

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3340	
GEF Agency project ID		3799	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Good Practices and Portfolio Learning in Transboundary Freshwater and Marine Legal and Institutional Frameworks	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		n/a	
Executing agencies involved		University of British Columbia, Institute of Asian Research	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Canadian Water Research Society, Network for Environment & Sustainable Development in Africa, Asian American Partnership, WWF-USA, Gender & Water Alliance, Columbia Basin Trust, Aquatic Resources Conservation Group, multiple academic institutions	
Private sector involvement		White & Case (Attorneys), Holguin, Neira & Pombo (Abogados), Lawson Lundell (Barristers & Solicitors), Pierce Atwood (Attorneys)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 9, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 18, 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2011	
Actual date of project completion		June 30, 2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	50,000	49,686
	Co-financing	30,000	59,700
GEF Project Grant		950,000	950,000
Co-financing	IA/EA own	n/a	n/a
	Government	n/a	40,000
	Other*	1,207,800	1,260,000
Total GEF funding		1,000,000	999,686
Total Co-financing		1,237,800	1,359,700
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2,237,800	2,359,386
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 6, 2012	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Laurence Boisson de Chazournes and Mara Tignino	
TER completion date		February 5, 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	MS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	n/a	n/a	MU	ML
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	S	S
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a	MS	S
Quality of Implementation	S	n/a	n/a	S
Quality of Execution	S	n/a	MS	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	MU	MU

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project was intended to be a review and assessment of the “formal and informal legal and institutional arrangements within, and beyond, the GEF IW portfolio” (TE, 11). It would strengthen international cooperation and governance frameworks for future GEF International Waters projects, thereby increasing their benefits. Almost half of the world’s population will soon live on an international river basin, and migration to these areas is increasing. Good governance of international waters is therefore necessary to manage the increasing demands on marine ecosystems, meet the challenges of the Millennium Development Goals, and resolve transboundary issues such as pollution, competing use of water sources, sustaining fisheries, mitigating invasive species, and dealing with climate change. This project will enhance these efforts by fostering good governance and decision-making on international waters management, focusing on adapting and replicating functional legal and institutional frameworks for cooperation.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The objective of the project was to strengthen international cooperation and to enhance the development of regional governance frameworks for GEF International Waters projects. To that end, it had three main components:

1. Identify beneficial legal and institutional practices of effective governance of international water resources and create South-South peer learning groups for collaboration.
2. Develop new learning tools and teaching and implementation guides to prepare local experts to use water governance tools. Tools include case studies, negotiations, a website, and simulation exercises.
3. Deliver and refine water governance tools through hands on programs with GEF International Waters practitioners in order to create local experts in each region.

For the identification of practices and experiences, the project focused on seven thematic issues: “benefit sharing, data and information sharing and exchange, dispute resolution, funding, resilience, institutional architecture, and public participation” (TE, 21).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

No. The terminal evaluation report says that some working contracts had to be shortened due to exchange rate variability.

#### 4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project follows GEF-4 International Waters Strategic Objective 2: “To catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns” (GEF-4 Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming document, 61). While the project will not directly reduce the overexploitation of fisheries, coastal pollution, or competing water uses, it will enhance the abilities of future projects to accomplish those programs by spreading good governance practices and frameworks and preparing local experts in all of the GEF regions.

Likewise for country priorities, this is a truly global project and does not cater to any specific national priorities. However, the beneficial governance practices promoted and spread by this project are in the interest of every country that has a stake in the challenges facing international waters.

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The project completed all of its intended goals. For the creation of governance tools, 28 case studies were written on international waters governance on shared river basins and other bodies of water all over the world. The case studies focused on the legal and institutional frameworks that apply to the water bodies, the mechanisms used to achieve international agreements, and what those agreements accomplished. A training manual of experiential learning and capacity building tools for international

waters governance was also created. It emphasized communication and negotiation skills and included role play simulations and managed debriefings. In addition, a synthesis document was written to identify and analyze six aspects of good governance in the international waters context, plus the actors, structures, and decisions involved: benefit sharing, information exchange, dispute resolution, funding, resilience, and institutional architecture. The project also made several journal publications, and created an interactive web tool for the case studies and experiential learning.

