



## International Waters: Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN)

---

### Action/Decision Items from IW:LEARN Steering Committee Meeting 16 July 2008 - Washington, DC, USA

The IW:LEARN Steering Committee (SC) held a face to face meeting on 16 July. Envisioned completion dates are **bolded in the text**. Actors responsible are underlined. ~~Strike-outs~~ were completed before this list was circulated. Participants are listed at the end. Alterations or additions to the sustainability plan are captured in **red**. Contested items are highlighted in **bold orange (with the contestor and rebuttal in parenthesis)**.

#### Opening and Agenda (UNEP/Tessa)

#### Introduction to the Draft Sustainability Plan (PCU/Dann)

#### Presentation of UNEP Inputs to the Draft Plan (DEWA/Sean)

#### Roundtable discussion on UNEP inputs - General comments from SC members

1. UNEP to provide a guidance document on website design (and the types of content it should have) that clearly articulates what datasets should be accessible, what kinds of information, etc. by **December 2008**.

#### UNEP's Data and Information Strategy (DEWA/Ashbindu) followed by Q&A

#### Presentation of UNDP inputs in draft plan (UNOPS team)

#### Roundtable Discussion on UNDP inputs - General Comments From SC Members

2. UNEP to report on who accesses the IWENs via E-Bulletin, website and add survey question to measure this.
3. UNEP to determine how big of a blip in traffic to specific pages comes following circulation of e-bulletin as a measure of its active readership/beneficiaries.
4. UNOPS or TE - Determine why/how IW Experience Notes are not reaching/benefiting [World Bank?] projects. Clarify source of demand, who accrues benefit, who reads.
5. UNOPS to draft sample TORs for JPO, including items which require GEF agency coordination + things which serve.

#### Presentation of World Bank inputs in draft plan (WB/Mei?)

6. MX to provide WBI input by **23 July**.

#### Roundtable discussion on WB inputs - General comments from SC members

#### Discussion on sustaining IW:LEARN service lines – key questions and follow-up

7. IWTF to ensure 1% of projects' budgets dedicated to cross-project learning, regardless of service provider(s) as in fee-for-service fashion. *(TH: This IW:LEARN SC meeting suggested to GEFSEC that \$1 % of GEF project cost may be sufficient for such knowledge learning related activities. The intent to include sufficient budget for a website consistent with IW:LEARN guidance and cost norms. Other possible uses of this funding could include participation in future Biennial International Waters Conferences (IWC), exhibits for these IWCs participations in capacity building and training activities, including those of GEF IW:LEARN. It is noted that GEFSEC wants such IW:LEARN activities to take precedent over independent learning with other groups, so that the portfolio can benefit from GEF funding for this rather than just the individual project and agency benefiting. However each project is able to select providers as best suits the needs of their project.)*

#### Project Progress and Workplan

INFO: Humboldt Current LME can pay itself for its learning exchange with BCLME (AH).

DECISION: Could add catalytic impacts and leveraged funds to sustainability plan. (TG)

#### Progress report UNOPS followed by Q&A

#### Progress report and workplan UNEP/DEWA followed by Q&A

#### Closure UNDP component

#### Road from IWC-4 to IWC-5 (GEFSEC/UNDP)

#### A.O.B.

### DISCUSSION SUMMARY

#### Opening and Agenda (UNEP/Tessa)

- ◆ Meeting commenced at 0921.
- ◆ TG: The focus of this meeting is sustainability.
- ◆ TH: For the record, the Bank has no formal input to the IW:LEARN sustainability plan, so no formal presentation or inputs have been prepared.
- ◆ AD: Does this mean the Bank will not offer anything toward IW:LEARN sustainability?
- ◆ TH: The IBRD will adhere to the blue standard requirements that seem to adhere to project interests...those that are in best interest of GEF, we will not subsidize.
- ◆ AD: Then WBI would have no participation?
- ◆ TH: WBI, as a subcontractor (passthru), did not see enough value-added to warrant continuing. The WBI no longer wants to play a similar role.
- ◆ AD: So what would the WBI do with its funding, would it offer its programs to GEF projects?

- ◆ TH: WBI is a fee for service agency, various projects can participate at cost in trainings, etc.
- ◆ JRMdS: The fee for service issue is important. It's an issue for all agencies, is there value for each?
- ◆ DMS: What is the role of non-core partners? Can we add that to the meeting?

