UNEP GEF PIR FY 07
(1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007)

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Strengthening Global Capacity to Sustain Transboundary Waters: The International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network

Executing Agency:	United Nations Environment Programme/Division of Early Warning and Assessment (UNEP/DEWA)[1]

Project partners:	United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank (IBRD)

Geographical Scope:	Global

Participating Countries:	Global

GEF project ID:	1893	IMIS number*[2]:	GFL/2328-2732-4813
Focal Area(s):	International Waters	GEF OP #:	10
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	IW-2 Targeted IW Learning	GEF approval date*:	13 September 2004
UNEP approval date:	3 November 2004	First Disbursement*:	N/A
Actual start date[3]:	November 2004	Planned duration:	48 months
Intended completion date*:	September 2008	Actual or Expected completion date:	October 2009
Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation*:	US$1,346,534 (allocation to UNEP)
PDF GEF cost*:	0	PDF co-financing*:	0
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	US$1,207,400	Total Cost*:	US$2,553,934
Mid-term review (planned date):		Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	N/A
Mid term review (actual date):	31st January 2007 (MTE handled by UNDP)	No. of revisions*:	None
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	4th June 2007	Date of last Revision*:	N/A
Disbursement as of 30 June 2007*:	N/A	Date of financial closure*:	N/A
Date of Completion[4]*:	N/A	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2007[5]:	US$523,225

---

[1] IW:LEARN is a joint UNDP/UNEP project with UNDP as lead agency. The details in this PIR pertain to the UNEP component of IW:LEARN executed by UNEP/DEWA

[2] Fields with an * sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

[3] Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

[4] If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.

[5] Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2007[6]:	US$560,719	**Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2007*:**	US$499,115
Leveraged financing:[7]			

| Project summary[8] | The International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) is co-implemented in collaboration with UNDP and IBRD. UNEP led components are presented in this document as a sub-project, other complimenting activities that contribute to the overall objectives of IW:LEARN are described in the UNDP project document.

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

• Facilitating access to information about transboundary water resources among GEF IW projects

• Structured learning among GEF projects and cooperating partners aimed at promoting inter-linkages in the Caribbean

• Testing innovative approaches to strengthen implementation of the IW portfolio through the development of a regional learning center for the South East Asia Region (SEA-RLC)

The project builds upon the achievements of the experimental pilot phase IW LEARN project, incorporating the findings of its final independent evaluation. In view of the great interest raised by and successes of the UNDP-implemented pilot, all three Implementing Agencies have committed to jointly propose and realize this operational phase IW:LEARN project and UNEP will oversee the implementation of the outlined components based on its comparative advantage as one of the implementing agencies in the GEF. |
|---|---|

Project status FY06[9]	A new and approved IW:LEARN website design was developed as well as many utilities and functions launched, including the project database. The SEA-RLC website was also established and launched. A pilot ICT workshop was held for 2 IW projects in Africa and a Website Toolkit developed to assist IW projects in developing and supporting their websites. A GIS module for this tool was developed as well. Scoping of the project and purpose of the IW Information Management System (IW IMS) under went considerable rework using input from the UNOPS/PCU and the Steering Committee. In-flow of content derived from UNOPS-led IW:LEARN activities into the IW IMS system and the number of projects linked were still limited. Helpdesk function also needed improvement.

---

[6]   Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format.

[7]   See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

[8]   As in project document

[9]   Brief description of implementation status in previous year (not more than one paragraph)

Project status FY07[10]	In FY07, a first full ICT workshop was held in Mombasa, Kenya, testing the usefulness of the Website Toolkit. Approximately 80% of the 25 participants have benefited from the workshop and implemented agreed actions as per the workshop. Helpdesk functionality has been improved and mechanisms for data and information discovery and management defined and being implemented. Following the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), which took place during FY07, progress towards a clarified log frame and work plan has been significant. Based on the MTE recommendations, maintenance of the SEA-RLC website was discontinued, all efforts now focusing on IW IMS. The website user interface has been redesigned to improve usability. In addition, the project database was enhanced to include an archive system or repository for key project information resources (e.g. datasets, documents, reports). Other utilities, such as blogs, were developed and a website competition launched to increase visibility and improve demand for services.

Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets[11]	IW:LEARN's key role in GEF's Strategic Priority (IW-2) for targeted IW learning is emphasized in Business Planning (GEF/C.21/Inf.11 Annex 3, paragr. 14): "The GEF Replenishment included a specific US$20 Million for targeted learning within the portfolio, based on the success of the IW:LEARN approach in OP 10 and piloted in GEF-2. The learning experiences among GEF projects undertaken within the IW portfolio [have] been successful as judged by survey, project evaluations and OPS2. The learning is aimed at exchanging successful approaches among existing projects and those under preparation so that they may be adopted within the framework of adaptive management that characterizes the GEF approach to transboundary water systems. They also help avoid problems that have been encountered by projects. Such South-to-South 'structured learning' contributes significantly to the success of GEF's foundational/capacity building work in IW."
	With design guided by the IAs' IW leads, all IW:LEARN components and activities align within the OP10 technical support component to realize these strategic priorities.

2.   PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project[12]

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

The immediate objectives are:

- To facilitate the integration, exchange and accessibility of data and information among GEF IW projects, their partners and stakeholders (Component A)

- To establish and technically support a series of face-to-face and electronically-mediated structured

---

[10]   Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

[11]   For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

[12]   Or immediate project objective

> learning activities – or learning exchanges – among related projects within the GEF IW portfolio (Component B)
>
> - To test, evaluate and replicate novel approaches and ICT tools to meet IW stakeholder needs (Component D)
>
> UNEP is in charge of component A and contributes to components B and D.

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

Leading up to and following the Mid Term Evaluation, significant progress has been made towards putting in place the technical infrastructure for IW:LEARN. The Website Toolkit was further developed and tested during the first full ICT workshop. Further, a mechanism for data and information discovery was defined and being implemented. Linkages to project websites using internet technology to automate information flow have been put in place. However visualization/classification and presentation of the volume of content as well as the in-flow of information from the UNOPS led structured learning activities has proved challenging. An improved GIS module for the toolkit has been developed and a demonstration and support website launched. At least 3 GEF projects are currently using the GIS utility.

The infrastructure for low maintenance and sustainable data and information collection is now online as a beta site (www.ecomundus.net) and ongoing implementation to identify suitable information systems and partners is proceeding (with at least 10 partner systems including MMA/Brazil, FAO and CGIAR/IWMI connected and sharing relevant datasets). Internal discussions on this infrastructure should be followed closely as the outcome may affect the sustainability of the IW:LEARN services through UNEP/DEWA and access to relevant content.

Bandwidth continues to be a challenge for operating IW:LEARN from Nairobi forcing deployment of a server in the USA to resolve slow access times experienced by stakeholders. Management of ICT services from Nairobi and efficient processing of sub-contracts continues to be challenging owing to the limited bandwidth and administrative procedures, respectively.

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document [13](not more than 200 words)

It is difficult to know for sure if any progress is being made towards the GEF strategic priorities as this must be assessed based on the collective effort of the project. However, at the present time, UNEP's efforts to put in place mechanisms to enable projects to share and exchange information is beginning to show usage.

---

[13]   Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**[14] will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

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

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

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)[15]

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]

---

[14]   For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

[15]   Based on revised logical framework for the UNEP component of IW:LEARN

[16]   Add rows if your project has more that 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