The various tools described above were promoted and disseminated in several workshops around the world. Regional seminars were also conducted to connect with the project stakeholders. The research and training tools have been adopted by several universities in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and via the Universities Partnership on Transboundary Waters. According to the terminal evaluation report, the project’s learning tools have reached both GEF and non-GEF international waters practitioners, with the target audience including local water managers, academics, civil society, and project managers. The project also promoted South-South cooperation, for instance by creating an African Peer Group to review best practices in transboundary water management.

However, there were some limitations to the project’s results. According to the terminal evaluation report, “field testing of the learning tools should be developed further. Only a small number of universities and GEF practitioners have used them” (TE, 32). Also, the project did not manage to translate the learning tools into French, Portuguese, and Spanish as originally planned due to a lack of funding. This deficiency limits the scope of the project’s impact, but the overall outcomes of the project were satisfactory.

4.3 <b>Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes were completed within budget, although the lack of funds available for translation to Spanish, French, and Portuguese is unfortunate. This may have been the result of exchange rate changes between the Canadian and U.S. dollars, which were unfavorable to project implementation. The project was extended by a year, but at no extra cost. Project management effectively coordinated with dozens of project partner agencies and beneficiary institutions to enact a successful global project with a presence in every GEF region.

This project’s efficiency stems not only from its successful and moderately cost-effective implementation, but also because it will have the effect of reducing the time, money, and effort needed for future International Waters projects: the best practices for governance that were identified and shared by this project will not need to be repeated and relearned with each successive GEF IW project.

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Project sustainability is rated as Moderately Likely. Financial sustainability of some project components is uncertain. The website, which hosts interactive training material and contains a database of research

and project tools, needs continuing financial support for hosting and maintenance. According to the terminal evaluation report, IW: LEARN has shown interest in maintaining the website, but this is unconfirmed and the report recommends exploring other options for maintaining the website. At the time of this GEF IEO review, the website (as given in the final PIR: <http://governance-iwlearn.org>) has been taken down. Many of the project's reports and documents are hosted on IW:LEARN, but the interactive training materials and research database are no longer available.

Another sustainability issue concerns the fact that training materials were not translated into French, Portuguese, and Spanish as planned, and there is no assurance that this will happen in the future. Translation would make the project's outcomes more widespread and long-lived; current and future international waters practitioners and beneficiaries must be able to understand the materials in their own language in order for the benefits to be realized.

Project sustainability is enhanced by the development of training that was housed in universities and by the creation of a network of experts in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The fact that project beneficiaries were so widespread geographically and a part of so many different types of institutions—governmental, academic, etc.—means that support and capacity for improved water body governance will come from many different sources and many potential GEF executing and partnering agencies.

On the other hand, the terminal evaluation report states that “it would be better if GEF IW practitioners enhance their interest in governance issues,” which implies that although the project has provided tools and identified best practices for enhancing governance of marine areas,, there is a risk that these tools and practices will not be applied due to stakeholders' lack of interest in international waters governance (TE, 18). In addition, it is not clear whether the universities and NGOs that were involved in creating and disseminating the training products would continue to teach and share them. Because of these uncertainties and the lack of a website, project sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

**5.1 Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The majority of the co-financing came in-kind from the project's partner institutions, although White & Case and the Canadian government also provided co-financing. The final PIR says that White & Case lent their staff for assistance in workshops, research on dispute resolution mechanisms, and preparation of the document “International Waters: Review of Legal and Institutional Frameworks.” The project finance table in the terminal evaluation report does not include co-financing funds, and there is no description of the project's partner agencies or what their co-financing was used for. Therefore, it is difficult to assess what co-financing was able to accomplish.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended at no cost "to take advantage of some important meetings for the project in terms of knowledge sharing and dissemination of materials" (TE, 25). It does not appear to have affected outcomes or sustainability.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

This project had a global constituency, but institutions of several countries benefitted from it. Government ministries, academic institutions, civil society organizations, local offices of international organizations, and even other GEF projects were direct beneficiaries of the project's efforts in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Europe/Central Asia. By adding capacity and creating South-South knowledge exchanges, this project has built a greater foundation for the country ownership of future GEF International Waters projects.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E design as given in the project document for CEO approval is robust. It is budgeted with detailed and appropriate indicators, with the time frame, reports, and responsibilities delineated. It has targets set for the creation of training materials, governance tools, and workshops for collaboration. Although there are no baselines in the project results framework, given the unique nature of the project design, this does not seem to be a major flaw. Overall M&E design was practicable and sufficient.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