#### Introduction to the Draft Sustainability Plan (PCU/Dann)

- ◆ DMS: The plan is a function of UNDP-UNEP inputs, with some gleaned from the GEFSEC. The objective was to outline what IW:LEARN affiliates can do to sustain services. The PCU is trying to assist the IWTF/SC, to ask whether the plan is commensurate with its benefits?
- ◆ DMS: Key questions regarding the plan are, which services are worth sustaining, and if so, who will sustain them (which champions), are the existing pledges enough to do so, is the schedule appropriate (closure of UNDP, UNEP and then looking at GEF-5), and are there other actors that should be there?
- ◆ DMS: I note that the terms information dissemination and information management constitute a difference of opinion between UNEP and UNDP, and hope that we can come to an agreement by the end of the day. Finally I hope the group can consider any refinements to the blue standards presently outlined.
- ◆ AD: Three items are not included in the plan. **The first item not previously mentioned is that *knowledge management (KM)* itself is not alluded to in the sustainability plan. It's back as a term, GEFSEC is stressing KM and it may help in the 'jargon' to secure funds. Does what IW:LEARN do help with KM? Second, communities of practice (CoP's) (with PAL's). Third, global contributions to international dialogues, for example, the nitrogen initiative meetings, WWF, UN Commission on Sustainable Development, etc. Also, please change the word meeting to portfolio-wide learning as regards the IW Conferences.**
- ◆ DMS: All the concepts AD mentioned are in the plan but perhaps, somewhat muddled. CoP's for example, worked in combination only with face-to-face meetings and have been difficult to keep alive.
- ◆ Others may not divide along the top-down definitions currently in the plan.

#### Presentation of UNEP Inputs to the Draft Plan (DEWA/Sean)

- ◆ SK: My presentation comes directly from the sustainability plan. UNEP's areas of interest lie in information management, networking and capacity building, visualization and learning...
- ◆ SK: Regarding iwlearn.net, we are looking at integrating iwlearn.net into a UNEP ecosystem knowledge management system, as well as networking existing platforms to access project data sets (maps, graphics, datasets), and improve visualization of the portfolio (e.g. hotspots).
- ◆ SK: With regard to technical support and capacity building, we are trying to create an environment that encourages data flow, i.e not just do IT training (which anyone can do). The content management system is a vehicle to permit that.
- ◆ SK: In terms of targeted training, UNEP will prepare a nutrient learning concept, as well as an IW science MSP (UNEP, UNU-INWEH).
- ◆ SK: In terms of regional dialogue processes, UNEP is working with GTZ on water and climate change, will incorporate IW:LEARN experiences in ongoing south-south cooperation and IWRM planning, and in mutual learning exchanges on vulnerability and management of groundwater resources, which could be linked to the learning project proposed as part of the MENARID programme.
- ◆ SK: In terms of the IWC's, UNEP pledges participation and input towards agenda setting and formulation.
- ◆ SK: In terms of information dissemination and assembly, UNEP pledges quality assurance and control for International Waters Experience Notes (IWENs) as well as for

- IW project datasets (through GEMS Water), SEEM, dissemination and sharing of GEF transboundary water information through UNEP South-South cooperation and the ecosystem management sub-programme, promotion of the ecosystem approach in international waters learning events, and incorporation of IW:LEARN derived content including datasets as a component of a global alert system.
- ◆ SK: In terms of Agency support to transboundary waters learning and knowledge management, UNEP is preparing a \$20M ecosystem management sub-program (with an important part related to transboundary waters. The amount will be worked out in course of 2009 (with UNEP offering liaison, coordination and information sharing between its water-related units).