[17]   Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

[18]   Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

[19]   Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]
Objective 1 (Component A):[20] To facilitate the integration, exchange and accessibility of data and information among GEF IW projects, their partners and stakeholders	% of projects using the GEF comprehensive IW Information Management System (IW-IMS including helpdesk) % of IW-IMS users obtaining needed TWM data, information and/or tools Stakeholders use IWRC to obtain project data and information	No system in place	The revised log frame has now included December 2007 targets at the Outcome level (see below)	>75% of projects use the GEF comprehensive IW Information Management System ("IW-IMS" including helpdesk) >50% of its users obtain needed TWM data, information and/or tools Stakeholders increasingly use IWRC to obtain project data and information	In response to user feedback and in consultation with stakeholders, a new website user interface highlighting the key functions and services of the IW-IMS is being tested and introduced incrementally. The new user interface improved the usabilty of key utilities in the IW-IMS (e.g. project database, homepage, collaborative tools). To facilitate exchange of information among GEF IW projects, blogs have been developed and introduced in the IW-IMS system . Steps to integrate the IW-IMS with a powerful meta-search engine (coined "omniSearch") to enable better access to information regarding TWM was launched and being enhanced. In addition, a mechanism to disseminate project-related information and allow projects to easily submit content to the IW-IMS has been implemented and an automatic translation feature has been added to facilitate non native english visitors to obtain a rough translation of content within the IW-IMS. There is no evidence-based estimate of the percentage of projects that use IW-IMS or IWTC and obtain needed TWM data, information and/or tools from the website. However, there are clear indications of use of the website as 45% (est.) of visitors bookmark iwlearn.net and 80% (est.) of these visitors actually refer to the bookmark to access the site again. It is assumed that a sub-set of these users are projects but this needs to be further substantiated through surveys. In the period January to June 2007, a total of 60Gb of content was downloaded from IW-IMS which equals the amount for the whole of 2006. Use of IWRC is no longer an indicator because a regional center is no longer pursued and efforts are re-focused towards the global IW-IMS as per the MTE recommendations.	MS

