United Nations Environment Programme

Terminal Evaluation of

UNEP/GEF Project GF/1020-03-01 (4264)

Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America (Delta America) GEF Id 1426

Glen Hearns

Evaluation Office

September 2010

Table of Contents

Acronyms

BSP	Bali Strategic Plan
CEHI	Caribbean Environmental Health Institute
ISP	Inter-American Strategy for the promotion of Public Participation in Decision-Making for Sustainable Development.
IW:LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
IWRN	InterAmerican Water Resources Network
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MTS	UNEP's Mid-term Strategy
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OAS	Organisation of American States
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project

"Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean"

I. Executive Summary

1. The "Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean" (DELTAmerica) project was undertaken to improve the capacity for managing transboundary waters through the promotion of South-South learning and exchange of experiences identifying lessons learned and findings; these were disseminated to other GEF International Waters projects.

2. The project was initiated in March 2003 and was scheduled to finish in December 2005. An extension was granted to June 2009 to complete documentation.[1]

3. The project was implemented through UNEP, on behalf of GEF, and executed by the Organisation of American States (OAS), consistent with both UNEP and OAS budgetary and financial rules. A Steering Committee was established consisting of the several Brazilian institutions (Brazilian Agency for International Cooperation, the Secretariat of Water Resources/Ministry of Environment, and the National Water Agency), UNEP, OAS, InterAmerican Water Resources Network (IWRN) and the International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN).

4. Brazil was strongly represented in the Steering Committee as it was involved in executing several GEF Projects[2] and was disposed to assist DELTAmerica both financially and through in-kind contributions. Consequently, the project was conceived with Brazil being the regional node for the IWRN, with pilot sites in other areas. Later, however, it was determined that other full sub-regional nodes would be constructed in South Cone, Pacific-Amazon and Central America, and the Caribbean.[3]

Main Results

5. Sub-regional nodes to operate the web based IWRN system were developed from existing institutions with experience in water resources within each sub-region. The technical secretariat had a physical presence in Brazil, and UNESCO (Montevideo) became co-chair of the technical secretariat in 2004.

6. Key project outputs contain:

i. Three strategic meetings with the national focal points of the IWRN: i) Arequipa, Peru, June 2003, ii) Montevideo, Uruguay in September 2003, and iii) in Lima, Peru, May 2005:

[1] Quarterly Report 2004 (2nd Quarter), and cited in terms of reference, and in terminal financial matrix (March 10, 1998) sent by Sandeep Bhambra April 27, 2010.

[2] Some of which include: São Fransisco, Upper Paraguay, and Guarani Aquifer.

[3] See 3.3 of prodoc: Establish a sub-regional node in Brazil and possibly as well in one or several potentially identified thematic centers of excellence—as pilot sites within this activity—to test the website and related communications tools.

ii. Three Sub Regional Dialogues: i) Brasilia, Brazil, July 23 -25, 2003, ii) Montevideo, Uruguay, September 26-27, 2003 and iii) in Saint Lucia, March 4-5, 2004.

iii. The creation of 4 functioning sub-regional Internet nodes in support of the IWRN: Con-Sur in Buenos Aires; Pacifica in Lima; MERCOSUR in Brasilia; and Central America in San José.[4]

iv. Strengthening of the governance structure of IWRN to allow for greater transparency in decision-making, and inclusion of civil society, academia, private sector, governments, and international organizations on the governing Board.

v. Publication outputs include: Lessons Learned and Best Practices for water management in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) (English, Spanish, Portuguese); A common strategy for Water Management in LAC (English, Spanish, Portuguese); Contributions to definitions best practices and lessons learned. (Portuguese); User Manual for Nodes (English, Spanish, Portuguese).

Assessment

7. The Evaluation was conducted following Terms of Reference (Annex I) that are based on the GEF and UNEP evaluation principles and guidelines. Beyond questions relating to how well the project was undertaken, the evaluation focused on four key areas: I) how well the project promoted South-to-South learning; II) has such information exchange shown benefits in integrated water and land resource management in the region; III) was the project able to strengthen information exchange; and IV) have the countries and stakeholders taken ownership of the project and continued to fund it? As the evaluation was being conducted approximately five years after the substantial activities had ceased, it provided an opportunity to see what had transpired in terms of ownership and application of the information generated in the project. In particular attention was paid to country and regional ownership of the exchange mechanisms.

8. The DELTAmerica project was mostly successful in promoting South-South learning, both through the continuation and strengthening of the IWRN's Inter-American Dialogue series as well as regional and sub-regional meetings focusing on substantive and process issues, such as the development of a constitution for the IWRN. The more substantive issues focused on developing criteria and identifying lessons learned and procedural issues, which further helped develop mechanisms for dissemination.

9. Dissemination occurred in two principal ways:

i) Through presentations and dissemination at regional and international forums, including:

- The 5th Inter-American Dialogue on Water Resources, Montego Bay, Jamaica, 2005
- The III GEF IW Meeting in Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, 20-24 June, 2005
- The 5th World Water Forum in Mexico, March 2006.

ii) Inclusion of the key publications on the websites of the nodes that are accessible to anyone.

[4] Note a web node for the Caribbean was envisioned in St Lucia, and was established towards the end of the project. The Central American node and Caribbean nodes were not functional as of April 2010.

10. The key publications along with databases of national legislation are available for download on the IWRN nodes. While it is difficult to gauge the effect of the dissemination process, the Pacific-Amazon, Brazil and South Cone nodes remain active and technical node operators suggest that they are accessed with as much as 20,000 hits annually. Argentina and Brazil have also used the lessons learned to inform their consultation process with the provinces over water resources. Moreover, the IWRN now has over 400 members.

11. The project served to illustrate that the systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned and best practices are helpful in creating a culture of integrated water resource management amongst resource managers in the region. Not only did the project assist in strengthening the existing GEF projects, but the meetings and dialogue process helped to stimulate two additional transboundary projects covering the Amazon Basin and the Plata Basin. Since the beginning of the DELTAmerica project several countries, including Argentina, Brazil, Columbia and Peru, have developed new laws and policies relating to water resource management (all are available from the web-nodes). While it is not possible to directly attribute these advances to the project itself, there is common agreement that access to relevant data on the nodes combined with regional meetings and dialogues have facilitated the process of legislative development. The development of the web nodes for IWRN was opportune in that it coincided with a large increase in use of the Internet by professionals.

12. Furthermore, there is general agreement amongst those interviewed that the DELTAmerica project worked well in integrating knowledge between water managers of the region, but generally fell short of having the political influence that was hoped. This was in part due to the short timeframe that the activities were programmed for, and the fact that Ministerial level dialogues had not been foreseen or programmed. The project relied, to a large extent, on the upward filtering of information from the National Focal Points, which varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

13. A more recent enterprise initiated during the DELTAmerica project is the concept of a Water Directive for the Americas.[5] Its objective is to develop common principles for water management based on Integrated Water Resources Management principles. The project is focused at the parliamentary levels of government in the region and would thus promote the concepts developed under the DELTAmerica project at the highest levels.