#### Roundtable discussion on UNEP inputs - General comments from SC members

- ◆ AD: Could UNEP consider revising wording to be more active participation in IWC preparation?
- ◆ AD: As an FYI, there are no more Implementing Agencies, only GEF Agencies.
- ◆ SK: What modalities for continuing to provide service to GEF IW projects (i.e. IT support, training and operations of iwlearn.net) is anticipated when the sustainability plan materializes ? A large portion of the IW:LEARN service is GEF centric. A question that needs to be answered is "how this will benefit UNEP ?"
- ◆ MW: UNEP is very much interested in the idea of building networks for uplifting field data from projects to reinforce and carry out its assessment/early warning function, etc. There is a clear practical need for a system that uploads information from the project level to the global level. DEWA is however on the service end of the programming. It will be very difficult at the moment to come up with solid milestones and precisely how this will be done. As Divisions go through the planning for 2010/2011 this will be refined.
- ◆ TG (summary): There is a clear practical home for the kind of system to upwell information from the project level to global level for alerts, to service countries and (UN) clients, etc. At the same time in UNEP there is a planning process ongoing that is anticipated to conclude by next year (DEWA is on the service end) making it difficult at this stage how the discovery mechanism and exploration of datasets etc will precisely shape up
- ◆ TH: Regarding the Nutrient Reduction MSP, I urge UNEP to be mindful of the fact that most similar interventions today have been between UNDP and the IBRD (i.e. the East Asian Seas and Danube/Black Sea Strategic Partnerships). There will be a separate exercise on dead zones and its interface with coastal and marine environment. Specifics of the work on the UNEP side and IBRD side (outside of the GEF arena) should be clarified and ensure they are complimentary. The UNEP work should ensure they have access to all the information (both strategic partnership portfolios) results and case studies.
- ◆ TH: In terms of the blue standard list on page 20, none of the work proposed in the blue standards were in the list. UNEP should make note of this.
- ◆ TH (referring to the last slide): I hear a mixture between the conversation of UNEP's input to IW:LEARN sustainability and contributions of UNEP as an agency looking for input towards its own program. The information management part seems to be UNEP's contribution to IW:LEARN. There needs to be a more careful look at separating out UNEP work program into IW:LEARN and UNEP work. For example, regarding the development of MSP's I find it difficult to separate out UNEP's contribution to IW:LEARN vs. UNEP's own agency development. A conversation with the GEFSEC should be done to clarify how to separate that conflict.
- ◆ TH: Finally, most of the bank projects can develop their own websites and need to be convinced that they need them. When they are provided for free they are taken for granted and wont know that until they are taken away, or monetarized...so people know how much they cost. **The cost for these services should be stated so that people understand what it cost to provide these services.** Otherwise, they can go else where for services beyond the establishment of the website.

- ◆ TH: If projects had to pay for the toolkit would they choose that or the private sector?
- ◆ SK: Actually, several Bank projects are using the toolkit. Many Bank projects have seen the value... the benefit they see is not having to go back to consultants everytime to fix things. They also see the advantage of a common platform. Other issue is archiving, people want a home for their efforts after the project ends.
- ◆ TG: The paper UNEP previously circulated gives an outline of the associated cost for GEF IW:LEARN services. I hope that the paper clarified the need.
- ◆ TG: Regarding the separation of IW:LEARN from agency programs, the costs mentioned for the MSP represent co-financing UNEP is intending to provide or find for these initiatives with clear learning components, not GEF funds. There is no conflict of interest as these efforts are not undertaken as part of the work for the IW:LEARN project. In the context of sustainability, there is furthermore an interdivisional effort going on to directly align parts of the IW:LEARN project concepts to UNEP's work. Previously it was entirely separate, but for identifying opportunities for sustaining part of IW:LEARN within the Agency, by definition we are looking at alignment with the regular program of work
- ◆ DMS: The original task was to create websites, but it has evolved into knowledge management. It's not just about websites, but creating ways to share and maintain information. By using the IW:LEARN toolkit you don't hire IT person to manage the resource. In other words, it will bring the cost down as you don't need to hire. The result is the communications person does the work...and you don't pay for an IT person for four years. 20K for something simple, 50K for a more expensive design...projects are saving anywhere from 30K to 70K for significant services. UNEP has provided a toolkit...content management has been separated from the IT management. The toolkit does not require technical funding and reduces the cost to maybe 10K. And over the course of the project it's real money that could be saved. UNEP does not have to provide the service ...they have provided the tool that an in-country person could use. Very few agencies have used this model ..to provide a generic free content management system (CMS), adapt it to the needs and replicate.
- ◆ MX: Idea from the operational point of view of transferring small funds to UNEP or somewhere is not practical. Many countries have difficulty agreeing to an outside person doing it and also transferring funds in the first place. Two alternatives exist.
  - MX: The first alternative is to get GEF to create some sort of mechanism/fund to allocate recurrent funds for IWL services. The fund could be funded by fees taken before money is transferred to projects to create a common pool.
  - MX: A second alternative would be for each IW project to have a single page (based on an IW:LEARN set of indicators) that has standard information, that they manage and that is part of their website so that they can update it with their own funds.
- ◆ AD: We have received an inflated request for funding for website work. I thought we fixed it with having the review sheet to require a website with GEF IW:LEARN guidance. So it's important now to have guidance...and also cost norms. We want to see real numbers for the cost for websites. We don't want to be spending 80K. We now have a project indicator...website consistent with guidance. We need good guidance on what each website should have. Other things that the project has done should be accessible beyond the agencies. A guidance document should be clearly articulated so that e.g. datasets are accessible, information available, etc. PIFs , etc would not be approved if this is absent. Knowledge is continuing to stay in agencies. We need access to project data sets...as well as quality assure and control to determine if it's usable or not usable.
- ◆ JRMdS: MX has a good point that not all projects have websites. All new projects should have websites. Essentially the most cost effective mechanism is to use a toolkit like the UNEP one. What's important is that the standards/guidelines are met. Most fundamental lesson learned from IW:LEARN...We've tried a variety of ways of getting sites going. In the end the most cost effective mechanism has been the website toolkit. **What we need from UNEP is...what is that budget line going to be?** *(SK: UNEP has provided such in tabled document on costing)*