---

[20]   Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]
Objective 2 (Component B): To establish and technically support a series of face-to-face and electronically-mediated structured learning activities – or learning exchanges – among related projects within the GEF IW portfolio.	Number of projects that apply lessons from IW:LEARN structured learning activities to improve TWM within their resposctive basins	No structured learning exchange taking place	The revised log frame has now included December 2007 targets at the Outcome level (see below)	30+ projects apply lessons from IW:LEARN structured learning activities to improve TWM within their respective basins	Component B comprises of 4 sub components for which UNEP's responsibility relates to a sub-activity of activity B1 (Regional Multi Project Exchanges): structured learning among GEF projects and cooperating partners aimed at promoting inter-linkages in the Caribbean. This activity was delayed due to lack of clarity on the contents/focus. In consultation with stakeholders prior to the end of FY07 a series of activities for the Caribbean Regional Exchange sub-component are now planned in the revised workplan for Q3/2007 onwards.	MS
Objective 3 (Component D): To test, evaluate and replicate novel approaches and ICT tools to meet IW stakeholder needs.	GEF IW projects and partners benefit from a set of demonstration projects integrating information sharing and structured learning	No GEF IW portfolio-wide targeted demonstration projects exist	The revised log frame has now included December 2007 targets at the Outcome level (see below)	GEF IW projects and partners benefit from a set of demonstration projects integrating information sharing and structured learning	A roster of experts portal was developed and populated, a translation tool added to the Regional Learning Center website and a 'skype' function to allow visitors to easily contact and obtain help from the RLC staff was introduced. In addition, several projects started to adapt the use of the GIS package. Following the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE), it was realised that a regional approach to IW:LEARN in the context of information and communications tools and assistance would be more effective through a central access point (i.e www.iwlearn.net) with regional (and thematic) views. Therefore, component D1 was revised to support the implementation of component A1 in the areas indentified as deficient during the MTE. Namely, organisation of ICT workshops and content management.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]
Outcome 1 (Component A): Improved access to TWM data and information across the GEF IW portfolio	% of GEF IW projects that access the www.iwlearn.net	As of February 2005, 69% of GEF IW project indicated they access www.iwlearn.net	At least 75% of projects indicate they access www.iwlearn.net	At least 85% of projects indicate they access www.iwlearn.net	This indicator came into effect following UNEPs response the MTE. No data is available for this period. However, based on the increased monthly usage of the website and indirect feedback from participants of the Africa regional ICT workshop (November 2006) an overall estimated access of 70% is assumed.	
	Number of ICT requests from the IW community that UNEP-IWLEARN responds to.	As of June 2006, UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 25 IW community ICT request	UNEP-IWLEARN responds to 50 IW community ICT request	UNEP-IWLEARN responds to 100 IW community ICT request	During this reporting period, an improved issue tracker was added to the suite of administrative tools being used by the implementation team to track and document support request received. According to the records in this system, a total of 45 request were responded to (see issuetracker.iwlearn.org).	
	Number of IW projects with web sites	As of July 2006, 59 GEF IW project have websites	90 GEF IW projects have websites	By 2009, 140 IW projects have websites	Taking into account the total number of projects under implementation, 59% or 40 projects out of a total of 68 have websites based on the iwlearn.net project database.	
	Number of IW projects that have websites link to www.iwlearn.net	As of January 2006, 10% (estimated) of IW projects that have websites link to www.iwlearn.net	60% of IW projects that have websites link to www.iwlearn.net	By 2009, 90% of IW projects that have websites link to www.iwlearn.net	Based on a Google search for link references 51.4% of GEF IW projects with websites (or 35 out of 68) are linked to iwlearn.net. This method assumes that Google has indexed websites that have links to IW:LEARN. While IW:LEARN maintains exhausitive statistics of references to IW:LEARN, the relevant indicator is only recorded if a user clicks on the iwlearn link on the project website.	
	% of projects that are accessible through www.iwlearn.net	As of January 2006, 0 of IW projects with websites are accessible through www.iwlearn.net	95% of IW projects that have websites are accessible from www.iwlearn.net	By 2009, 95% of IW projects that have websites are accessible through www.iwlearn.net	Utilising the iwlearn.net search engine and project websites in the iwlearn project database, all known project websites are linked and searchable from www.iwlearn.net	
	Increased number of unique visitors accessing www.iwlearn.net	As of December 2006, >38,000(estimated) unique visitors accessed www.iwlearn.net	>48,000 (estimated) unique visitors access www.iwlearn.net	>60,000 (estimated) in unique visitors access www.iwlearn.net	For this period, a total of 58,013 unique visitors accessed iwlearn.net. This indicates a total increase of ~20,000. (http://stats.iwlearn.net/awstats/awstats.pl?config=www.iwlearn.net)	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]
	Number of datasets from and about IW projects sites available through the www.iwlearn.net	As of January 2006, 0 datasets about IW projects available through the www.iwlearn.net	20 datasets about IW project available through the www.iwlearn.net	50 datasets about IW projects available through the www.iwlearn.net	There are no documented datasets for this period. However, as 3 projects use the GIS module, datasets have already been acquired but not yet documented. Similarly, datasets available through the development of the South China Sea metadata base have not yet been documented in iwlearn.net	
	% of projects that have deployed a website using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	As of January 2006, 0 projects have deployed a website using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	> 20 project deploy websites using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	> 60 projects deploy websites using the UNEP-IWLEARN website toolkit	Currently, 13 projects have deployed the website toolkit. However, at least 20 projects have indicated they are interested in using the website toolkit and are actively populating and customizing the product (see http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit). A GIS tracking tool has also been launched to monitor the status of implementation (http://gis.iwlearn.org/sites/demo/primagis/). In some cases, projects have deployed more than one website using the website toolkit (e.g. NWSAS-2, PERSGA-2).	
	Number of projects indicting satisfied assistance from IWLEARN	N/A	60% of project responses indicate satisfaction	80% of project responses indicate satisfaction	As this indicator was not detailed until after the MTE, there is no data available yet to report on the level of satisfaction at 30 June 2007. However, there is feedback available from the ICT workshop. The questionnaire conducted during the Africa ICT workshop in November 2006 indicates an overall high satisfaction rate by the participants regarding the outcome of the workshop.	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[16]	Baseline level[17]	December 2007 target[18]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2007	Progress rating [19]
Outcome 2 (Component B): Enhanced TWM capacity at project and basin-levels through sharing of experiences among subsets of the GEF IW portfolio, including projects, their partners and counter parts.	Number of GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing in the Caribbean region drafted and accessible through www.iwlearn.net	As of January 2007, 0 GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing are accessible through www.iwlearn.net	N/A	At least 10 GEF experience notes regarding data and information sharing are accessible through www.iwlearn.net	In the revised workplan, the Caribbean activity is expected to commence Q3/2007 onwards.	
Outcome 3 (Component D): A widely available suite of tested and replicated ICT and other tools and approaches for strengthening TWM.	Number of GIS related requests from the IW community that UNEP-IWLEARN responds to.	As of January 2006, UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 0 IW community request	UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 10 GIS IW community request	UNEP-IWLEARN responded to 20 GIS IW community request	Based on the iwlearn issuetracker (issuetracker.iwlearn.org) system, a total of 12 GIS requests were responded to.	
	Number of projects using the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	As of January 2006, 0 project use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	As of January 2007, 5 projects use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	10 projects use the UNEP-IWLEARN GIS package	Currently, 3 of the 15 projects that attended the IW:LEARN Africa ICT workshop have deployed the GIS toolkit and actively use it.