14. When the project was initiated in 2003, the principal mechanism for the dissemination of information and lessons learned in the region was the IWRN and its Inter-American Dialogue Series. The project assisted with an improved technical capacity to disseminate information, more legitimacy and stronger relations at the line agency level in governments. The generation of lessons learned was accomplished through regional meetings with a specific focus on analysis of work conducted by several consultants. Lessons learned and findings were disseminated through the Inter-American Dialogue series (V Dialogue, Jamaica, 2004), international meetings (World Water Forum, Mexico City, 2006) and through the web sites of the IWRN where documents could be downloaded.

15. To ensure ownership and sustainability of the project benefits, agreements were signed with several countries confirming that nodes would be maintained after the termination of the DELTAmerica project. This has occurred to varying degrees. In the case of Brazil, the government now has an official database to publish and promote new legislation, displaying a high level of interest and ownership for that aspect of information dissemination. As such the IWRN node for Brazil needs only to link to that database, as opposed to update this

[5] DELTAmerica (2005-a). *Common Strategy for Water Management among the Countries of Latin America and the Carribean (preliminary proposal)*. OAS, Washington, 2005

information themselves, to maintain that aspect of the node. While the Brazil node continues to be maintained by the Secretariat for Water Resources, individuals do data entry and create updates on a more voluntary basis.[6] The Central American node, housed at the National Meteorological Institute of Costa Rica, has not been used for some time; however, there are plans to revitalize it.[7] The Sub-secretariat of Water Resources for Argentina has personnel maintaining and updating the Cono-Sur node, and have used it as a mechanism for information exchange between the provinces for water resource management.[8] The Pacific and Amazon node, which is hosted by the National Water Agency of Peru, is updated regularly with information and notices, including new laws and training courses.[9] The Caribbean the IWRN node, which was to be maintained by the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI), is not functioning. Another website for the Integrating Watershed and Coastal Zone Areas Management project[10] was also operated by CEHI and may have taken over the IWRN web site.

16. One of the key mechanisms that ensure the sustainability of the project activities, particularly in terms of the development of the nodes, is their immediate utility and practicality in addressing country needs. Countries such as Argentina have seen clear benefits through use of the node to address pressing local issues. The mechanisms that have been set up will clearly continue to be used. In other cases, such as the Caribbean, while the IWRN network may not be active, other mechanisms that have followed have likely borrowed concepts from the DELTAmerica project.

17. In terms of the IWRN, the DELTAmerica project assisted in developing a strategy to enhance the operations and outreach associated with IWRN, and stimulated the development of a governance structure with by-laws. The effect of this should not be underestimated and may be one of the major achievements of the project. The IWRN is an attempt to put into practice the principles of stakeholder engagement as laid out in the Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-Making for Sustainable Development.[11] It is an example of bringing government officials, international organizations, academics, the private sector, and NGOs together to exchange ideas and discuss some of the major water issues challenging the region. Traditionally, national governments and international organizations have had strong linkages for obvious reasons. Less common, however, is the cohesiveness of other actors at a substantially high level. While there were clear growing pains with respect to adequate representation on the Board of the IWRN there is a true potential for increased and effective dialogue.

18. Of importance will be the recognition that certain dialogues and exchanges will necessarily want to remain within the realm of the national governments and international organizations. The greater IWRN and the Inter-American Dialogue Series should be seen as an open platform for dialogue and the exchange of ideas, and thus help to inform the development of national and regional policy in the area of water resource management.

---

[6] Duque, B. G. (2010) Technical Assistant, Secretary of Water Resources Brazil., Brasilia, Personal communication 27 April, 2010, Zinato, M. d. C. (2010) Exectutive Secretary, ApexBrasil, Brasilia, Personal communication 26 April, 2010.

[7] Sanchez, R. (2010) Jefe Departamento de Computo, Instituto Meterológico Nacional de Costa Rica, Email contact, Personal communication 6 may 2010.

[8] Scuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010

[9] See http://pacificosur.rirh.net/. Also, Jesús, J. (2010) Technical Administration IWRN, Autoridad Nacional del Agua, Peru., email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April, 2010

[10] See http://cep.unep.org/iwcam.

[11] OAS (2001). *Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development*. Unit for Sustainable Development and Environment, OAS, Washington DC, 2001

Summary of Lessons Learned

19. The project experienced some complications with project team design and institutional management related to the different locations of various personnel. Technical coordination was run from Brasilia while project management was done from Buenos Aires, and administration from Washington DC. This did not help in building a culture of collaboration for project implementation.

20. As with any project of this scope and complexity, clarity of deliverables at all project levels as well as for the sub-contracted consultants is essential. In this instance, such lack of clarity resulted in delays and not meeting expectations.

21. All forms of information dissemination should be used thereby reaching a variety of audiences. However, use of virtual forums need to be well structured and have well defined specific goals to be of use. Moreover, there will always be situations where face-to-face discussions will be needed for building trust more effectively.

Recommendations

22. There are benefits in continuing to support and strengthen the IWRN, based on the work of the project and the continued support and interest in the electronic network and the dialogue series. The evolving structure of the IWRN is entirely consistent, not only with the OAS's policy on stakeholder engagement, but with that of other organizations such as UNEP.

23. During the latter stages of the DELTAmerica project, a common approach to water resources from a regional perspective was promoted. The promotion of a dialogue for a regional common approach to water should be advanced, using the OAS as an appropriate executing agency with the required credibility at the dialogue level, and using the IWRN as a mechanism for information exchange between governments and with other sectors such as academics, NGOs and the private sector.

24. The DELTAmerica project placed emphasis on the development of lessons learned from the region with respect to best practices in transboundary water resource management. The packaging and dissemination of this information, however, did not achieve the level of sophistication that it warrants. A small project should be undertaken to enhance the current knowledge base and develop clear principles and actions (as opposed to listing case study examples) for implementing lessons learned. The results could be disseminated, through the IWRN as well as the IW:LEARN network.

II. Introduction

A. Context

25. The Inter-American Dialogue on Water Management process was initiated 1993, in response to Agenda 21 (1992) and the Montevideo Declaration, to address the challenges facing water resource management in Latin America and the Caribbean. It has convened at least 6 regional meetings over the past two decades. Early in the process, the Inter-American Water Resources Network (IWRN) was established to provide a venue and platform for the continued exchange of ideas and to help organize the Dialogue meetings. The IWRN became a web-based network but remained more-or-less basic in its ability to be used as a platform for the exchange of experiences and ideas. In 1996, at the Bolivia Summit, countries reaffirmed the importance of managing transboundary water resources as identified in the Inter-American Plan for Sustainable Development. OAS had been given the role to follow-up on this plan at a hemispheric level. By 2000 numerous GEF projects involving transboundary water management in Latin America had reached a level of maturity that they, and others, would have benefited from an exchange of information regarding the implementation of the GEF projects, as well as lessons learned in transboundary water management in general. The Fourth Dialogue meeting in September 2001, helped solidify the concept of stimulating the IWRN as a tool for the exchange of experiences and lessons learned and enhance the Dialogue process, while at the same time addressing many of the issues that GEF projects were faced with.