- ◆ TG: What's been on the table since December last year is actually a costing of the IT services that UNEP provide...
- ◆ IvdB: As a project manager, I am wondering how as a project manager could have access for services. Before there was a central home for all information (Mish, the team, etc). From which the demand was translated to an intervention to address the need. How can people access these services now...**What's not covered in the sustainability plan is how people will access these services, make contact.**
- ◆ JA: One should not think of IW:LEARN.net as a website but as an application. The reason why sustainability is such an important issues is because of the question who will capture all the data and information and ensure maintenance and updating of the iwlearn.net application beyond the project lifetime. This includes the harvesting of metadata, providing one stop entry, etc whether at national or global levels. Also, iwlearn.net follows specific standards and protocols. So if a consultant puts together things on his or her own, we may not create an interexchange environment that the IW:LEARN toolkit and website offers to that effect. Sustainability needs to look at what is needed at national level and what is needed at the iwlearn.net level.
- ◆ TH: Potentially a JPO @ one of the Agencies to continue being the central hub...

#### UNEP's Data and Information Strategy (DEWA/Ashbindu) followed by Q&A

- ◆ Ashbindu Singh of UNEP/DEWA gave a presentation around the future direction of UNEP work on data to keep the environment under review as part of its mandate.

#### Presentation of UNDP inputs in draft plan (UNOPS team)

- ◆ DMS asked that we looked at the services which services we want to sustain. He proposed that we step through the services to get a sense of what we would like to focus on. Then a 2<sup>nd</sup> pass to look at commitments and/or discussion. He asked that we "cross out" services not needed and then return to the blue standards.

#### Roundtable Discussion on UNDP inputs - General Comments From SC Members

##### [Service Line 1]

- ◆ DMS: **Page 5, should now be called knowledge management.**
- ◆ TH: The wording of need is very passive. There are things they need but wont necessarily demand. **Change the wording to DEMAND or REQUIREMENT...and be very clear whether it's coming from GEFSEC or projects.**
- ◆ TG: Really clarify what the portfolio needs.
- ◆ SK: We are preparing a survey.
- ◆ AH: [Discussion of WaterWiki growth...potential use at UN Water]
- ◆ AH: A link between WaterWiki and IW:LEARN be made. They proposed that water wiki be a potential resource for UN water to use.
- ◆ TG: For clarification, what from iwlearn.net set should be sustained through the WaterWiki?
- ◆ MH: WaterWiki is more a user driven virtual working platform and is broader than IW:LEARN.
- ◆ AD: What sort of users are on WaterWiki?
- ◆ MHH: Mish responded that at present it requires registration.
- ◆ MX/TH: The World Bank has made a decision to use Wikipedia as its platform for supplementing WSS and IWRM content (rather than IW:LEARN and/or WaterWiki).
- ◆ DMS: Wiki style editing projects information is an idea.
- ◆ DMS: Is IW:LEARN a model to be applied across other focal areas. ?

