Columbia; Lakes -- Lake Victoria, Lake Tanganyika and the ICJ experiences with the Great Lakes; Groundwater -- the NW Sahara and the Guarani Aquifers; Marine systems -- the Benguela Current, the Guinea Current, the Red Sea, The Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, the South China Sea Large Marine Ecosystem, the Mediterranean GPA Protocol, the Pacific SIDS fisheries, and the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape Initiative. Close ties will be developed with the UNDP/GEF-MSP Transboundary Waters Management Experience in Europe, Caucasus and Central Asian program, as well as with the proposed regional MSP testing adaptive learning mechanisms to improve regional water systems governance in Africa in order to complement that work and to share both project implementation experiences as well as substantive findings. Part of the activities will also involve an assessment of “on the ground” needs and experiences for capacity building, including those already generated by IW:LEARN and PDF A Workshop and Survey results. The results of the research will be circulated to the Advisory Panel as well as the South-South Peer Review Group (see below).

- ii) Promoting facilitated exchanges of experience and increased partnership implementation.

This will be achieved through the establishment of a South-South Peer Review Group (S-S PRG) and learning networks, and will incorporate local objectives for capacity building. The S-S PRG will be initiated at the onset of the project and will continue for the duration of the project. This will involve regional meetings as well as global meetings, taking advantage of IW conferences and workshops.

Component 2

Component 2 has the following goals:

- i) The primary goal of component 2 is accelerating capacity building for good governance of IW through the creation and promotion of novel experiential learning tools specifically targeted for GEF IW practitioners, designed in collaboration with local experts and practitioners.

The outcome of this component will be an enhanced ability to promote good governance in IW. The output will be a series of novel experiential learning tools for good governance focusing on understanding and promoting effective legal and institutional frameworks and decision-making. The experiential learning tools will include case studies, negotiations, role play simulation exercises, and interactive tools. Tools will be developed in collaboration with South-South PRG and regional groups and local experts. The tools will include electronic CDs and web-based platforms. Possible software will be “tool-books,” “illumina” and “visio-basic” for example. The tools will be developed for capacity building of professional practitioners, but will also be available as teaching tools in universities for graduate courses. El Colegio de Mexico will be a partner institution in this and other academic partners may include Chulalongkorn University, the University of Bogota and the University of Addis Ababa.

- ii) The other major output from this component will be the creation of a cadre of local experts trained in tool delivery to ensure replication and on-going development of the tools.

A trainers guide and course programs of 1, 2 and 5 days will be developed including electronic presentation packages. The guide will be tested and enhanced during the creation of a cadre of local experts who will be responsible for the majority of the training under component 3. Two Experiential learning capacity development courses will be conducted for training local experts in tool delivery through appropriate institutions, such as UNESCO-IHE, IAR, and el Colegio de Mexico. Training Guides will be available in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese as appropriate. Information and promotion of the tools will be done at regional workshops and international conferences.

Component 3

Component 3 has the following goals:

- i) The primary goal of this component is building local capacity of GEF and other IW practitioners in good governance through targeted experiential training and adaptive learning; and ensure local capacity to replicate experiential learning programs that foster a culture of good governance in IW.

The outcome will be enhanced capacity of GEF practitioners in good governance and effective decision-making, including experienced local experts to replicate learning programs. Activities will center on conducting regional targeted programs where local experts are delivering to regional practitioners. This activity will take place over at least three regional capacity building sessions and will be given to a minimum of 60 GEF practitioners in IW, 20% of who will be women. Advantage will be taken of all regional and international meetings to deliver the materials, but a minimum of 3 programs of 5 days will be conducted. The outcome will be enhanced collaboration between GEF practitioners, increased effectiveness in decision-making, including engagement and participation of civil society and other interest groups. A survey determining understanding and knowledge of IW practices will also be conducted to monitor the success of the workshops.

- ii) A secondary goal of the component will be the promotion and awareness of the tools.

This will be achieved through partner organizations and the continuation of the South-South PRG, academic papers, conferences, media, web-based platforms such as IW:LEARN, CAP at UNESCO-IHE. Development and continued maintenance of UBC IAR web site will assure ease of accessibility to tools, Teaching Guide and project gathered/developed materials.

This project fosters dialogue between GEF project practitioners and builds on South-South learning experiences. This will be sustained in part by the South-South Peer Review Group initiated in the first component and established in a manner that will facilitate on-going exchange of ideas and solutions after the project concludes. While the project expert team and staff have excellent credentials and many years of experience worldwide, the contributions of the project's partners in the field will be equally essential to accomplishing this work.

The project is evaluated through a program consistent with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation guidelines including a suite of evaluation indicators to help judge the eventual success of the project.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

Participants in IW:LEARN regional workshops in all GEF regions consistently affirm the benefits and need for further sharing of knowledge and practical experience on legal and institutional aspects of good governance. In a PDF A experts workshop, held in July 2006 in Vancouver with representatives from countries in all major GEF regions (Asia Pacific, Latin America, Africa, Eastern and Central Europe and the Caucasus), recommendations were made that capacity building in several key areas of international water governance were needed by IW practitioners in the field. Subsequent to the workshop a survey was sent out to GEF project managers soliciting their input for capacity building needs in their various projects. The findings of the workshop and the responses from the survey converged on the need for better understanding and institutional capacity in trans-boundary waters governance in the following priority areas: basic and advanced legal principles of shared waters; institutional aspects of managing shared waters; methods of increasing the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement; and sustainable management decision-making practices. The project design ensures that the project is demand-side driven. The tools created and delivered and capacities built will contribute to a wide range of national and regional priorities or plans by facilitating the effective development and adoption of regional legal and institutional frameworks – ex. by incorporating regional GEF frameworks into national frameworks.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

The project is crosscutting and involves multiple GEF Strategic Programs: 1. Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity; 2. Reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion; and 3. Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins. This project correlates with the portfolio learning mandate of each program. Its emphasis on targeted experiential learning for capacity building and South to South experience sharing among existing and a limited number of new IW projects will foster multi-country collaboration on priority transboundary concerns. It will facilitate enhancement of portfolio successes through development, use and accelerated replication of good practices. As mentioned in the Draft Strategic Programs for GEF-4 (April 26, 2007): “ An increased emphasis on targeted experience sharing and learning among the new and existing GEF IW projects in the portfolio is planned to improve capacity of projects to achieve objectives and to identify and replicate good practices before project completion. South-to-South experience sharing among IW projects contributes to quality enhancement for the GEF IW portfolio, development of knowledge management tools to capture good practices, and accelerated replication of good practices. With the help of its IW:LEARN program, its web-based resource center (www.iwlearn.net), and the GEF International Waters Task Force, this portfolio learning is an important feature of GEF programming and will be enhanced with a focus on many Africa IW operations now underway.” This project will help satisfy this GEF effort.

D. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The over 140 GEF-recipient governments working to strengthen joint management of over 50 shared water-bodies are the primary stakeholders relevant to the project objectives, as well as civil society organizations in these countries plus existing and/or nascent IW intergovernmental bodies interested in establishing and/or strengthening IW legal and institutional frameworks.

Stakeholders with particular interest and/or aptitude in strengthening international waters governance include: The GEF and all of its various implementing agencies (UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, FAO, UNIDO, AfDB, ADB, IADB, EBRD, IFAD); multi- and bilateral donors such as the EU, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), DFID, Swedish SIDA, US-AID and others; the UN-ECE; and a number of generous private sector supporters of the project. Various research institutions throughout the world specializing in international water and energy law and policy and who have expressed particular interest in this initiative also include Texas Tech University; University de la Rochelle; Oregon State University; University of Washington; Bates College; University of Dundee; Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok; the United Nations University for Peace; the University of the Pacific, Sacramento, California; the Water Initiatives Project at the Munk Center, University of Toronto, Toronto; the University of Upsala (Sweden); and the

Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies. Many of these institutions have pledged co-finance support to this project. See Table I.C. for the list of co-finance supporters.

Among the numerous NGOs and philanthropic foundations who have also expressed particular interest in this initiative are the Environmental Law Institute, WWF USA and IGSD, all in Washington, DC; ELAW, Eugene, Oregon; Canadian Water Research Society, Vancouver, Canada; the Aquatic Resources Conservation Group, Seattle, Washington; the Colombia Society of Environmental Law; and the Asian Environment Centre. For further details, please see co-finance table herein. In August 2006, participants in the July '06 Vancouver workshop and all current GEF project managers were surveyed to determine if there was a convergence of opinions regarding the major pressure points for capacity development in international waters governance. The attendees represented all GEF regions and have significant professional experience in environmentally sustainable governance in developing countries.

The GEFSEC has been integrally involved with the genesis of this project from the beginning through a number of face to face meetings, telephone conversations and email correspondence. Also involved since the inception of the project have been the lead counsel for the World Bank on water issues and the lead counsel for the World Bank on sustainability issues. Their involvement has also been through both face to face meetings and telephone and e mail correspondence. In addition, one of this projects main proponents has also worked, or is currently working, with counsel for the World Bank on international water and energy issues in the Mekong, the Nile Basin and Central Asia.

Other international agencies associated with the international waters area who have been involved in the gestation of this project include UNESCO, FAO, and the World Bank Institute. Attached is a letter of support from UNESCO. The individual most closely associated with the project from an FAO perspective continues to be the Director, Legal Development Division in Rome. One of this projects main proponents has worked with FAO on international water governance issues including in Cairo, Bujumbura, Rome and Nairobi.

The project has also already forged preliminary links with the World Bank Institute, UNDP and IW:LEARN. Indeed IW:LEARN has also been integrally involved in the development and formulation of this project.

In addition to the above, a large number of individuals and institutions from government, the NGO community, academia and the private sector with background and experience in the governance of international waters, including a significant number from developing countries, have been associated with the project from the beginning.

E. DESCRIBE THE INCREMENTAL REASONING OF THE PROJECT:

The following is based on the Operational Guidelines for Incremental Cost Analysis – Information Requirements at GEF Project Cycle Stages

The five step incremental analysis for this project at CEO endorsement stage is as follows:

Step # 1 – Analysis of “Business as Usual Scenario”

“Business as Usual” would mean that “lesson learned” and “best practices” regarding good governance of international waters in the GEF portfolio would continue to not be identified and shared on a regular and effective basis. With “business as usual” there will be little, if any, cross pollination between international marine, international groundwater and international freshwater “lesson learned” and very little in the way of assimilation of knowledge through the development and implementation of advanced experiential learning techniques. With “business as usual” there will also most likely continue to be needless duplication of effort and missed opportunities for cooperation and collaboration within and between GEF initiatives.

Step # 2 – Analysis of Global Environmental Benefits and Strategic Fit

The Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) associated with this project center on the unique opportunity to identify and share lessons learned and best practices as they relate to good governance of international waters. The project is truly global in scope and involves NGO and other partners from throughout all the regions of the world where GEF is currently active. Regrettably without GEF support those who fail to learn from history will be indeed doomed to repeat it. To use but one example from the international freshwater area just think how much time, money and effort could have been saved in negotiating the recent Nile Basin Agreement if there had been a better awareness and appreciation

of the lesson learned and best practices from other GEF supported initiatives?

Among the indicators that will be used to track progress in the realm of GEB will be number of dispute resolution strategies successfully integrated into international waters agreements and the number of data and information sharing and exchange agreements successfully implemented within and between countries sharing international waters. The project will specifically come to grips with those GEF strategic objectives that are focused on balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins.

Step # 3 – Incremental Cost Reasoning and GEF role

The expected global benefits in the context of the focal area under which the proposal has been submitted for GEF funding include making significant and unique contributions to balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins, restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity, and reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion. Thus, a whole range of GEF IW programs, reflecting freshwater, marine and coastal water bodies, will benefit from the project.