B. Project Description

1. Background

26. The project, "Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean" (DELTAmerica), aimed to promote South-to-South learning, develop and implement mechanisms to disseminate the lessons learned in GEF International Waters-related (GEF-IW) projects in Latin America and the Caribbean, and improve capacity to integrate land and water resource management. This Medium-Sized Project served as a demonstration project using Latin America and the Caribbean region to illustrate how systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned, and best practices could improve integrated water resources management. Specifically, the project hoped to strengthen and improve mechanisms for the dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects and other experiences in integrated land and water resources management within the Latin America and Caribbean region. In doing so it was to specifically strengthen the IWRN and the Inter-American Dialogue Process.

27. The initial project proposals were developed with Brazil as the lead country to host the technical IRWN node. It was well positioned to undertake the role as it had hosted the Fourth Dialogue (2001), and was involved in the execution of four GEF-IW projects—in the Sao Francisco and Upper Paraguay river basins and the Guarani Aquifer—and, hence, had first hand knowledge of the nature and conduct of GEF-IW projects in the region. At the first regional meeting in Arequipa (June, 2003) it became clear that there was a desire to decentralise the IWRN and have a series of sub-regional nodes in Cono-Sur, Brazil, Pacific-Amazon, Central America and the Caribbean.

28. The project, based on GEF-IW OP 10[12], specifically addressed the short-term objectives of "dissemination of lessons learned from ongoing projects, and the sharing of experiences and best management practices within groups of countries co-operating on transboundary water projects." It aimed to solidify a process that could be replicated through the IW:LEARN[13] projects and related initiatives of UNEP and the GEF, using Latin America and the Caribbean as a privileged region within which to develop the necessary approaches, mechanisms, and infrastructure. The overall aims of the project are in keeping with the overall aims of UNEP's Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work (See section 4.12).

2. Project Objectives and Components

29. The DELTAmerica project was undertaken to improve the capacity for managing transboundary waters through the promotion of South-South learning and exchange of experiences, identifying lessons learned and findings and disseminating them to other GEF International Waters projects.

30. Component 1 was to foster dialogue amongst GEF-IW and other related water resource management projects in LAC establishing a mechanism to share recent accomplishments, experiences from the planning and management of IW projects, lessons learned, and best practices.

31. The objective of this Component was to facilitate communication amongst and between GEF-IW project managers in order to address common concerns, but also to develop a mechanism whereby they could meet with government officials, local authorities, and other stakeholders to discuss the strategies for incorporating lessons learned in water resources management practices and policies. The major activities comprising this component related to sub-regional meetings; enhanced the virtual forum and the use of IWRN; the creation of CDs, documents and brochures.[14]

32. Component 2 was to foster the inclusion of lessons learned and best practices into water resources management practices. The objective of this Component was to develop a framework within which the experience acquired during the execution of GEF-IW projects could be shared and disseminated so as to minimize problems and issues of concern through improved communication and information sharing. The outcome of this Component was shared experiences and inclusion of lessons learned into routine water management practices in the region. As a result, reports and guidelines for the inclusion of best practices and lessons learned were developed and disseminated through the Internet and through three regional training workshops.

33. Component 3 was to strengthen IWRN as the principal hemispheric communication tool for integrated water resources management. The objective was to develop specific processes for sharing and disseminating experiences and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects in Latin America and the Caribbean. The expected output of this Component included Internet as well as other media, refined for future use, with appropriate linkages to other networks and information systems as well as a sustainable financial and knowledge base. A strengthened and actively used IWRN, capable of meeting the needs of the stakeholder community, was to

[12] In 2003, one of the GEF Operational Program 10 objectives was to derive and disseminate lessons learned from projects undertaken in the pilot phase and the permanent GEF, share the learning experience with groups of countries cooperating on International Waters projects.
[13] IW: LEARN is the foremost tool used by GEF to exchange information and disseminate knowledge related to International Waters. See www.iwlearn.net
[14] Project twinning is where personnel from one project are able to work with project personnel from another project to exchange knowledge and information at the most appropriate level.

be the principal result of this Component. The IWRN web was redesigned; sub-regional nodes were established; workshops were undertaken on how to run and develop the web sites; and linkages were developed with other regional activities and knowledge exchange programs.

34. Component 4 was to involve civil society according to principles set forth in the Inter-American Strategy for Public Participation in Environmental Decision-Making (ISP). The objective was to facilitate access to the IWRN by civil society, as a specific stakeholder within the region, pursuant to the principals of the ISP. The expected outputs included a meeting of IWRN focal points leading to the formulation of a strategy for the inclusion of the ISP principals within the information dissemination process. The expected result of this Component was enhanced participation by civil society in water resources management and decision-making. Special meetings were undertaken to facilitate the inclusion of the principles of Public Participation; and access to the nodes, the information and forums were available through any of the five regional sub-nodes.

35. Component 5 was the M&E component. It is assessed under Section III.E.

3. Institutional Arrangements

36. The project was implemented through UNEP, on behalf of GEF, and executed by the OAS, consistent with both UNEP and OAS budgetary and financial rules. A Steering Committee was established consisting of the several Brazilian institutions (Brazilian Agency for International Cooperation, the Secretariat of Water Resources/Ministry of Environment, and the National Water Agency), UNEP, OAS, InterAmerican Water Resources Network (IWRN) and the International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN).

37. Brazil was strongly represented in the Steering Committee as it was involved in executing four GEF Projects[15] and was disposed to assist DELTAmerica both financially and through in-kind contributions. Consequently, the project was conceived with Brazil being the pilot regional node for the IWRN. Later, however, it was determined that other full sub-regional nodes would be constructed in South Cone, Pacific-Amazon and Central America, and the Caribbean.[16]

38. A technical committee was established in each participating country consisting of national Focal Points for the IWRN, and sub-regional nodes to operate the web based IWRN system were developed from existing institutions with experience in water resources within each sub-region. The technical secretariat had a physical presence in Brazil, and UNESCO (Montevideo) became co-chair of the technical secretariat in 2004.

39. As defined in the Project Brief, the following technical cooperation partners were identified: Secretaria de Recursos Hídricos in Brazil, Sub-Secretaria de Recursos Hídricos de Argentina, IRENA de Peru, Secretaria de Recursos Hídricos do Brasil, and the Regional Commission for Water Resources.