The GIS module has been enhanced to be easier to use and more compatible with common browsers available today (i.e IE, FF). Efforts to increase the uptake of this tool are underway and include further enhancement of the tool to take advantage of GIS related technologies, and improved documentation of the product through iwlearn.net. | |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager*)

FY2006 rating	FY2007 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the FY07 rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting period
MU to MS	MS	Some progress has been made towards achieving the objectives in FY07, particularly in response to the Mid-Term Evaluation. Technically, the IW Information Management System to facilitate the integration, exchange and accessibility of data and information has been established. However, further improvement is needed to obtain client satisfaction on services provided and accessibility of data and information of relevance to TWM. Implementation of the project has been refocused and quantitative indicators to properly assess progress established. This, in addition to an improved staffing and management structure for the project, has started to yield results in a relatively short period following the MTE and in comparison to the previous FY.

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

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
1. Improve classification/presentation of content in the IW IMS system in order to better facilitate the integration and accessibility of data and information	PM/TM	Q2/2008
2. Develop new mechanisms, such as blogs and wiki's, to facilitate the exchange among IW projects, partners and stakeholders	PM	Q3/2008
3. Expedite the process of making available datasets from and about IW project sites	PM	Q1/2008
4. Increase and improve mechanisms to capture the needs of projects and measure client satisfaction	PM	Q4/2007
5. Consolidate all structured learning materials generated by component B	PM	Q1/2008
6. Prioritize the organization of the Caribbean Activity	PM	Q4/2007

3.2   Project implementation progress[21]

Outputs [22]	Expected completion date [23]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2007 (%)	Comments if variance[24]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[25]
Output A1: Designed and operating IW:LEARN information system	Q3/2009	57%		S
Activity A1.1: Design, launch and maintain the IW:LEARN Information system	Q1/2006	100%		
Activity A1.2: Migrate all content from the Pilot Phase IW:LEARN website (www.iwlearn.org & iwlearn.net) into new IW:LEARN information system	Q1/2006	100%		
A.1.3: Develop a metadata-base of the GEF IW project portfolio and stakeholders	Q1/2006	100%		
Activity A1.4: Develop a search engine for the IW:LEARN information system that can access information held in various project and stakeholder websites.	Q3/2006	100%		
Activity A1.5: Produce and maintain an online calendar of IW events as part of the IW:LEARN information system	Q3/2006	100%		
Activity A1.6: Develop a multilingual glossary and/or thesaurus of IW terminology	Q4/2007	50%	Time lag and process for expediting contracts though UNON is excessive	
Activity A1.7: Integrate the IW:LEARN information system to a wider environmental information network infrastructure	Q4/2007	50%	Indecision in UNEP regarding ecoMundus is impacting the project's ability to properly sustain access to and gather relevant information.	
Activity A1.8: Implement a disaster recovery system (e.g. back-up or mirror server)	Q4/2007	100%		
Activity A.1.9: Maintain a metadata-base of the GEF IW project portfolio and stakeholders	Q3/2009	25%		
Activity A.1.10: Deploy at least 2 collaborative tools (such as list servers, blog or syndication tools) to encourage dialogue among GEF project practitioners.	Q3/2009	75%		

---

[21]   Based on revised logical framework for the UNEP component of IW:LEARN
[22]   Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.
[23]   As per latest workplan (latest project revision)
[24]   Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.
[25]   To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