##### [Service Line 2]



- ◆ TG: There is a need to debate whether the sustainability plan should include cash pledges from GEF money and whether that's really sustainability? What is presented is **clearly a mixed bag. Can we clarify what is coming from where?**
- ◆ AH: When we talked about this originally....if agencies put regular commitment from their core budgets, then GEF would match that....**it would be good to spell out if it is non-GEF vs. GEF related.**
- ◆ AD: Is there a piece of the WBI trainings?
- ◆ TH: Internally to Bank, WB projects pay WBI for their clients to be trained by either WBI or any of these PAL-like centers of excellence. WBI rarely does the training, it organizes it.
- ◆ AD: So equivalent is that GEF project would...
- ◆ JRMdS: We can use the needs assessment survey process to determine IW management priorities (for training)
- ◆ TH: It's not tied to WBI.
- ◆ JRM: But WBI has a budget ...seed money...
- ◆ DMS: We've trained about 800 people, roughly 80/year...GEF Agencies should plan 4 regional workshops per year, with topics defined by conferences. Should the IW:LEARN sponsored workshops (demand driven activities) be sustained (he added in a WBI manner)? Is this sort of demand driven services needed?
- ◆ [There was a discussion on funding sources versus sustainability.]
- ◆ AD clarified that GEF would match funds that agencies put into sustainability. Stating that Andy's point on agency commitment is important. But if UNDP put their own funds into sustainability then they would be eligible for GEF funding associated with sustaining IW:LEARN.
- ◆ DMS stated that projects ask for more help for identified areas. He asked the SC if identification of project training needs are within the interest service areas that they wish to sustain. If not, he wanted to move forward.
- ◆ AD responded by asking TH if there is a piece of the WBI operations that would allow the country officials to participate in these sort of activities.
- ◆ AD: Since WBI is fee for service...should this be built into project fees or IW:LEARN service fees?
- ◆ TH: WB projects pay WBI for its clients to be trained by WBI or any of its "PAL" equivalents.
- ◆ AD then summarized that GEF projects should include this type of element to pay a service provider for similar training.
- ◆ JRMdS intervened that there are different models. In IW:LEARN there is a multi-project targeted multi-thematic approach???? Is there going to be online learning thematic training?
- ◆ **[Portfolio learning maybe should be tied to IWC and the needs assessment survey process could be used to identify IW thematic issues (in addition).]**
- ◆ JRMdS proposed that the IWC being used for training and an additional budget be set aside for this purpose.
- ◆ AD acknowledged but reiterated that \$200K be put aside in projects for this purpose.
- ◆ TH clarified that he misunderstood, WBI puts aside x funds for fee for service. The funds are not tied to IWL or WBI. The projects can go wherever to get these services.
- ◆ DMS stated that IW:LEARN has a track record for this sort of training. He proposed that the agencies plan 1 regional workshop/year (i.e. 4 /year) to pool similar projects (1/qtr). There is a 1 year lead time.

[Service Line 3]

- ◆ TG: Is everything for the IWC paid by GEF through UNDP? If yes, can this be counted as a cash pledge towards sustainability? If we are proposing business as usual, shouldn't all Agency be listed here to pledge their continued support in form of sustained participation in IWC?
- ◆ TH: We should have a conference fee for attendees. The fee should be differentiated between people attending from projects...vs. agencies. We would like to have a fee for

service where we have those projects who want to come be able to pay back and capture cost of their attendance. Not all of our projects are interested in attending...

- ◆ TG: Tracy, would you see this as part of IW:LEARN sustainability plan?
- ◆ TH: We don't envision having all the projects attend as we have found that not all projects are interested, only 50% are interested. **WBI has a budget from the WBI/GEF of 50-60K to subsidize staff travel and a select number of WBI staff whom are chosen to present. This could be contributed to the IW:LEARN plan.** For the balance this funding comes from the project supervision budget and is a decision of the project task managers.
- ◆ DMS: If we only send people who can give presentation, we run the risk to get stuck into the old IWC model.
- ◆ AH: Tiered structure, best way going forward...try to get costs down...
- ◆ TH suggested that the pre and post dialogue cost be rolled into ..... ??? so that conference fees be .... Everyone should have to pay to attend.
- ◆ AH agreed in principle to the cost recovery approach (tiered). In effect however, he noted that we have funds to put into the management cost from the MENARID project. A fee based approach is good and we have funds for 2009 and 2011.
- ◆ AD added that the 2009 plan start transition so that the 2011 IWC fully incorporates the fee based approach.

[Service Line 4]

- ◆ AH: Do we include gender into Blue Standard?

[Service Line - Experience Notes]

- ◆ **TH: Nobody is reading these things. WBI projects have not been reading the IWENs. They do not know that they exist !! and have not been reading them. Which questions the benefits of the notes. Where does the demand come from?** (AD - IvDB said there is benefit expressed by UNEP projects. AH has said to me that there are important benefits for learning...I said they are important to GEFSEC--so GEFSEC can learn from agency projects so that things that work are incorporated into new projects instead of replicating failed strategies. I personally still do not know what happened and what was learned from the World Bank's pilot phase Romania and Ukraine Danube Delta projects---maybe the World Bank staff know...or maybe they don't since some World Bank GEF projects have had 4 TTLs. one of the delta projects was good I hear, one was not so good. but this knowledge should not be proprietary to the World Bank...is GEFSEC funding continued failed projects in the Black Sea Danube Program? we were pleased that the Romania project produced its IWEN with TH's help. this is important to the portfolio and to GEFSEC. What happened in the Georgia IW project---I still don't know. Can we replicate? This is a serious issue of failure for GEF not to learn ... especially when new science information shows the importance of reducing nutrient loading globally. Perhaps GEF needs to work with FAO on these agriculture issues to get animal waste properly considered a resource for producing energy and then remaining nutrients re-used on the land. Is that was intended in the Georgia project?