4. Main Project Outputs

40. Key project outputs include:

[15] São Fransisco, Upper Paraguay, Putumayo, and Guarani Aquifer.

[16] See 3.3 of prodoc: Establish a sub-regional node in Brazil and possibly as well in one or several potentially identified thematic centers of excellence—as pilot sites within this activity—to test the website and related communications tools.

i. Three strategic meetings with the national focal points of the IWRN: i) Arequipa, Peru, June 2003, ii) Montevideo, Uruguay in September 2003, and iii) in Lima, Peru, May 2005:

ii. Three Sub Regional Dialogues: i) Brasilia, Brazil, July 23 -25, 2003, ii) Montevideo, Uruguay, September 26-27, 2003 and iii) in Saint Lucia, March 4-5, 2004.

iii. The creation of 4 functioning regional Internet nodes in support of the International Water Resources Network (IWRN): Con-Sur in Buenos Aires; Pacifica in Lima; Mercosur in Brasilia; and Central America in San José.[17]

iv. Strengthening of the governance structure of IWRN to allow for greater transparency in decision-making, and inclusion of civil society, academia, private sector, governments, and international organizations on the governing Board.

v. Publications: Lessons Learned and Best Practices for water management in LAC (English, Spanish, Portuguese); A common strategy for Water Management in LAC (English, Spanish, Portuguese); Contributions to definitions best practices and lessons learned. (Portuguese); User Manual for Nodes (English, Spanish, Portuguese).

5. Budget

41. The total project budget was US$1.637 million comprised of a GEF grant (US$972,000) and co-financing from Brazil (US$470,000, of which US$170,000 in cash and US$280,000 in-kind), OAS (US$100,000 in-kind) and UNEP (US$95,000 in-kind)

6. Key project dates

42. The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in September 2002. It was initiated in March 2003 and was anticipated to terminate in December 2005. A Mid-term Evaluation was conducted in August 2005. The project was extended to June 2009[18] to finalize certain products and reports, and to complete project documentation.

III. Evaluation scope, objective and methods

A. Evaluation background and scope

43. The Terminal Evaluation of the DELTAmerica project was conducted by Mr. Glen Hearns, consultant, under the overall responsibility of the UNEP Evaluation Office, between April and May 2010. The evaluation focused on the activities and results of the project from its inception in March 2003 until its termination in June 2009. It does however include developments resulting from the project up to and including April 2010. Most of the substantive work was completed by 2005, consequently, this terminal evaluation allows for an assessment of medium term impacts.

B. Objectives of the Evaluation

44. The objective of this terminal evaluation was to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation also

[17] Note a web node for the Caribbean was envisioned in St Lucia, but was established but was never really functional due primarily to problems of language. The Central American node is not currently operating.
[18] Van der Beck, I. (2010) Task Manager, UNEP, Washington DC, and Personal communication March 26, 2010; April and May communication.

assesses project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation focuses on the following main questions:

1. To what extent the projected has promoted South-to-South learning, and developed and implemented mechanisms to disseminate the lessons learned in GEF International Waters-related (GEF-IW) projects in Latin America and the Caribbean.
2. To what extent the project has served to illustrate how systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned, and best practices can improve integrated land and water resources management?
3. How the project has strengthened and improved mechanisms for the dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects and other experiences in integrated land and water resources management within the Latin America and Caribbean region?
4. What mechanisms are in place to ensure stakeholder ownership and sustainability of the benefits of the project activities and associated technical support?

C. Methods

45. The evaluation methods consisted of:

- A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and relevant correspondence);
  (b) Specific products including the 'experience and guidance' publication, final reports from country executing agencies;
  (c) Notes from the Project Steering Committee meetings;
  (d) Relevant material published on web-sites maintained by GEF *www.thegef.org* and UNEP maintained website www.unep.org/eou;
  (e) Correspondence.

- Interviews (live and via email correspondence) with project management and technical support including the UNEP Task Manager, staff from the OAS, IWRN, and the nodes in Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Costa Rica;

- Interviews (live and over the telephone) with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project.

- Field visit to Washington DC, Brasilia, Montevideo and Buenos Aires.

46. The interviews, while appropriately focused, were guided by a general questionnaire (Annex C: Questionnaire)

IV. Project Performance and Impact

47. The following section provides a review of the project performance and impact based on the eleven evaluation criteria used by the UNEP EO for GEF project evaluations. Evaluation criteria are rated on a 6-point scale:

HS = Highly Satisfactory
S = Satisfactory
MS = Moderately Satisfactory
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory

HU = Highly Unsatisfactory

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results

48. In this evaluation impacts are viewed as new policy or legislation, and their implementation; intermediate states can be seen as continued dialogue at national and regional levels, pilot studies or projects to test the products of the project, development of new projects affecting policy etc. Table D-1 (Annex D) outlines the ROtI analysis conducted in this evaluation.

1. Effectiveness

49. Table 1 summarizes the intended outcomes, their indicators and their level of achievement at the time the evaluation was undertaken. The project met the design requirements in 2003 for a Medium-Sized Project[19], and there is sound logic between the intended outputs, outcomes and their impacts. The logic considers and addresses the underlying contextual elements of the water management situation of Latin America taking account of the socio-political, economic and environmental factors at the time. The focus is on enhancing the knowledge and capacity of water managers combined with the exchange of information and best practices to achieve better water management, both within and between countries. Furthermore, the concept of building upon and strengthening the IWRN as a mechanism for achieving the intended outcomes and thus impacts is also well grounded. The IWRN was sufficiently developed at the time of assistance and this helped to take it to a new level of influence as a mechanism for facilitating the transfer of knowledge between managers and decision-makers on water resources. The global growth in the use of the Internet as well as an increasing understanding of environmental issues at the decision-making level created a momentum that contributed greatly to the promotion of IWRN.

50. One of the clear driving factors enhancing the realization of intended impacts was the evolving understanding and growing acceptance of both integrated water resource management principles in countries and the realization that greater levels of cooperation were needed to address future challenges of pollution, water supply and water management. Having already initiated a number of GEF projects in the region, including the Guarani Aquifer Project, the Bermejo, Upper Paraguay and the San Juan, water managers and decision-makers saw the benefits of exchanging information and strengthening a network of specialists.