The project's contribution to expected global environmental benefits (GEB) is reflected by the following impact indicators and targets in the project results framework:

Project Objective: To foster good governance and effective decision-making in international waters management through adaptation and replication of beneficial practices that focus on effective and functional legal and institutional frameworks for cooperation.

Sample Indicators:

- specific performance indicia for IW good governance developed;
- demand driven targeted syntheses of lessons learned and experiences produced;
- targeted experiential learning case studies produced;
- targeted negotiation simulation exercises produced;
- CD-ROM "textbooks" produced;
- training meetings held with local experts and GEF IW practitioners, of which 20 % will be women;
- local experts trained in tool delivery for replication purposes;
- south to south peer to peer implementation teams established.

Step # 4 – Determination of Result based Framework

In satisfaction of this step please see the attached detailed logical framework matrix (Annex A) including relevant indicators, risks and assumptions.

Step # 5 – Role of Co-finance

Please see attached co-finance matrix for identification of sources, amounts and types of co-finance as well as GEF and co-finance by outcome.

Each co-finance partner is committed to helping to pay for a portion of the cost of the GEB emanating from this project.

F. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:

Note the following table is composed of numerous detailed risks outlined in the LogFrame (Annex A).

Risks	Assumptions	Mitigation Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant information may not be obtainable in a timely fashion; - Governance arrangements may not be studied in adequate depth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are common elements of 'good governance' in marine and freshwater systems - That current local areas of conflict and concomitant security risks will not limit information gathering. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a larger data base of international water situations than are necessary so that there are 15% redundancy and can be used as fall back if problems arise with any of the initial selected areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not have access to specific local areas, or relevant information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access will be possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Begin very early developing a relationship with the necessary personnel to ensure access to information, use fall-back study areas if necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not find appropriate Local Experts for South-South Peer Review Group; May be a challenge to find 20% women local experts. - Meetings may not be held/ poorly attended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local professionals have time to attend peer group and meetings. - ICT capacity of all members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage early to develop appropriate links with potential S-S peer group members, include redundancy in search - Emphasise identifying women for the S-S peer group.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time and resource limitations hamper 100% accomplishment of tool development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tools developed with sufficient input from South-South PRG and with time for Advisory panel to assess/approve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At onset of project continue to look for additional resources to ensure tool development is executed to the maximum extent. - Develop protocol for input from S-S PRG and Advisory Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be able to test out the T/I Guide at appropriate institutions in Vancouver. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UBC and/or SFU will be able to conduct training of trainers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify alternative institutions such as el Colegio de Mexico and IHE UNESCO-IHE may not be able to accommodate course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNESCO-IHE may not be able to accommodate international water course capacity building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course will be incorporated into existing curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage early to develop and alter curriculum at IHE. Identify alternative institutions such as El Colegio de Mexico.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not find sufficient appropriate local experts to train for experiential tool delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will find sufficient appropriate local experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage early in identification of local experts. Some may come from the S-S PRG, and local institutions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 60 practitioners many not be available for full experiential training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training locations found, and practitioners are available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organise workshops in conjunction with larger meetings; develop training workshops for smaller numbers (5-7 people) and conduct more of these per region if 20 people cannot

		attend.
- The Understanding and Knowledge Survey may not be properly responded to by recipients; and S-S PRG members do not stay in touch	- Target audience will be enthusiastic as will be the S-S PRG	- Effort will be made to develop an easily answered survey, the survey will be conducted both immediately before the training as part of the application to attend training.
- Partner organizations decline to cooperate and incorporate tools. - Training in ICT capacity may be required for web based platforms.	- Partner organisations will cooperate. - Practitioners are familiar with web-based tools.	- Chose partner organisations carefully and develop MOUs for engagement. - Show web-based platform as part of tool delivery.

G. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:

1. The primary objective of this project is to identify and share lessons learned and best practices with regard to the good governance of international waters. The tremendous cost effectiveness of this project follows from the fact that sharing these lessons learned and good practices will avoid the time, trouble and expense of having to relearn these lessons and good practices with every new GEF initiative;
2. The project proponents have designed the project to be particularly cost effective with regard to such expenses as international travel and other fixed costs by purposefully arranging for project activities to coincide with activities funded by other funders;
3. The project proponents have already attracted more than a 1:1 co-finance match to help make the project particularly cost effective with more to come after approval by GEF.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

Following the successful application of a PDF A grant, an IW experts workshop was held in July 2006 to make recommendations for this MSP. At that workshop members of UBC’s IAR (Dr. Richard Kyle Paisley), UNDP (Dr. Andrew Hudson), El Colegio de Mexico (Dr. Boris Graizbord), and IW:LEARN (Janot-Riene Mendler de Suarez) discussed coordination and collaboration between the implementing agency (UBC) and executing agency (UNDP).

The cornerstone of this project will be its transparency and critical rigor. The project steering committee (SC) will be formed from key personnel from GEF implementing and executing bodies, including UNDP, UNEP and WB members. The SC will meet at least every 9 to 12 months. The project management team (PMT) will be comprised of key individuals chosen by the executing body, the University of British Columbia, and administered through the Institute of Asian Research at UBC. An Advisory Panel (AP) of specialists in legal and institutional aspects of shared waters management will be created to work with the PMT on substantive project issues and to provide guidance for work. The Chair of the AP will also be a member of the SC to ensure fluid communication between the two bodies. Site choice will be reviewed by the AP to ensure transparency. Analysis will be primarily conducted by the executing bodies, and reviewed by the coordinating body and AP.


The project will be implemented by the UNDP (under the International Waters focal area), and executed, through either by UNOPS or by UBC through UNDP NGO execution modality (TBD), by the Institute of Asian Research, at the University of British Columbia. The executing bodies will consult and collaborate with UNDP/GEF and GEF-IW project staff and partners as appropriate.

Documentation of this arrangement is found under the approved PDF A application dated 8 June, 2006.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:

The Project Design has been adjusted to be even more demand side driven as compared with the original concept developed in the PDF.