According to the terminal evaluation report, "The M&E plan was followed with timely quarterly reports, annual PIRs, ad-hoc communications and annual steering committee meetings" (TE, 25). Monitoring was described as "careful" and "noteworthy" (TE, 28). No problems or issues were reported. The project

steering committee decided that a midterm evaluation would not take place, as there were no issues that needed review. Project M&E is therefore rated as Satisfactory.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The project designers deserve credit for developing a unique and rewarding project that will enhance the benefits of all GEF International Waters projects going forward. The terminal evaluation report states that the project was “overly ambitious” in structure, but aside from the lack of language translation all tasks were completed as planned and within the project budget (TE, 27).

Project implementation went smoothly. The failure to translate the project outputs into Spanish, Portuguese, and French as planned does not decrease the implementation or execution score because it is not apparent whether the fault lies with the agencies or is due largely to changes in the Canadian and US dollar exchange rate.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

As with project implementation, project execution went smoothly with no problems reported. All project components were completed at the Satisfactory or Highly Satisfactory level according to the terminal evaluation. Although the terminal evaluation report gave highly satisfactory ratings to the project management components of the Findings table, it failed to describe the quality of project implementation and execution. Considering the satisfactory project outcomes and lack of any issues mentioned, project execution is rated as satisfactory.

## 8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The terminal evaluation report contained a few lessons for future GEF projects. For one, the training tools created in this project should be embedded into future GEF projects. This could be accomplished by increasing and assessing the participation of IW project managers in learning events.

The report noted the importance of the project's Advisory Committee, which consisted of people "of high standing in the water sector...[who] contributed in an individual capacity" (TE, 38). The report states that the Committee should have played a more prominent role in the project, and that its ownership and visibility in the project should be increased.

The report also emphasizes the importance of gender mainstreaming, since "no work has been done on gender and transboundary waters" (TE, 40). It is not enough to ensure, as the project sought to do, that a certain percentage of women participate in meetings and workshops. Instead, a more comprehensive strategy should be developed that scales up the successes of the small grants projects to the transboundary level.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The terminal evaluation report recommends that synergies between GEF and non-GEF projects be strengthened, as this project drew lessons from and integrated non-GEF work into its policy framework tools. In addition, the GEF should refocus its attention on water conflicts, which are a threat to peace and security but receive little international engagement. The report also notes the importance of training local experts and GEF project managers to address global challenges that affect international waters, such as climate change and biodiversity.

For recommendations specific to this project, the report states that further networks should be developed in order to find new project partners to aid the project's continuation. The training tools need to be updated and refined, and the report suggests that IW: LEARN have a prominent role in their refinement and dissemination.

The terminal evaluation report also suggested developing more studies on the legal and institutional framework regarding estuaries, rivers, wetlands, and marshes, where studies on governance are scarce. The project should further collaborate with organizations such as the African Net Basin Organization, which would help with tool dissemination as well as South-South cooperation. This project and others should also "plan and assess existing collaborative mechanisms for the management of transboundary water resources in Africa" and develop a framework to streamline the activities of these mechanisms in order to prevent overlaps and waste.



## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The assessment of project outcomes and impacts is adequate. The report provided a rating for each project component but did not give an overall outcome, implementation, or execution rating.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	More details and a separate description of the process and experiences of project implementation and execution would have been helpful. The report does not explain the functions of most of the project's partner institutions, nor does it assess their involvement. In addition, poor phrasing occasionally made meanings unclear throughout the report.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	No sustainability rating is given, and the section on sustainability needed greater detail. The report included vague statements such as "The NGO community should also be considered" but did not specify how or why (TE, 36). It was also unclear whether the universities would remain involved in teaching the project's outcomes after the project's end, which if true would be a great boost to project sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Many of the lessons learned are vague, and the recommendations are not very clear. They don't always result from the experiences of the project, but instead contain sweeping recommendations for the GEF as a whole.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project finance table does not include co-financing sources or uses. None of the sources or uses of co-financing are described, aside from White & Case.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Very little time is devoted to discussing the project's M&E systems.	MU
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

TE Quality = (.3\*(4+3)) + (.1\*(3+3+3+3)) = 3.3 = MU

## 10. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources were used.