*From the start, this concept of learning has been a part of IW:LEARN and is in the Council-approved Operational Strategy, the old OPs, the GEF 4 Strategy for IW. In fact, other GEF agencies, with less experience now that we have 7 new ones, can benefit from the mature and smart agencies' on-the-ground experiences by documenting their experiences. This focal area is based on capturing experiences during project implementation as a learning tool supporting adaptive management in what we fund and not waiting 5 years until a project ends and 2-3 years later when a completion report or evaluation is issued.*

*GEFSEC would expect all PIFs submitted to include the intent to include sufficient budget for a website consistent with IW:LEARN guidance and cost norms as well as participate with at least one country official in each Biennial International Waters Conference (IWC), produce an exhibit for the IWCs and actively participate in GEF IW:LEARN activities,*



including producing IWENs. This IW:LEARN SC meeting suggested to GEFSEC that \$1 % of GEF project cost may be sufficient for such GEF IW:LEARN-related activities. GEFSEC would want such IW:LEARN activities to take precedent over independent learning with other groups, so keeping the IW:LEARN wording is critical so the portfolio can benefit from GEF funding for this rather than just the individual project and agency benefiting. Agencies will have noticed that these types of indicators for learning have been incorporated into the GEF 4 tracking tools. GEFSEC would also expect at PIF stage the commitment to program reporting on GEF 4 IW indicators into the logframe for project design (with sufficient funding) so that progress on indicators may be reported annually at time of the PIR/AMR process. GEFSEC would expect agency water contacts (TH, TN and AH...or their regional counterparts) to send GEFSEC water staff an e-mail at endorsement stage just before submission showing us where these points are included the endorsement document.

May I repeat that GEFSEC looks forward to these features of your PIF and endorsement submissions so that your projects are consistent with the learning accomplished so far in this focal area and the wording approved by Council on learning in the GEF 4 IW Strategy. In the past, your contacts have urged quick approval of concepts, PIFs or endorsements at the last minute. Missions were leaving or agency deadlines needed to be met. We request you incorporate these features from the beginning to avoid delay in our recommendations for approval to the CEO).

- ◆ DMS: Is it communication/marketing thing vs. a utility issue?
- ◆ SK: We do have several systems to track data
- ◆ IVB: UNEP had a different experience when it organize the Bangkok meeting to share experience amongst project manager...people were quite interested...amongst project managers, it might be an awareness issue.

[Service Line Gender]

- ◆ JRMDs: The gender integration in projects has been very challenging. As an aside, in particular the LAC participants have been very instrumental in taking the Gender and Water Alliance forward. However, the GEF projects have not been receptive. A better job is required, if GEF really wants to mainstream gender, then it should be mandated within the projects or it will not be done. The gender audit is part of the stakeholder involvement.
- ◆ AH: I suggest adding a blue standard be added.
- ◆ TH: Projects have not demanded gender integration to date. It should be made clear that the demand is from the agencies and the GEFSEC.
- ◆ DMS: Stakeholders who may have the demand may not be part of the project formulation.
- ◆ AD: This is a demand from the GEFSEC and should be reflected. If agencies are comfortable then it too should be stated. GEFSEC looks forward to specific mention of gender-related commitments in the PIF and provisions in the endorsed document on this important issue in which we have learned projects ignore them. please specifically include the commitment to include gender issues in the PIF as a component of project prep stakeholder involvement (GEF policy may not be specific enough but we expect the agencies to cover this as a result of learning) to determine whether they are critical to that type of project. if critical, please include them specifically in the project.

[Service Line 5]

- ◆ TG and TH want to remove 5.0 section entirely...too much blending
- ◆ TH: I do not like MSP's in general.
- ◆ WBI stressed that there exist a conflict of interest that caused the project to suffer because staff on IW:LEARN devoted time to developing MSPs which are featured in the section. She stated that WBI will stress this during the terminal evaluation.
- ◆ TG: This issue was already raised at the December SC.

- ◆ AD: Look at it as a program...We have certain opportunities to get learning through...as partners come up...issue of projects beings written that don't want to learn...I want to be interviewed as part of TE, if we are going to work with different disparities and temporal...to cobble together an IW program...so I defend IW:LEARN role to interlink.
- ◆ TH: We never said we don't want to be part of cross-project learning, just don't want to pay for GEFSEC overhead.
- ◆ DMS: We have examples of 5.0 interventions that resulted in greater consistency and harmony...anyway the basic point is some 5.0 is needed.