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.	
 John Hough UNDP-GEF Deputy Executive Coordinator, a.i.	Andrew Hudson, UNDP-GEF Principal Technical Advisor Project Contact Person
Date: 21 December 2007	Tel. and Email: 1-212-906-6228, andrew.hudson@undp.org
<i>Name & Signature</i> GEF Agency Coordinator	Project Contact Person
Date: <i>(Month, Day, Year)</i>	Tel. and Email:

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<p>Project Objective: To foster good governance and effective decision-making in international waters management through adaptation and replication of beneficial practices that focus on effective and functional legal and institutional frameworks for cooperation.</p>		<p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on specific performance indicators for GEF and non-GEF IW Legal/institutional frameworks; • Demand driven targeted synthesis of lessons learned produced; • Targeted experiential skills based learning and negotiation simulation modules produced; • CD ROM of text books produced • Number of local experts capable to deliver experiential learning program for replication; • The number of GEF IW practitioners trained, 20% of who will be women; • South to South peer to peer implementation teams established. • The capacity building tools developed are widely used (# of downloads, # of requests for material, courses held etc.); 				
Outcomes	Output	Indicator	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Input GEF	Input Co-Fin
<p>Component 1: Identification and Understanding of Good Practices and Fostering a South-South Dialogue.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p>1.1 IDENTIFY AND ANALYSE SUCCESSFUL APPROACHES TO GOVERNANCE OF INTERNATIONAL WATERS (IW) WITHIN AND BEYOND THE GEF PORTFOLIO, AND DEFINE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN COOPERATIVE REGIME BUILDING.</p> <p>1.2 PROMOTE FACILITATED EXCHANGES OF EXPERIENCE THROUGH ESTABLISHMENT OF SOUTH-SOUTH PEER REVIEW GROUP (S-S PRG) AND LEARNING NETWORKS, AND INCORPORATE LOCAL OBJECTIVES FOR CAPACITY BUILDING.</p>					210,000	280,800
<p>Outcome 1.1.1 A clear understanding of institutional and decision making frameworks that provide effective governance of international water resources, with</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1.1 Report and CD “Review and analysis of GEF and non-GEF international waters legal and institutional frameworks and other relevant frameworks”</p>	<p>-Identification of common elements of ‘good governance’ in marine and freshwater systems; -Analysis vetted by Southern practitioners as well as international experts; -Analysis conducted on up to 25 arrangements that cover marine; groundwater, and river systems;</p>	<p>-Report and CD are written and approved by advisory body and Executing Agency staff; -Variety of experiences studied in different ecosystems; -Cross cutting institutional performance measures found; - up to 25 legal/institutional arrangements surveyed;</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> -Relevant information may not be obtainable in a timely fashion; - arrangements may not studied in adequate depth. <i>Assume:</i> - There are common elements of ‘good</p>	70,000	100,000

a particular focus on those elements which developing country practitioners find most beneficial.		-Creation of institutional performance measures.		governance' in marine and freshwater systems. –that current local areas of conflict and concomitant security risks will not limit information gathering.		
	Output 1.1.1.2 On the ground analysis of a variety of IW regimes at various stages of development.	-Analysis conducted by local experts identifies common elements of 'good governance.'	-Local analysis conducted; -Analysis of local level management and international impact. -Good governance will include participation of women.	<i>Risks:</i> - May not have access to specific local areas, or relevant information. <i>Assume:</i> Access will be possible.	60,000	80,800
Outcome 1.2.1 Increased interaction and South-South dialogue of experiences and objectives in regime management.	Output 1.2.1.1 Formation of South-South Peer Review Group and regional groups for dialogue and target group input for project direction, tool development, and information source (beyond data base and reports).	-Greater exchange of information and experience between South-South practitioner; -Number of people involved in peer groups; -Activity in ICT between peer groups. -Document women practitioners to ensure gender parity.	-South-South Peer Review Group (and regional groups) established; -At least one meeting held per region (Africa, Latin America and Asia); -Initiate project survey of understanding and knowledge for South-South groups, and others.	<i>Risks:</i> -May not find appropriate Local Experts for South-South Peer Review Group; - May be a challenge to find 20% women local experts. - Meetings may not be held/ poorly attended. <i>Assume:</i> - Local professionals have time to attend peer group and meetings. -ICT capacity of all members.	80,000	100,000
Component 2: Development and Validation of Experiential Learning Tools, Field Testing, and Training Local Experts in Tool Delivery.						
Objectives:						
<i>2.1 ACCELERATE CAPACITY BUILDING FOR GOOD GOVERNANCE OF IW THROUGH THE CREATION AND PROMOTION OF NOVEL EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING TOOLS SPECIFICALLY TARGETED FOR GEF IW PRACTITIONERS, DESIGNED IN COLLABORATION WITH</i>					327,000	377,000