1

Outputs [22]	Expected completion date [23]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2007 (%)	Comments if variance[24]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[25]
Activity A1.11: Compile and make accessible selected data and information on key topics identified through IWLEARN surveys, feedback and projects.	Q3/2009	10%	There is no systematic process, policy, or documentation to support or identify on an ongoing basis "needed" data and information from projects. As a result content on targeted areas may be lacking.	
Activity A1.12: Develop a portal for news, and other information about GEF IW projects (e.g., announcements, events etc) within the IWLEARN Information System	Q2/2007	70%	Redesign is needed and being planned for next year. The technical development is in place but the user interface needs revision	
Activity A1.13: Develop and operate an archive/repository service for GEF IW project data and information	Q3/2007	75%		
Output A2: ICT assistance provided to GEF IW projects	Q3/2009	15%		MU
Activity A2.1: Develop a tracking system to manage help request from IW projects regarding ICT matters	Q3/2009	100%	(http://issuetracker.iwlearn.org)	
Activity A2.2: Develop and maintain a ICT help section within the IW:LEARN information system	Q2/3 2009	100%	(http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/help)	
Activity A2.3: Develop a website toolkit to enable any GEF project to deploy and manage a project website and exchange information with other projects and stakeholders.	Q2/2006	100%	(http://www.iwlearn.net/websitetoolkit/users/userscommunity)	
Activity A.2.4: Conduct at least 2 regional ICT capacity building workshops among GEF IW projects to enable projects to utilize the website toolkit and associated utilities.	Q3/2006	10%	Delayed due to slow responsiveness from projects and identification of a suitable venue/date (expected Nov/Dec 2007)	
Activity A2.5: Conduct periodic surveys to assess user needs and effectiveness of ICT utilities	Q3/2009	50%		
Output D1: *South East Asia Regional Learning Centre (SEA-RLC)*	Q3/2009	31%		MS

Outputs [22]	Expected completion date [23]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2007 (%)	Comments if variance[24]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[25]
Activity D1.1: Transfer the Regional Learning Center (RLC) website to www.iwlearn.net server	Q2/2007	re-focussed	As a result of the MTE, it was decided to not maintain hosting of the SEA-RLC website at SEA START RC and combine efforts to operate an effective information base (www.iwlearn.net).	
Activity D1.2 Selected RLC resources and functions migrated to IWLEARN.Net	Q4/2007	80%		
Activity D1.3 Create GIS section on IWLEARN.Net	Q2/2007	95%	(http://gis.iwlearn.org/sites/demo)	
Activity D1.4 Establish a GIS test platform for projects using existing spare RLC server	Q2/2007	100%	(http://gis.iwlearn.org/sites/demo)	
Activity D1.5 Produce IWLEARN GIS toolkit module	Q2/2007	100%	(http://gis.iwlearn.org/sites/demo)	
Activity D1.6 Content management of information on the IWLEARN.net information system	Q3/2009	25%		
Activity D1.7 Provide logistical support for UNEP-IWLEARN planned workshops	Q3/2009	10%		
Activity D1.8 Provide technical back stopping to projects on GIS related issues	Q3/2009	30%		

Overall project implementation progress [26] *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager):*

FY2006 rating	FY2007 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for FY07 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
MU to MS	MS	During FY07, the work plan has been revised and the project extended to October 2009 in order enable UNEP/DEWA to deliver the components and the full co-financing of the IW:LEARN project for which UNEP is responsible. Compared to FY06, the revision has allowed for better tracking of progress. The rate of project implementation has increased over the second half of FY06 with implementation of some components in substantial compliance with the revised plan, whereas some components still require further remedial action.

---

[26]   Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. *(To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager[27])*

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
1. Develop a 'marketing' plan for IW:LEARN ICT services including a robust mechanism for obtaining user feedback	PM	Q1/2008
2. Refine definitions on content management functions and translate these into sub-activities in the 2008 work plan	PM	Q4/2007
3. Develop a sustainability plan for the UNEP component of IW:LEARN	TM/PM	Q4/2007
4. Investigate options for administrative arrangements	PM	Q1/2008
5. Put in place a systematic process to gather on an ongoing basis "needed" data and information from projects for database	PM/TM/IAs	Q4/2007

---

[27]   UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

3.3. Risk

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

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

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems					X		PM –revised management structure in place but not proven as yet TM - The project suffered from unclear roles and responsibilities between UNEP/DEWA/DGEF and UNOPS, e.g. with regard to the management of content on IW			X			

1

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR			X				PM – SC meetings and members need to commit more time to the project. TM – The portfolio-wide nature of the project requires continuous interest and guidance from Agencies on SC		X				
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment	X						Improved following MTE Communication between PM and PCU of executing agencies was deteriorating but since MTE follow-up meetings steadily improving		X				
Work flow	Project progressing according to	Some changes in project work plan but without	Major delays or changes in work plan or method	X									X			