#### Presentation of World Bank inputs in draft plan (WB/Mei)

- ◆ MX: Remove contract from recommendation to WBI...in no way could I commit to that...remove that list...this is a 40K thing.
- ◆ MX: We are moving more and more to developing local capacity
- ◆ MX: I will write a specific paragraph
- ◆ MX: Might want to consider making recommendations to local institutions...so recommendation should be not just a JPO but a person or combination of persons

#### Roundtable discussion on WB inputs - General comments from SC members

- ◆ [At this point a decision was made to discuss the so called Blue Standard Requirements]

#### Discussion on sustaining IW:LEARN service lines – key questions and follow-up

- ◆ AH: The section should not be called “conclusion”.

##### [Blue Standard 1]

- ◆ SK: Traditionally made people aware thru websites...but it is more than a website.
- ◆ DMS: The issue is having basic content available...style is not the issue.
- ◆ AH: Require projects to have websites, encourage them to follow guidelines.
- ◆ SK: whole point was to have an information system with a central node...that's what the toolkit was designed to do. You lose that if you just have websites with just a page.
- ◆ MX: IW:LEARN is meant to furnish information about things everyone is concerned about.
- ◆ TH: Projects don't have to make use of the toolkit but rather the standards for inter-exchange, etc. This is where UNEP may wish to include its value added services into the guidelines?

##### [Blue Standard 2]

- ◆ DMS: The IW focal area has been trying to do this for years and perhaps five-to-seven page documents are not the right way to go...if we cannot say this is an effective.
- ◆ SK: The idea was to capture what works and doesn't work...and how to replicate good practices. Incentives are the big issue.
- ◆ lvdB: Until you put it on papers, you don't codify.
- ◆ TH: WBI does not endorse GEF IWEN as there is no direct benefit to the projects. ...
- ◆ MX: WBI (MX) interested in IWENs because it serves as one window into what IWRM is doing, good, bad lessons and needs. I suggest that we remove (page 9) the word “contract”, and also would rather use local capacities to do the work. I suggest that the list be removed from page 9.

##### [Unclear what this Standard these notes refer to]

- ◆ MX: In terms of learning, the twinning...you might consider basin twinning as its own category. WBI has moved from regional to global activities that might suit IW:LEARN better. #1 we are developing a water governance course based on IWRM. We could specifically allocate some budget to ensure that IW is part of the development of that 5-day course, its delivery and testing. An experience note is one window into what the projects are doing.

- ◆ JRMDs: Would course be fee for service?
- ◆ MX: We are encouraged to move to fee-based courses

#### [Blue Standard #3]

- ◆ TH: We shall specify commitment and funding...but does not actually obligate projects to do this...

#### [Blue Standard #5]

- ◆ TH: drop something?!?!...
- ◆ AH: Identify and participant in relevant events...water down the numbers
- ◆ TH: Make them untied enough...to see how quickly projects take up the services or let them die...see how they spend that 10%
- ◆ AH: Could have 1% budget recommendation for inter-project learning
- ◆ TG: Good to have that...and gatekeeper function
- ◆ DMS: 1% of your budget...can have a project document budget line for "learning".
- ◆ TH: I believe we are reaching some consensus...call them blue standards and drop requirements. Blue standard requirements should not be "requirements" if truly needed by projects. Each one be completely re-written in a project centered light. "Projects will disseminate their news to other projects on a regular basis to highlight their achievements" rewrite everything that it is project-centered...here is what you can do with your 1%...give some kind of indicative range on how much for each blue standard...
- ◆ TH: The issue is also sustaining GEF-Learning vs. Sustaining Projects. Projects will not want to sustain 10+ IW:LEARN requirements when IWRM is difficult as it is.

#### [Discussion]

- ◆ Considerable discussion evolved towards the need for a staff person at the GEFSEC dedicated to IW:LEARN (JPA, JPO, etc).
- ◆ TH commented that on 3, 4, 5, and 6, the language should be "shall specify commitment and funding". #4 was not stated that way. On 7,8,9, and 10 there is no cost to these items. For the WBI to be serious about this, they would like to see the language tied to "participation towards learning events per year" and not specify IW:LEARN or the GEF. In particular she suggested that #5 be clarified to "one learning project per year" rather than "GEF IW:LEARN event". IW:LEARN should be able to compete in a market where there are choices. She recommended that "tying" to GEF or IWLEARN be removed to quickly determine (from the projects) which services are truly needed.

#### [Other edits to sustainability plan not previously captured]

- ◆ De-brand IW:LEARN services for post-project sustainability, with 1% of projects' budgets dedicated to cross-project learning, regardless of service provider(s) as in fee-for-service fashion, starting with PPG.