LOCAL EXPERTS AND PRACTITIONERS.						
2.2 ENHANCE THE LOCAL AND REGIONAL CAPACITY TO FOSTER A CULTURE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN IW.						
Outcome 2.1.1 Enhanced ability to promote good governance mechanisms through the development of experiential learning tools, and increased use of learning technology by GEF practitioners, including IW:LEARN.	Output 2.1.1.1 Novel and targeted experiential learning tools for good governance of international waters, focusing on understanding and promoting effective legal and institutional frameworks and decision making.	-Novel targeted experiential learning tools for governance and decision-making are developed; -Collaborative development and testing begins; -South-South Peer Review Group helps develop/approves tools; -Advisory panel approves tools; -Dissemination of materials and project information at regional meetings, international conferences etc.	-Project reporting; - Collaboration conducted with South-South PRG groups and local experts; - Meeting held of South-South PRG.	<i>Risks:</i> Time and resource limitations hamper 100% accomplishment. <i>Assume:</i> Tools developed with sufficient input from South-South PRG and with time for Advisory panel to assess/approve.	120,000	128,000
	Output 2.1.1.2 Teaching/Implementation Guide and course programs (1, 2, 5 days) are developed (in electronic form) specifically for replication purposes; Testing done.	-Creation of Teaching/Implementation Guide doc. and materials; - Proto-testing occurs at UBC and Simon Fraser University (SFU).	- Project reports; - Production of Teaching/Implementation Guide.	<i>Risks:</i> May not be able to test out the T/I Guide. <i>Assume:</i> UBC and/or SFU will be able to conduct training of trainers.	35,000	74,000
	Output 2.1.1.3 Field Testing 1: Experiential learning conducted through appropriate institutions, such as UNESCO-IHE, FAO,IAR, and IW:LEARN etc.	-Field testing 1: Training is conducted in UNESCO-IHE and through IW;LEARN, and others.	- Training course utilized into UNESCO-IHE ; - Courses available through IW:LEARN, and other sites.	<i>Risks:</i> UNESCO-IHE may not be able to accommodate course. <i>Assume:</i> Course will be incorporated into existing curriculum.	35,000	100,000
Outcome 2.2.1 Ongoing local and regional capacity building to	Output 2.2.1.1 Local experts trained in tool delivery; Enhanced South-South collaboration and	-10-15 local experts trained in program delivery, a minimum of 20% will be women; - South-South peer	- Project reports; - Report on training; - South-South peer groups convene to receive training/share	<i>Risks:</i> May not find sufficient appropriate local experts. <i>Assume:</i> Will find	137,000	75,000

foster a culture of good governance in IW.	networking accomplished through peer groups; Dissemination of project materials and information.	groups are active in collaboration/participation; Dissemination of project plan/materials at meetings and conferences, web etc.; - Materials translated as appropriate into French, Portuguese (for Angola, Mozambique, Brazil) and Spanish.	ideas & help develop/ validate tools; -Attend at least three regional events (taking advantage of conferences and international meetings) to disseminate.	sufficient appropriate local experts.		
Component 3 –Validation and Promotion of Tools, and Enhancing Collaboration and South-South Learning. Objectives: <i>3.1 BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY OF GEF AND OTHER IW PRACTITIONERS IN GOOD GOVERNANCE THROUGH TARGETED TRAINING AND ADAPTIVE LEARNING; AND ENSURE LOCAL CAPACITY TO REPLICATE EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PROGRAMMS TO FOSTER A CULTURE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN IW.</i> <i>3.2 ENHANCE COLLABORATION BETWEEN GEF IW PRACTITIONERS.</i> <i>3.3 BUILD AWARENESS AND PROMOTE THE USE OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING TOOLS WITHIN THE GEF PORTFOLIO, AND BEYOND, ASSURING EASE OF ACCESSIBILITY. DEVELOP & DELIVER INNOVATIVE “ON THE GROUND” TRAINING TOOLS AND BUILD ON IW:LEARN, AND OTHER INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND LEARNING MECHANISMS SUCH AS THE GLOBAL DISTANCE LEARNING NETWORK, THOSE OF THE WORLD BANK INSTITUTE, AND IUCN’S WATER AND NATURE INITIATIVE TOOLKITS.</i>					256,000	375,000
Outcome 3.1.1 Enhanced capacity of GEF practitioners in good governance and effective decision-making, including capacity of local experts to replicate learning programs (by delivering <i>in-situ</i> capacity building programs to ensure replication).	Output 3.1.1.1 Final package of experiential training tools, including CD, and web-portal; -Formal targeted training conducted for up to 60 GEF practitioners.	-Knowledge surveys are conducted before and after training to assess understanding; -10-15 local experts experienced in program delivery. -Formal training, conducted by local experts, of up to 60 GEF practitioners, a minimum of 20% who are women; - Three regional training workshops; -Tools are validated through evaluations and workshops; -Tools are used by training facilities;	- Project reporting; - Reporting from training sessions; - Participant Training evaluations; - Knowledge surveys.	<i>Risks:</i> 60 practitioners many not be available for full training. <i>Assume:</i> training locations found, and practitioners are available.	226,000	199,000

<p>Outcome 3.2.1 Enhanced collaboration within and between GEF projects; increased effectiveness in decision-making, including public engagement and participation; and continuation of S-S PRG.</p>	<p>Output 3.2.1.1 Survey of understanding and implementation of good governance and practices; Ongoing collaboration of the S-S PRG.</p>	<p>-Potential of institutional modification in the GEF portfolio, as result of capacity development; -Review and/or inclusion of stakeholder engagement programs in IW programs; -Surveys of concept understanding before and after learning.</p>	<p>- Project reporting; - Completion of the Survey determining understanding and implementation of IW practices amongst GEF practitioners; - Continued collaboration of S-S PRG.</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> - Survey may not be properly attended to by recipients; - S-S PRG members do not stay in touch. <i>Assume:</i> Targeted audience will be enthusiastic as will be S-S PRG.</p>	<p>2,000</p>	<p>12,000</p>
<p>Outcome 3.3.1 Increased availability and use of capacity building tools in good governance of transboundary water resources resulting in improved development and implementation of existing and future legal mechanisms and action programmes for international waters.</p>	<p>Output 3.3.1.1 Promotion of tools through partner organizations, academic papers, conferences, media, web-based platforms such as IW:LEARN, CAP at UNESCO-IHE Dedicated UBC IAR site where tools, Teaching Guide and materials are easily available.</p>	<p>- Demand for tools; - International training centers are using the training materials; -Tools accessed from web-based systems, such as UBC and IW:LEARN; -World Bank, FAO, and other international organisations have copies.</p>	<p>-Completion of Comprehensive Plan for Information Dissemination; - 3-5 academic and policy papers produced and disseminated; -Partner organizations using tool; - Promoted UBC site very visible; - Project reporting done.</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> Partner organisations decline to cooperate and incorporate tools. -Understood that training in ICT capacity may be required for web based platforms <i>Assume:</i> Use of peer networks and identified partners will facilitate tool usage.</p>	<p>26,000</p>	<p>155,000</p>
	<p>Output 3.3.1.2 Tools and Training materials available for downloading or by request.</p>	<p>-Tools are easily available through web platforms (including IWLEARN and the UBC IAR site).</p>	<p>- Tools placed for downloading on a number of websites; - Number of downloads.</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> Web-based learning and downloading is ignored. <i>Assume:</i> Materials are sufficiently innovative that there is significant demand.</p>	<p>2,000</p>	<p>9,000</p>