[19] OAS (2002). *MSP Project Document 'Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean'*. 22 September 2002

Table 1: Assessment of outcome achievement

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Assessment of level of Achievement in April 2010
Objective: With a view to promoting South-to-South learning, the project's objective is to develop and implement mechanisms to disseminate lessons learned from GEF IW projects and other Integrated Water resource Management initiatives in LAC in order to develop capacity to improve water resources management. In doing so, it will support the work of IW: LEARN.	i) Integrated Water Resources Management Lessons learned and Best Practices identified, disseminated, and institutionalised in Latin America and the Caribbean, using IWRN	Mostly successful: Best Practices have been identified and disseminated through reports, documents, IWRN and meetings (See Table 2 Outputs) Some institutional change has occurred, there have been alterations in water laws in some countries: i.e. Brazil, Peru, Columbia, and Argentina. In Brazil the Water Resources Secretariat has undertaken to develop a legislation database based on that of IWRN. There is increased cooperation in transboundary resources through more efficient implementation of the GEF projects.
	ii) The knowledge base and lessons learned in water resources management, as well as the mechanisms for their dissemination developed through this project are being used by (a) the IW:LEARN project in other GEF regions and by (b) the IW:LEARN Best Practices Database component implemented by UNEP.	a) In agreement with IW:LEARN – the GEF IW San Juan database structure and institutional mapping system were modeled by DELTA in revitalizing IWRN. There are links on the IW:LEARN and IWRN sites linking each other.[20] IW:LEARN was included as co-organizer in meetings with IWRN. b) The IW: LEARN best practices database was terminated several years ago.[21]
	iii) National water management authorities and river basin authorities assimilate lessons learned and knowledge in their planning and decision-making processes.	Based on interviews there is indication that authorities have in general adopted Integrated Water Resources Management some more actively then others. However, it difficult to assess exactly to what degree the DELTAmerica project contributed. There are now over 400 members of IWRN.
	iv) A sound basis with LAC experiences in water resources management to be shared at the Third IW Conference in 2004.	This was accomplished and interviews suggested it was a successful endeavor. Results were presented in additional forums. The GEF projects of LA were able to exchange lessons learned and best practices.
Outcome 1: Better informed water resources management communities in the Americas; enhanced sharing of critical water resources management	i) National water management policies, river basin strategic action programs, and watershed management plans reflecting the integrated approach to water resources management.	There have been alterations in water laws in some countries: i.e. water laws in Brazil, Peru, Columbia, and Argentina. Some countries in the region have applied Integrated Water Resources

[20] IW: LEARN (2010). International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network. Retrieved April 12, 2010, 2010 from http://www.iwlearn.net
[21] Hamid, M. (2010) Technical Administrator, IW:LEARN, Personal communication email - 27 April, 2010

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Assessment of level of Achievement in April 2010
knowledge, experiences, and best practices; and strengthened collaboration amongst riparian countries leading to improved water resources management.		Management principles at the national level. Argentina has undertaken a programme of consultation with the provinces on water use. The extent to which this can be attributed directly to the project is not easy to determine.
	ii) Water managers are better informed	"Common Strategy for Integrated Water Resources Management in LAC"[22] discussed and approved within the framework of the Gov. Focal Point meeting. Three Regional meetings, five sub-regional dialogues for national agency personnel have attended exchange of information and knowledge, water management institutions and GEF projects managers. A document with a "Pilot Virtual Library of Best Practices in Water Management" prepared for publication.
Outcome 2: Processes for sharing experiences and lessons learned from GEF-International Waters (GEF-IW) projects are refined and disseminated and provide pilot site for IW:LEARN	Published documents and materials disseminating best practices resulting from GEF-IW projects in water resources management. Project twinning.	Documents and publications have been developed, presentations have been made regarding the best practices etc, and some project twinning has occurred (See Table 2 Outputs). IW: LEARN has benefited from the DELTAmerica project, and regularly use Notes as a process of information exchange. Project twinning has occurred[23]: • San Juan and FREPLATA • San Juan and San Francisco • Lerma-chapala and San Francisco • La Plata and Amazon • Pantanal-Everglades
Outcome 3: Increased capacity of water management organizations and river basin authorities for sharing information and experiences via the Internet as well as through other media.	IWRN (and/or related sites) make accessible GEF-IW project experiences, results, best practices, and water resources management knowledge base. Similar information available from IW: LEARN and it's Best Practices Database for parallel global and regional activities.	Three IWRN sites, Pacific – Amazon, South Cone and Brazil node have national legislation posted, lessons learned etc. available to download. In the case of the South Cone, which is the most active, there are links to lessons learned from the EU and water management practices. The IW: LEARN best practices database is not longer in existence.

[22] OAS (2005-a). *Common Strategy for Water Management among the Countries of Latin America and the Carribean (preliminary proposal)*. OAS, Washington, 2005
[23] Rucks, J. (2007). *Terminal Report*. OAS, Washington DC, 3 May; and interviews.

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Assessment of level of Achievement in April 2010
Outcome 4: Lessons learned and experiences from GEF-IW projects disseminated using the IWRN as a platform.	Redesigned IWRN web page with a systematic process for updating the information available, and its maintenance and financial sustainability guaranteed once GEF funding is over.	The redesigned IWRN system is being maintained and supported by Peru, Argentina and Brazil (Table 3). However, Argentina and Peru appear to be the most active, as they have continued to support updating of the nodes by positions within the ministries.
Outcome 5: Strengthened IWRN	Virtual Fora for broad discussion on water management issues functioning.	IWRN has been strengthened, both in terms of technical capacity, as well as awareness and knowledge of its role. Its membership has increased and the Dialogue process is continuing. It has also been strengthened in terms of legitimacy by the increased role of governments in the network. With new by-laws and varied representation of different stakeholders on the board it has a potential for increased influence in promoting Integrated Water Resources Management regionally.
Outcome 6: Strengthened civil society participation in water resources management projects.	Partnerships between local organizations and governmental agencies established and applying the principals set forth in the Inter-American Strategy for Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development to land and water management issues.	The development of five (3 operational – in April 2010) regional nodes where any member of society can review documents, legislation, and become a member is a step towards implementing the goals of the ISP on a regional level. The board of the IWRN has representation from i) NGOs and civil society ii) national governments iii) academia iv) private sector and v) international organizations. The IWRN has membership from a variety of interests. While the governance structure has taken a long time to develop and get agreement on, it is innovative and unique in terms of its structure. The V Inter-American Dialogue in Jamaica had participation from a variety of different sectors including NGOs and civil society.

51. Intermediate states have been achieved in terms of enhanced dialogue and learning and the exchange of information at the national agency level through continued meetings that have been funded outside the DELTAmerica project. These are clearly linked to advancing its objectives.[24] Other intermediate states have been achieved through the continued promotion of a project to develop a Water Directive or Common Approach to water resources in Latin America and the Caribbean. This project, aimed at developing greater consensus at the parliamentary level, was conceived and developed as part of the DELTAmerica project and thus illustrates a solid step in attaining some of the intended project impacts. In assessing or rating the scale of outcomes in terms of progress towards 'intermediate states' (Annex D) the project has done well in the area of creating better-informed water resource managers and exchanging and sharing information. It has achieved intermediate states for strengthening civil society participation in water resource management projects and has advanced the dialogue somewhat through continued endorsement of the principles laid out in the ISP, including such projects as the Bermrjo, Pantanal and Sao Fransisco, as well as at the V Inter American Dialogue in Jamaica, 2005. As such the overall achievement in attaining intermediate states is assessed as C-B (See Annex D).