1

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
										To compensate for the slow start of project components and in response to MTE recommendations, major changes have been made to the work plan						
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize		X					To date a detailed schedule for realizing co-financing on the part of UNEP is not clear		X				
										Realization of co-financing has been slow						
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding		X					Relates to co- financing and lack of programmatic focus			X			

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
										Project progress has been slow and as such low rate of expenditures. This will eventually result in budget re-allocation. The first budget revision, which has been submitted for approval, has increased allocation to project staff and equipment and reduction in consultancies, sub-contracts and publications. This has been in response to the MTE.						
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds					X		N/A for UNEP internally implemented projects					X	

1

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting		X					Timeliness of report on the part of PM needs improvement

Delays in substantive reporting. | | | X | | | |
| Stakeholder involvement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | | | | | X | | PM- Target audience not proactive in uptake of services

Feedback from stakeholders has been limited. To be determined if this is because of a lack of interest or otherwise. | | | | | | X |

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined

INTERNAL RISK

Project management

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	Notes	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
External com-munications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand-ings concerning objectives and activities evident		X					A revised approach is needed See comment on previous risk factor. Messages might not be successfully transmitted.		X				
Short term/long term balance	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected		X					Understanding of the long term needs to be improved.		X				

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties					X		Project is testing new approaches in the IW community		X				
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives					X							X	
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary								X							X	

2

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

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance	X							X					
Others, please specify																

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

N/A

2

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN[28]

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

Rank	Risk Statement[29]		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
1.	Work flow challenges	Delays in implementing activities, substantive reporting and progressive changes in work	Clarify the logical framework for the UNEP components, include SMART indicators to track progress and address staffing issues	DEWA/DGEF/SC	April 2007
2.	Unclear management and governance structures	Potential conflicts of interest and tension between project partners	Revise management structure for IW:LEARN within UNEP, clarify roles of PCU/project team versus Steering Committee, and develop a coordination agreement with UNOPS	DEWA/DGEF/SC/UNOPS	April 2007
3.	Project progress and realization of co-financing slow	Unable to deliver all project components within timeframe	Revision of workplan in order to focus more on the major UNEP component, component A, and extension of the project duration	PM with approval of SC	April 2007

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2006 rating	FY2007 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for FY07 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Not available	Substantial to medium	No risk rating was provided in the PIR for FY06. However, DGEF management placed the project in the 'at-risk' category.
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period please report on progress or results of its implementation

---

[28]   Key actions to deal with the top risks that became apparent during FY07 have already been taken in response to the MTE.
[29]   Only for Substantial to High risk.

No risk mitigation plan had been presented for the previous period, however, it was acknowledged during FY07 that a number of internal risk factors needed to be addressed. Based on the MTE recommendations discussions were held at management level and remedial action taken as outlined in the top risk mitigation plan above. A significant amount of time and effort was spent on revising the logical framework for the UNEP component, revising and detailing the work plan and budget allocations, and improving the institutional and management arrangements of the project to enhance supervision and consequently project delivery. All proposed changes were tabled for the Steering Committee meeting held on 19 April 2007 and subsequently approved.

4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

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

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

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:
- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator   **Yes □**   (logframe revisited in this regard after MTE)
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes   **Yes □**   (included in revised logframe)
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. **Yes □**

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:
- Mid-term review/evaluation   **Yes □**   (handled by UNDP component)
- Terminal evaluation   **Yes □**   (in UNDP component)
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information   **No □**   (this could be considered in a future revision)

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): S   (the answers and rating based on the revised plan)

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

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

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period[30]

The Mid-Term Evaluation was carried out during the reporting period. A management response was prepared and considered by the Steering Committee which agreed to make a revision to the work plan and modus operandi. With regard to user feedback, the primary source has been the use of questionnaires at meetings,

---

[30]   Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

conferences and workshops, in addition to online feedback. However, in the context of the PIR following the MTE, questionnaires will have to be revised to properly capture feedback needed to assess progress based on the revised log frame. In general, projects are slow to respond (if at all) to surveys. In total there have been 4 questionnaires distributed. In addition, an issue tracker system has been established to track and monitor user help requests and the use of Google analytic and Webstats software programmes to monitor website usage applied. Finally, an online feedback submission form is available on the website (however usage is low) and a new e-bulletin service is planned to enable easier feedback and involvement.