Component 4 – Monitoring and Evaluation					66,000	10,000
Objective: 4.1 – Assure that project performs to standards and criteria established in proposal						
Outcome 4.1.1 Clear and transparent management process suitable for replication.	Output 4.1.1.1 Approved management plan, including M&E, from inception meeting. 4.1.2 Final evaluation.	M&E Plan; External evaluations.	Project reporting and external evaluation.	<i>Risks:</i> external evaluator not found. <i>Assume:</i> M&E plan followed.		
Component 5 – Management					91,000	155,000
Objective: 5.1 Assure that project resources are properly, carefully and efficiently controlled						
Outcome 5.1.1 Efficient management with all tasks duly met.	Output 5.1.1.1 Project outputs delivered in efficient & timely fashion.	Management Plan; External evaluations.	Project reporting.	<i>Risks:</i> project manager over committed. <i>Assume:</i> Management plan followed and efficient reporting structure developed.		

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

1. Project Review: Elaboration and enhancement of the country drivenness component (including consistency with national priorities).

Response:

- The response of the participants, especially those local experts, at the Proposal development meeting in Vancouver, July 2006.
- The results of the survey/questionnaire sent to all UNDP-GEF IW managers soliciting input for priority areas of focus regarding ‘good governance’ and associated ‘best practices’.
- In the field, consultation with local experts and practitioners in the Nile Basin region (throughout 2007 in relation to developing a Data and Information Exchange agreement, and including between 2-6 December 2007, in conjunction with an FAO sponsored workshop in negotiation and multi-state governance).

2. Project Review: Enhanced support and encouragement from co-finance partners.

Response:

- Receipt of letter of support and promises of future resources from the Government of Canada.
- Dialogue with USAID, particularly in response to implementation of the project in Asia.
- Initial agreement with IHE-UNESCO (Netherlands) to cooperate in the implementation of the project and enhance funding sources from Europe.

3. Project Review: Comments from GEF and UNDP reviewers regarding increased input from local experts.

Response:

- Revised the capacity development role of local experts to emphasize their greater involvement in the development, refining and delivery of experiential tools.

4. Project Review: Increased emphasis on the execution phase of the project (components 2 and 3).

Response:

- Increased efficiencies in component 1, including template for institutional comparisons and performance measurements; modification of development and presentation package for experiential tools (reflecting reduced involvement from international experts in component 1).

5. Project Review: Alteration of travel budget to reflect more equity between GEF funds and Co-financing.

Response:

- Application of special travel funds from Canadian government, personal contributions from proponents (ex. using air-miles/points), increased effort to assure private sector financing for travel, increased possibility to enhance meeting and travel opportunities in conjunction with international meetings and conferences as well as other projects, such as Nile Basin Agreement on Information Exchange.

6. Project Review: Leveraging UNEP’s capacity through its regional seas, freshwater, Environmental Law programmes, in addition to its GEF-funded projects and its partnership with other institutions and organisations, such as IUCN Environmental Law Centre and INECE.

Response:

- UNEP, and other bodies such as the FAO in the Nile Basin, have been instrumental in engaging in regional trans-boundary water programme development. In particular UNEP's Regional Sea Initiative has been highly successful in developing institutional arrangements in Large Marine Ecosystems. The project has been in contact with project managers of a number of these LME initiatives, such as the UNEP South China Sea and UNDP Yellow Sea projects, at an early stage and these projects had intended, but were unable, to participate in the PDF Proposal Development meeting in July, 2006. It is fully anticipated that the project will develop greater collaboration with UNEP's Regional Seas initiative as well as their freshwater initiatives.

7. Project Review: Funding of mobilization and participation of UNEP-implemented GEF projects, as well as participation in the Steering Committee meeting.

Response:

- Local experts from UNEP IW projects will be engaged through the implementation of this project through GEF funding and any appropriate additional co-financing. Funding options for UNEP participation in the Steering Committee will be identified in consultation with GEF and UNDP as one of the primary actions during project inception phase.

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Local Project Director	1000	20	Review and development of project design, project overview, communication, coordination, additional fundraising as necessary, reporting and project monitoring.
International			
International Project Director	Not applied to GEF funding (Co-financing)		Coordinate project, overall guidance, communication with UNDP/GEF/donors etc. , report formation, fundraising, project monitoring, directing the Project Management Team, liaise with Steering Committee and Advisory Board.
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
Local Experts – Latin America (3-4 persons)	1000	89.6	Research on performance measures, governance, legislation; development and participation in the S-S peer group, organization of local workshops; training and capacity in tool delivery; workshop and tool delivery.
Local Experts – Asia (3-4 persons)	1000	89.6	Research on performance measures, governance, legislation; development and participation in the S-S peer group, organization of local workshops; training and capacity in tool delivery; workshop and tool delivery.
Local Experts - Africa (3-4 persons)	1000	89.6	Research on performance measures, governance, legislation; development and participation in the S-S peer group, organization of local workshops; training and capacity in tool delivery; workshop and tool delivery.
Local International Water practitioners	1000	200	Assistance in research, attending capacity development and

(Africa, Asia and Latin America) Between 60-80 people. South – South Peer group			experiential tool delivery. Participation in S-S Peer group.
International			
Local Governance Marine/freshwater Experts (5)	3000	59	Research, reporting, analysis of governance tools, experiential tool development, workshop delivery, coordination of input for tool development, specifics involving governance models and administration for performance measure determination.
International Law Water Expert (5)	3000	59	Research, reporting, analysis of governance tools, experiential tool development, workshop delivery, promotion of tools, coordination of tool delivery, specifics for integration of law (freshwater, marine) for tool development.
International Resource Management Policy Expert (5)	3000	59	Research, reporting, analysis of governance tools, experiential tool development (interactive tools in particular), workshop delivery, field testing of tools, capacity development for local experts, Specifics include the development of decision-making models (incl. dispute resolution) for tool development..