52. A major assumption assisting the achievement of impacts was the continuing importance given globally to water resources and their sustainable management, and environmental matters in general. Since UNESCO held the First International Conference on Water in Mar Del Plata, Argentina in 1977 there has been a continued emphasis on transboundary water dialogues[25].

53. Although the project evaluation is occurring some five years following the completion of the bulk of DELTAmerica activities, it is still difficult to attribute influence directly to the DELTAmerica project in terms of affecting policy within the regional countries.[26] The approach that Argentina took in developing its consultation process with the provinces would likely have looked different had the DeltAmerica project not occurred.[27] New legislation has been developed in different countries (Table 1) relating to water resources, however an analysis of the process by which this legislation has been formulated but would have helped clarify attributable policy impacts is beyond the scope of this evaluation,. The facts that countries, such as Brazil and Argentina, which are leaders in water management in the region, have their laws and legislation available on the nodes, that these nodes are receiving as much

[24] OAS (2007a). *1er Reunion Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH*. Guatemala City, 11-12 agosto, 2007, OAS (2008). *Segunda Reunion Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH*. 9-10 septiembre, 2008, OAS (2009). *2 Reunion de Punots Focales Nacionales de Agua antes de OEA y ante de la RiRH: Centro América y México*. 25-26 fevrero, 2009

[25] Including: the International Conference on Water and the Environment in Dublin in 1990; the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio; the 1st World Water Forum in Marrakech in 1997; the 1st St. Petersburg Round Table International Dialogue in 1998; the 6th session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD 6) held in New York in 1998; the Millennium Summit of the United Nations in New York in 2000; the 2nd World Water Forum in the Hague in 2000; the International Conference on Freshwater in Bonn, Germany in 2001; the Johannesburg "Rio Plus 10" Earth Summit occurred in 2002; and, the 3rd World Water Forum in Kyoto in the spring of 2003; the Berlin Rules (2004); and more recently, the Fourth World Water Forum in Mexico, March 2006; the Fifth World Water Forum in Turkey, March 2009 as well as many other regional meetings and conferences dealing with water resource management.

[26] Rodriguez, A. (2010) National Director, Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 29 April, 2010; Rucks, J. (2010) National Director of Environment, Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente, Uruguay, Montevideo, Personal communication 28 April, 2010

[27] Rodriguez, A. (2010) National Director, Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 29 April, 2010

as 2,000 hits a month,[28] and that regulations available on the websites have been very frequently downloaded[29], indicate that there is interest regionally and nationally in reviewing the legislation as well as best practices.

54. According to the principles of the Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development (ISP)[30] the involvement of civil society is key in developing balanced decisions for environmental resource use such as water. By enhancing the IWRN network, the project emphasized the development of a more effective mechanism through which greater civil society engagement could eventually take place.

55. In strengthening the IWRN, time was clearly needed to balance the objectives and views of various participants. It was an ambitious proposal to have civil society and NGO's, academics, private sector, government representatives and international organizations working together to exchange lessons learned and enhance existing GEF projects. Nevertheless, the IWRN has recently agreed upon a new set of by-laws that allow the various actors to have a position on the board. The future direction of IWRN is not certain: Its impact in terms of involving civil society in particular and its exact membership composition are still important outstanding issues. As such, the transparency component is called into question, but, as IWRN membership is open to all, and the network allows for open and transparent forums, it has potential to assist in realizing the principles defined by the ISP.

56. To date it is difficult to attribute greater civil society involvement in policy development at either national or international levels directly to the DELTAmerica project. However, in Argentina a process of provincial consultation around water resources is occurring and is employing both the lessons learned[31] from the DELTAmerica project as well as the information exchange mechanism established under the South Cone node.[32] Brazil has an established mechanism of consultation through basin committees. CEHI (where the Caribbean node of the IWRN was established) is heavily involved with the implementation of the Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management project, which has elements of civil society involvement.

57. In sum, DELTAmerica was successful in promoting dialogue, developing and exchanging a database of lessons learned, and strengthening the IWRN to a point where it can now move forward with a mechanism to include civil society and other stakeholders in discussions concerning integrated water management and transboundary cooperation. **Project effectiveness is therefore rated satisfactory.**

2. Likelihood of achieving impacts

58. Using table D-1 and Table 1 (Assessment of outcome achievement) the project is given an outcome rating of B as the majority of outcomes intended have been achieved to some extent, though there was only partial allocation of funding associated with responsibilities once

[28] Duque, B. G. (2010) Technical Assistant, Secretary of Water Resources Brazil., Brasilia, Personal communication 27 April, 2010

[29] Scuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010

[30] OAS (2001). *Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development*. Unit for Sustainable Development and Environment, OAS, Washington DC, 2001

[31] Such as conducting regional and community meetings and "open houses" to explain issues and solicit input.

[32] Rodriguez, A. (2010) National Director, Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 29 April, SScuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010

project funding ended. These were associated with the sub-regional nodes. The rating associated with progress towards Intermediate states is also favourable (Table 1). Results have clearly been achieved, however, as discussed, it is difficult to assess them across the Latin American and Caribbean region. While some countries have developed new legislation (Columbia, Argentina, Brazil, Peru) it is difficult to determine if the appropriate regulations are in place nationally, or whether appropriate funding and resource are available at the national and sub-national level to affect change. Moreover, it is not clear to what extent other countries in the region have adopted Integrated Water Resources Management into their institutions and what intermediate states have been achieved there. The rating on progress toward intermediate states is considered therefore as a C-B. The overall likelihood of impact achievement is therefore considered to be "likely".

3. Relevance

59. At the onset of the DELTAmerica project, the outcomes and goals of capacity building and the promotion of integrated water resources management amongst water managers and professionals in Latin America and the Caribbean were in direct alignment with the goals of Operational Programme 10 in terms of lessons learned. The current GEF programme goal "to promote collective management for transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services" is also served. One of GEF's main objectives is "to catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change". The work of the DELTAmerica project has advanced the realization of this objective through the enhancement of projects such as the Guarani and Upper Paraguay (Pantanal) as well as the development of further collaborative projects such as the Amazon Basin initiative. This objective has been further assisted by increased accessibility of water and environmental legislation and policy through the enhanced IWRN sites and the dissemination of principles of Integrated Water Resources Management and lessons learned through regional dialogues and meetings convened under the auspices of DELTAmerica. **The relevance of the project to GEF priorities is therefore rated highly satisfactory.**

4. Efficiency

60. The overall project budget, all spent, was roughly US$1,64 million. In benchmarking the DELTAmerica project with other GEF projects related to information exchange and best practices, developing knowledge bases, and promoting lessons learned in policy development of a comparable regional scope and duration, the cost of DELTAmerica was in line or less.