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

For this type of project it is difficult to truly measure impact or progress towards the objective owing to the nature of the internet and online services in general. One relies primarily on stakeholder feedback to identify and assess needs and the usefulness of our services. In addition, insufficient consideration was given to this aspect in the original design of the project. The pilot phase provided not enough useful data (acquired though user feedback) to establish a baseline for the operational phase.

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

Indicators used in the components are adequate given the nature of the responsibility. However, indicators at the outcome level were not clearly defined and could be improved (as noted in the MTE and applied for the UNEP led components).

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

None. As noted in 4.5, stakeholders' response rates to surveys have been poor and require a substantive effort in follow-up to gather sufficient data for analysis.

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

None

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

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

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

Important lessons were gained through experience in the area of institutional arrangements/project governance over FY07. In the original design of the project's institutional framework, reporting lines were unclear and the same entity (UNEP-DEWA) was implementing activities as well as providing oversight. This was posing challenges with regard to roles and responsibilities in the execution of the project. For example, the agency implementing the UNDP component and hosting the Project Coordination Unit felt that it did not get sufficient insight in progress made on the UNEP component. This started to affect the relationships between the executing partners. The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) also highlighted problems within the project governance design e.g. in terms of the structure of the Steering Committee. Persons who were actively involved in the technical or financial implementation of the project were sitting on the Steering Committee leading to potential conflicts of interest with respect to delivery of some components. In response to the MTE, UNEP addressed this observation by appointing a Task Manager within the Division of GEF Coordination to provide oversight for the UNEP component and to represent UNEP as

Implementing Agency at the Steering Committee level. At the same time, the Division of Early Warning and Assessment agreed to supervise the Project Manager and allow the Staff Member to focus full time on the implementation of activities.

- •   Engagement of the private sector;
- •   Capacity building;
- •   Scientific and technological issues;
- •   Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- •   Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;

The experience with the IW:LEARN project over FY07 has resulted in more insight in conditions necessary to achieve institutional and financial sustainability. Probably the greatest factor affecting the implementation and sustainability of this project relates to the institutional ownership of the project. At the design stage, the institutional support was expressed in co-financing commitments and a clear linkage to the common goal of the GEF project and the UNEP-DEWA programme. However, during implementation, true endorsement and understanding of the mutual benefits at the institutional level was not so apparent. As a result, the project is seen as a single activity that ends after the specified duration instead of a catalytic work complementing the larger work programme of UNEP. This also affects the rate at which co-financing is realized. Various actions have been taken to address these concerns in FY07: first, the institutional embedding of the project in the executing Division has been further strengthened through a revised and broadened project supervision structure involving members of UNEP-DEWA senior management; and second, following budget revision, the IW:LEARN funds for the UNEP component will be transferred and integrated in the comprehensive Divisional costed work plan. Future internally implemented GEF projects may want to assess in more detail how the project objectives, outcomes and activities complement relevant elements in the UNEP work programme. For IW:LEARN, this can still be a useful exercise as part of implementing the sustainability plan for the UNEP component of IW:LEARN.

- •   Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- •   Financial management and co-financing.

Adaptive management:

IW:LEARN is a joint UNDP/UNEP project. As such, both UNEP and UNDP contribute to components of the jointly developed project logical framework. However, the Mid-Term Evaluation pointed out some weaknesses in the project design and recommended, if possible, that the logical framework were revised and simplified to reflect a clear vertical logic that will contribute to the delivery of the overall goal. In addition, the MTE recommended that there was little point in continuing with the development of the South East Asian – Regional Learning Center (SEA-RLC), until the IW:LEARN website and toolkit were fully operational. As a result UNEP proposed to refocus the SEA-RLC activities in support of the work on the website and toolkit under Component A. In order to reflect these changes in the outcomes and activities, and guide the delivery of the remainder of the project, UNEP decided to adopt the MTE recommendation to revise the logical framework for the UNEP component. Quantitative indicators were established to track progress towards the revised outcomes as well as baselines and interim targets and timetables. When designing project logical frameworks, future joint project might want to consider what the implications are if the need arises for one of the partners to change elements of the logical framework. Whereas it provides the backbone for project implementation, it also has to allow for some flexibility to apply adaptive management, if one of the partners requires to do so.