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

(NOTE: PDF SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED IN JULY 2006)

- A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN. YES**
- B. DESCRIBE IF ANY FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.**

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To-date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
Workshop to determine format for MSP to look at IW governance best practices and how to replicate in tools to be used in the field	Completed	50,000	49,686	49,686	314	30,000
Total		50,000	49,686	49,686	314	30,000

* Uncommitted amount should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: DETAILED ATLAS BUDGET AND BUDGET NOTES

DETAILED BUDGET

Does not include PFD A financing.

Award ID:	
Award Title:	PIMS 3799 IW MSP: Good Practices and Portfolio Learning I GEF Transboundary Freshwater and Marine Legal and Institutional Frameworks
Business Unit:	
Project Title:	PIMS 3799 IW MSP: Good Practices and Portfolio Learning in GEF Transboundary Freshwater and Marine Legal and Institutional Frameworks
Implementing Partner/ Executing Agency:	UNDP/UBC

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:	
Component 1: Identification and Understanding of Good Practices and Fostering a South-South Dialogue		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	\$50,000				\$50,000	1	
		62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants	\$50,000				\$50,000		
		62000	GEF	71300	Contractual services	\$40,000				\$40,000		
		6200	GEF	74500	Meetings/ Learning	\$25,000				\$25,000		
		62000	GEF	72200	Equipment	\$10,000				\$10,000		
		62000	GEF	71600	Travel	\$30,000				\$30,000		
		62000	GEF	74500	Miscellaneous	\$5,000				\$5,000		
		UBC				sub-total GEF	\$210,000					
					71200	International Consultants						\$0
						Sub-total Donor 3	\$0					\$0
					Total Outcome 1	\$210,000				\$210,000		

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
Component 2: Development and Validation of Experiential Learning Tools, Field Testing and Training Local Experts in Tool Delivery		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants		\$55,000			\$55,000	2
		62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants		\$75,000			\$75,000	
	UBC	62000	GEF	71300	Contractual services		\$30,000			\$30,000	
		62000	GEF	74500	Meetings/Learning		\$75,000			\$75,000	
		62000	GEF	72200	Equipment		\$7,000			\$7,000	
		62000	GEF	71600	Travel		\$80,000			\$80,000	
		62000	GEF	74500	Miscellaneous		\$5,000			\$5,000	
					sub-total GEF		\$327,000			\$327,000	
					Total Outcome 2		\$327,000			\$327,000	

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
Component 3: Delivery and Promotion of Tools, and Enhancing Collaboration and South-South Learning		62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants			\$25,000		\$25,000	3
		62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants			\$95,000		\$95,000	
	UBC	62000	GEF	71300	Contractual services			\$16,000		\$16,000	
		62000	GEF	74500	Meetings/Learning			\$50,000		\$50,000	
		62000	GEF	72200	Equipment			\$5,000		\$5,000	
		62000	GEF	71600	Travel			\$60,000		\$60,000	
		62000	GEF	74500	Miscellaneous			\$5,000		\$5,000	
					sub-total GEF			\$256,000		\$256,000	
					Total Outcome 3			\$256,000		\$256,000	

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation		62000	GEF	71200	Personnel	\$12,000	\$0	\$0		\$12,000	4
		62000	GEF	71200	MSP Review and annual audit	\$3,000	\$8,000	\$23,000		\$34,000	
		62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants	\$6,000	\$0	\$0		\$6,000	
		62000	GEF	71600	Travel	\$8,000	\$0	\$6,000		\$14,000	
	UBC	62000	GEF	72500	Office Supplies					\$0	
		62000	GEF	74500	Miscellaneous					\$0	
					sub-total GEF	\$29,000	\$8,000	\$29,000		\$66,000	
					Tot M & E	\$29,000	\$8,000	\$29,000		\$66,000	

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
Component 5: Project Management (This does not appear as an Outcome in the Logframe which is structured around project substantive outcomes)		62000	GEF	71200	Personnel	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$30,000	5
		62000		71300	Local Consultants	\$7,000	\$6,000	\$7,000		\$20,000	
				71200	Int'l. Consultants						
				71300	Contractual services	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$35,000	
		62000		71600	Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$6,000	
				72500	Office and Supplies					\$0	
				74500	Miscellaneous					\$0	
	UBC				sub-total GEF	\$34,000	\$28,000	\$29,000		\$91,000	
					Total Management	\$34,000	\$28,000	\$29,000		\$91,000	
				PROJECT TOTAL	\$273,000	\$363,000	\$314,000		\$950,000		

Budget Notes for GEF Contribution

Note that many of the outputs are equivalent for the local and international consultants

Note also that the GEF rate for local consultants is US\$1000/week (the average for the project is US\$1100/week as some in-kind local consultants have a higher rate)