61. The project was initially programmed to start in March 2003 and finish in December 2005. However, the project required extension to finalize reports and products. A terminal report was prepared by the project team in May 2007[33] but was shared by OAS with UNEP only in January 2009. The final audit report did not come in before June 2009. The Closure documents were signed by UNEP in July 2009. While most substantive activities were completed by 2005, the final publications was only completed by January 2009, and this was the major reason for the excessive extension of the project duration.[34] The delays in finalizing the final publications appear to be due to several factors:

[33] Ibid.
[34] Isabelle Vanderbeck (email communication August 3, 2010)

- Personnel changes. As with any project where key personnel leave and needs to be replaced, the change has an effect on the efficiency of the overall activities. In this case there were three project managers between the inception and 2006.
- Lack of clarity over key deliverables. As seen from table 2 the bulk of the research, building or nodes and mechanisms for information exchange were created, including a series of reports on lessons learned and best practices etc. were available in English, Portuguese and Spanish. These, however, along with other documents were never published for distribution as there were differences expressed from the part of the implementing agency and the executing agency as to what the final content should look like and include. In the end, a simple brochure was developed for publication. Nevertheless, the more complex draft versions of the work are available from the websites. The lack of clarity over the deliverables resulted in a delay,[35] initially extending the project until March 2008, and then again until June 2009 to ensure completion of all products and delivery of all the needed reports.

62. Efficiency gains were achieved by the project by building, to a certain extent, on previous initiatives of the IWRN, both in terms of the Dialogue Series and the concept of developing web based interactions. Clearly, it was most logical and efficient to build on existing work of IWRN instead of beginning something new from scratch. However, it had not been envisioned at the onset of the project that IWRN would need that much support to enhance its institutional stability, and much time and effort went into developing an enhancement strategy and by-laws for the IWRN.

63. To minimize costs associated with face-to-face meetings, the organizers often attempted to maximize the delivery of the project by joining other regional or international meetings. For example, DELTAmerica Focal Points that attended the First Latin American Seminar on Public Politics on Water Resources in Brasilia, October 2004, met each other the day after the meetings.[36] Such cost saving measures clearly assisted the project to extend the financing to enhance face-to-face meetings.

64. In summary, the costs to achieve the project outputs are in keeping with other projects. However, the delay in the project, both in terms of completing final products and in terms of reporting, somewhat compromised the otherwise efficient use of resources. **The efficiency of the project to meet its objectives is therefore rated moderately satisfactory.**

B. Sustainability

65. The DELTAmerica project is a foundational project in that it focuses on policy development, institutional capacity, exchange of information and enhancing mechanisms for better water management. In reviewing the overall impacts that the project has achieved, or is likely to achieve, the project has advanced its objective of improving water resource management in the region. One of the clear driving factors has been the continued support, both internationally and regionally, for both Dialogue Series, as well meetings of the Focal Points and the greater enhancement of the IWRN network. Financial, socio-political, institutional and ultimately environmental risks remain, but they are less likely to affect the whole region equally; consequently impacts have been and will be achieved at varying levels over different times throughout the region.

[35] In this case there was lack of clarity between the executing and implementing agencies.
[36] Dopazo, F. (2004). *Email communication with Focal Points of DELTAmerica*. 3 August, 2004

1. Financial resources

66. Currently, there are two levels of financial risks that jeopardize the project outputs in realizing their intended impacts. The first is at the national level. The strengthened IWRN and sub-regional nodes will only continue to be supported for as long as they have a perceived value either to the host institution or to the host government. Currently, they are funded from relevant ministries. Host governments are unlikely to continue to maintain the nodes, and are much less likely to run and actively update nodes if there is not a direct relevance for them to do so. This also can be affected by shifting interests within the host ministries. Economic swings, particularly in the period of recent global economic instability could have an impact on the maintenance of the nodes and the interest that governments have in continuing to support meetings, including the Dialogue Series.

67. The second level of financial risk is at the international level. Funding for the Dialogue Series in particular requires commitments from international donor agencies, governments and also increasingly the private sector. Economic uncertainty could compromise continued strengthening of IWRN and thus increased exchange and capacity building for water management. The Dialogue Series are generally held every 3 years, and thus should be held again in 2010. At the time of writing, however, it was still under discussion where and how the next Dialogue will be held. As the host countries usually pay for the Dialogue along with some private funding from corporations, and the host country has not yet been decided upon, it is unlikely that a Dialogue will be held in 2010 as planned.

68. What appears to bode well is that on one level there is national government support for maintaining the nodes in the sub-regions that are functioning. Both host governments and the private sector generally fund the Dialogue Series allowing it to perhaps be buffered from economic turns. Furthermore, in relation to the nodes and web-usage, new technologies have emerged making the hosting of the nodes less tied to specific locations and thus susceptible to local problems. The South Cone node for instance does not have to be housed in the Sub-secretariat of water resources in Argentina for it to continue to run. Nodes could be set up and run remotely from almost anywhere. New technologies and the potential for remote management of the web nodes allow for an increasing interesting from other countries that may have been reluctant to participate to date.

69. In summary, even though there is a risk both at the national and international level that financing for the IWRN nodes and Dialogue Series will be increasingly hard to find, there are a number of positive factors that increase the likelihood of financial sustainability such as increasing private sector interest and technological advances. **Financial sustainability of project results is therefore rated likely.**

2. Socio-political sustainability

70. The potential socio-political risk that would jeopardize the sustenance of project outcomes is one of lack of support for the IWRN structure and maintaining the nodes by neighboring countries of the region, which undermines the overall potential of region-wide impacts. The lack of support is unlikely to be due to lack of interest at the managerial level as the tools have been shown to be useful and continue to be supported within ministries.[37] It is more likely that

[37] Scuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010; Duque, B. G. (2010) Technical Assistant, Secretary of Water Resources Brazil., Brasilia, Personal communication 27 April, 2010, Zinato, M. d. C. (2010) Exectutive Secretary, ApexBrasil, Brasilia, Personal communication 26 April, 2010; Jesús, J. (2010) Technical Administration IWRN, Autoridad Nacional del Agua, Peru., email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April, 2010; Sanchez, R. (2010) Jefe Departamento de Computo, Instituto Meterológico Nacional de Costa Rica, Email contact, Personal communication 6 may 2010.

lack of support will stem from shifting priorities at the senior level due to changes in political or economic priorities.