#### Replace:

- ◆ Incorporate all points with proposal for [more] effective Communities of Practice, including composition, format and lifecycle.
- ◆ Include "Global Contributions to International Dialogs" (WWF, international N meeting(s), UNCSD, etc.)
- ◆ Further incorporate Blue Standards references into body of document.
- ◆ For partner commitments, distinguish agencies' baseline work plans (for GEF) from contributions expressly to foster and integrate/institutionalize IW:LEARN services.
- ◆ Posit GEF IW:LEARN provides standards for learning and web sites, but is not exclusive provider (cost-recovery from competitive sources)
- ◆ For IWCs, plan for partial cost-recovery through registration fees: E.g., for [lowball] \$150-250k conference, \$125k from \$250 pp. for 200 beneficiary nation representatives, \$750 pp. for 100 others.

#### Blue Standards

- ◆ Focus on benefits to projects' business processes and sustainability, not GEF corporate agenda, e.g.,
- ◆ To develop cost-effective professional project Web sites, easily maintained and including features for knowledge management, knowledge sharing and learning among partners and across projects, GEF agencies shall ensure their projects..."
- ◆ Focus on benefits accrued by those who share.
- ◆ ~~Add E-bulletin to info assembly and dissemination section.~~
- ◆ p. 3 [MX:] Note twinning is a good learning tool; WBI developing global course on water governance, IW subject could be part of this course. (Participation via fee-based with some subsidizing, see p. 9 for more.)

#### Dann's in-line notes on SP:

- ◆ p.3: Number categories to reflect #s in body of doc, so this list may serve as a numbered key.
- ◆ p. 4: Note Issue of "How can IW:LEARN services been scaled-up across the GEF portfolio, IW and beyond?"
- ◆ p. 5: replace "of GEF IW:LEARN learning activities" with "GEF IW:LEARN and other IW-related learning."
- ◆ p. 6: Remove "your" after "Upscale"
- ◆ p. 7: insert "d" after "an" in "an hosting"
- ◆ p. 9:
- ◆ MX rejects second bullet as currently written.
- ◆ MX to provide lingo for IW module for water governance w/s.
- ◆ Ref to "UNDP-GEF TDA/SAP learning MSP concept" appears to be in wrong place in plan.
- ◆ p. 14 switch "dissemination and assembly" to "Assembly and Dissemination" (since A comes prior to D)
- ◆ p. 19 Replace "undo" with "undue"

#### Project Progress and Workplan

#### Progress report UNOPS followed by Q&A

#### Progress report and workplan UNEP/DEWA followed by Q&A

- ◆ SK: Presented revised budget and clarified allocation for the TE short fall of \$20,000
- ◆ SK: Presented progress report for Q2 and work plan for Q3-4, there were no comments.
- ◆ SK: Provided progress on implementation of the Caribbean activity. There were no comment
- ◆ SK: Presented an overview of the progress towards a more interactive website (i.e. Web2.0).
- ◆ They were no substantive comments.

#### Closure UNDP component

#### Road from IWC-4 to IWC-5 (GEFSEC/UNDP)

#### A.O.B.

TG: As this was the last IW:LEARN Steering Committee with both executing parties, UNOPS and UNEP/DEWA, present, the chair thanked in particular the UNOPS staff, Dann, Janot and Mish in particular for their contribution to the IW:LEAR project now that the UNDP component is coming to an end in November 2009.

---

<i>Steering Committee Representatives Present</i>	<i>Steering Committee Members or alternates</i>
GEF: Al Duda	<u><i>Not Present</i></u>
Projects:	GEF: Ivan Zavadsky, Peter Bjoernsen,
UNDP: Andrew Hudson	Christian Severin
UNEP: Tessa Goverse, Isabelle Van der Beck	Projects: Samuel Taffesse (IBRD-Guarani),
World Bank: Tracy Hart, Mei Xie (WBI)	John Pernetta (UNEP-SCS), Vincent Sweeney
	(UNDP-IWCAM)
	UNDP: Vladimir Mamaev
	UNEP:
	UNOPS: Andrew Menz
<i>Other Participants – IW:LEARN Project Coordinating Unit (PCU): Dann Sklarew, Janot Mendler, Mish Hamid, Sean Khan, UNEP/DEWA: Ashbindu Singh</i>	
<i>UNEP phone-in - Takehiro Nakamura (UNEP/DGEF), Johannes Akiwumi (UNEP/DEWA), Mick Wilson (UNEP/DEWA)</i>	

---