Logical Framework outcome Budget Note	Contractual Service	Consultants time (person weeks)	Contract Price (USD)	Targeted Outputs
<p>Budget Note 1</p> <p>Component 1: Identification and Understanding of Good Practices and Fostering a South-South Dialogue</p>	International consultants	16.6	50,000	<p>Output 1.1.1.1 Report and CD “Review and analysis of GEF and non-GEF international waters legal and institutional frameworks and other relevant frameworks”</p> <p>Output 1.1.1.2 On the ground analysis of a variety of IW regimes at various stages of development. Includes site visits.</p>
	Local Consultants	50	50,000	<p>Output 1.1.1.1 Report and CD “Review and analysis of GEF and non-GEF international waters legal and institutional frameworks and other relevant frameworks”</p> <p>Output 1.1.1.2 On the ground analysis of a variety of IW regimes at various stages of development. Includes</p> <p>Output 1.2.1.1 Formation of South-South Peer Review Group and regional groups for dialogue and target group input for project direction, tool development, and information source (beyond data base and reports). Includes 3 workshops/meetings in Africa, Latin America and Asia.</p>
	Contractual Services	16	40,000	Research and development of report, layout, software development, interactive CD,
	Meetings/ Learning		25,000	Output 1.2.1.1 Includes 3 workshops/meetings in Africa, Latin America and Asia.
	Equipment		10,000	Software, computer, projector
	Travel	3 international and 30 regional	30,000	Travel for at least 1 of the PMT to the 3 regional workshops initiating the S-S Peer Group. Including basin site assessment and developing relations.
	Misc.		5,000	
<p>Budget Note 2</p> <p>Component 2: Development and Validation of Experiential Learning Tools, Field Testing and Development of Local Experts in Tool Delivery</p>	International consultants	18.3	55,000	<p>Output 2.1.1.1 Novel and targeted experiential learning tools for good governance of international waters, focusing on understanding and promoting effective legal and institutional frameworks and decision making.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1.2 Teaching Guide and course programs (1, 2, 5 days) are developed (in electronic form) specifically for replication purposes; Testing done.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1.3 Field Testing 1: Experiential learning conducted through appropriate institutions, such as UNESCO-IHE, FAO,IAR, and IW:LEARN etc.</p>

	Local Consultants	75	75,000	<p>Output 2.1.1.1 Novel and targeted experiential learning tools for good governance of international waters, focusing on understanding and promoting effective legal and institutional frameworks and decision making.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1.3 Field Testing 1: Experiential learning conducted through appropriate institutions, such as UNESCO-IHE, FAO, IAR, and IW:LEARN etc.</p> <p>Output 2.2.1.1 Local experts trained in tool delivery; Enhanced South-South collaboration and networking accomplished through peer groups; Dissemination of project materials and information.</p>
	Contractual Services	12	30,000	Training workshops development, material dissemination, layout, design, software development. Translations.
	Meetings/ Learning		75,000	Regional meetings for SS-Peer group with tool evaluation. Regional Training of local experts in tool delivery.
	Equipment		7,000	IT and communication. Projector for each regional expert.
	Travel		80,000	Travel for regional SS-Peer meetings and review. International and local consultants to capacity building for local experts.
	Misc.		5,000	

<p>Budget Note 3</p> <p>Component 3: Delivery and Promotion of Tools, and Enhancing Collaboration and South-South Learning</p>	International consultants	8.3	25,000	<p>Output 3.1.1.1 Final package of experiential training tools, including CD, and web-based interactive platform; - Formal targeted training conducted for 60 or more GEF practitioners.</p> <p>Output 3.3.1.1 Promotion of tools through partner organizations, academic papers, conferences, media, web-based platforms such as IW:LEARN, CAP at UNESCO-IHE.</p> <p>Dedicated UBC IAR site where tools, Teaching Guide and materials are easily available.</p>
	Local Consultants	95	95,000	<p>Output 3.1.1.1 Final package of experiential training tools, including CD, and web-based interactive platform; - Formal targeted training conducted for 60 or more GEF practitioners.</p> <p>Output 3.2.1.1 Survey of understanding and implementation of good governance and practices; Ongoing collaboration of the S-S PRG. Including</p> <p>Output 3.3.1.1 Promotion of tools through partner organizations, academic papers, conferences, media, web-based platforms such as IW:LEARN, CAP at UNESCO-IHE.</p>
	Contractual Services	6.5	16000	Design and web software development, publication.

	Meetings/ Learning		50000	Capacity building seminars for local practitioners (60). In 3 regions.
	Equipment		5000	Portal and web equipment, memory space,
	Travel		60000	Local experts, int consultants, to attend regional training of local practitioners.
	Misc.		5000	

Budget Note 4 Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation	Personnel	10	12,000	Project team personnel involved in M And E support – reporting etc.
	MSP Review and annual Audit		34,000	External review of project and general auditing.
	Local Consultants	15	6,000	Involvement of consultants in development of project monitoring and reporting.
	Travel		14,000	Travel associated with project monitoring by PMT and external reviewer.

Budget Note 5 Component 5: Project Management	Personnel	30	30,000	Management of project, including co-ordination, project reporting requirements.
	Local Consultants	20	20,000	Management of project, including co-ordination, project reporting requirements.
	Travel		6,000	Travel for steering committee meetings, at least one per year.
	Office operations		0	
	Misc		0	

* This includes the external evaluation.

RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS PER BUDGET ITEM

Budget Item	GEF Contribution			Co Financing Contribution			Item Total
	Amount \$	% GEF (by input)	GEF% (rel. to co-fin)	Amount \$	% Co-Fin (by input)	% Co Fin (rel. to GEF)	
Local Consultants	\$246,000	25.9%	61%	\$160,000	13.2%	39%	\$406,000
International Consultants	\$130,000	13.7%	24%	\$401,800	33.3%	76%	\$531,800
Contractual Services	\$121,000	12.7%	31%	\$275,000	22.8%	69%	\$396,000
Meeting/Learning	\$150,000	15.8%	86%	\$25,000	2.1%	14%	\$175,000
Equipment	\$22,000	2.3%	100%	\$0	0.0%	0%	\$22,000
Travel	\$190,000	20.0%	49%	\$196,000	16.2%	51%	\$386,000
Ext. Review and Audit	\$34,000	3.6%	100%	\$0	0.0%	0%	\$34,000
Personnel	\$42,000	4.4%	100%	\$0	0.0%	0%	\$42,000
Office space and operations	\$0	0.0%	0%	\$150,000	12.4%	100%	\$150,000
Miscellaneous	\$15,000	1.6%	100%	\$0	0.0%	0%	\$15,000
Management	\$91,000	9.6%	37%	\$155,000	12.8%	63%	\$246,000
TOTAL	\$950,000	100.0%	45.8%	\$1,207,800	100.0%	54.2%	\$2,157,800