71. In terms of maintaining the nodes, and in particular the sub-node structure, there is lack of region-wide participation in updating information and sustaining the vitality of the network. To date, for instance, seldom do the sub-regional nodes receive information updates from neighboring countries, despite the fact that the nodes have been established for everyone's benefit and training in making updates has been given. There are indeed risks that the benefits of interaction are not very clear or tangible for neighboring countries, and that there may be a natural reluctance for one country in a sub-region to make much effort updating or providing information to a web-site that is run by a different country. Under the project, countries maintained and updated the nodes, such as Argentina maintaining the Cono-Sur node. While the structure of the nodes was the same, the content was different. All countries of a sub-region, such as Chile in the Cono-Sur, were given training and had access to update and add information to the node, but in practice it was the host institution that did the majority of updating.

72. Another issue is that there might be competing interests between civil society participating in the node, and the national agencies which may not always be comfortable with non-official points of view on the node. This has already been brought up as an issue in the course of the project. In the same vein, balance must be sought to ensure that meetings and dialogues are available to meet the needs of the users. Otherwise there is a real risk that the IWRN will neither meet the needs of international organizations and national governments nor shall it fulfill the interests of academics, NGOs and other sectors who see the potential for IWRN as a tool for information exchange and being able to have some input on the development of water management policies.

73. Despite these risks the advantage of the IWRN has been a melding of governmental with non-governmental ideals and philosophies. There are no other forums in the water sector that we are aware of which have attempted to intertwine interests in such a way. Support, particularly from the governmental sector and international organizations will be essential to reduce the risk of loosing enthusiasm for the system.

74. I**n sum, socio-political sustainability is rated moderately likely**, but it should be noted that in the countries where there has been support, it is more likely that there will be continued activities and sustainability. The rating applies to the overall region.

3. Institutional framework and governance

75. The sustenance of some of the intended outcome depends heavily on governance and institutional structure. The project, by virtue of its activities to date, has advanced the outcome of better-informed water management communities in the Americas (See 4.2). However, it might not attain the level of impact that it could achieve, if both the intended outcomes of strengthening the IWRN and strengthening civil society participation in water resource management were not achieved any further.

76. When the project set up the sub-regional nodes, it found strong institutional partners within the sub-regions to undertake the operation and running of the web-nodes. In the cases of Brazil, Argentina and Peru these were national ministries with a relevant mandate and the technical capability to operate and run the nodes. CEHI in the Caribbean is a regional institution that had the technical capability to run the nodes.[38] Only, in Central America was

[38] While the CEHI node was not up and running, this was a language issue rather than technical know how.

the node operated by National Meteorological Institute but managed by the Regional Commission for Water Resources, a regional institute with a mandate for water resources. While the Central American node was operating for the majority of the project, it has no stalled, most probably due to this split over two institutions.

77. The IWRN has recently altered its structure to ensure the participation of international organizations, governments, academics, the private sector and NGOs on its board. It is an interesting vehicle not only to inform and strengthen the water resource managers from the region, but also to embody some of the principles set forth in the ISP. There is a likelihood that the long term can be realized, providing that international organizations (UNESCO, OAS etc.) and the governments continue to support it, both engage and finance it, and that the system continues to expand. There are, however, several institutional uncertainties, such as the overall direction of the IWRN and the continued support it might receive from international organizations like the OAS.

78. In conclusion, **from an institutional framework point of view, it is only moderately likely that the project will achieve desired impacts in the medium or longer term**.

4. Environmental sustainability

79. Climate change, alterations in hydrologic regimes, increased pressure on water resources, soil erosion and sedimentation along river basins and many other environmental problems related to water resources, converge to make traditional notions of water management obsolete and create a need for continuous innovation and learning. The DELTAmerica project specifically focused on building greater linkage and networks to exchange knowledge as well as address common issues related to water management. As such, the project intervantions sought to directly address old and new environmental risks through better and more informed decision making and increased collaboration over shared resources and thus shared challenges, and remain highly relevant. **Environmental sustainability of project results is therefore likely**.

C. Achievement of outputs and activities

80. The degree in which outputs were achieved is summarized in Table 2 below. The following text summarizes the most salient points.

81. In terms of documentation, the project outputs do not clearly identify who was involved in the development and creation of the product. While the documents have the mark of approval of the UNEP, GEF and OAS, a paragraph or two outlining the consultants involved, and describing the peer review process by water managers from the region and international experts would have helped to raise their credibility. Also, the material on the websites for download could be better developed and promoted, as in many cases they remain in draft form, which may reduce their influence as compared to final publications.[39] Some effort could be made to determine if more information could be promoted and as such review these draft documents, update them and finalize them for greater dissemination.

82. In general terms, the process by which technical documents were developed was sound with knowledgeable consultants being hired to undertake an initial study and then present the

[39] For example: Common Strategy for Water Management among the Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean (preliminary proposal). OAS, Washington, 200?; Contribuição às definições de boas prácticas, experiências bem sucedidas e ligação de uma biblioteca virtual de estudos de casos em boas Práticas em gerenciamento integrado de Recurso Hídricos na América Latina e no Caribe. Washington DC, 200?; and Lecciones Aprendidas y Buenas Practicas en Proyectos GEF Aguas Transfronterizas en America Latina y Caribe. OAS, Washington DC 200?

findings for refinement and adoption. However, within the DELTAmerica project there appears to have been a lack of clarity surrounding product deliverables and expectations. At one level consultants hired to develop drafts were not seen to produce what had been anticipated by project management,[40] while at another level some of the overall outputs of the project were not in keeping with expected outputs from donor agencies.[41]

83. The web sites and nodes appear both professional and informative. While there is again a lack of information regarding 'who' contributed to the development of some of the documents, there are numerous links to direct authors or other web sites with additional information. In particular the sections with new and emerging legislation are particularly useful and credible as they list complete texts (unaltered for viewing) that can be referenced and confirmed if needed. The list of sponsors and affiliates, such as line ministries, which are seen on the web sites further add to the credibility and influence of the material available on the sites.

84. In terms of meetings and dissemination of information the project was successful in bringing together water related ministries from the region to discuss and exchange information on both substantive issues, such as climate change, Integrated Water Resources Management, as well as procedural issues such as implementing GEF projects and the benefits of trans-diagnostic analysis and strategic action plan procedures. New projects are being developed through the OAS for La Plata and Gran Chaco that are benefiting from the work of the DELTAmerica project in terms of information exchange mechanisms and trans-diagnostic analysis and strategic action plan procedures.

85. The project meetings proved useful in helping to promote and advance the larger Dialogue Series and have proved of interest to the national governments as indicated by the fact that some of the regional meetings have continued to be held after GEF funding had ceased.[42] While it is difficult to attribute new legislation on water management directly to the project, there have been a number of new laws and regulations developed which reflect the principles and issues discussed in the project documents and web-sites (See tables 1 and 3).

86. The project has also spent a great deal of time and effort developing a strategy and creating by-laws for the IWRN that can bring together a variety of stakeholders to manage the system. The complexity and potential impact of this should not be underestimated, and should be viewed as major advance. The IWRN strategy could help and allow the group to develop into a strong multi-sector forum for discussions across vertical levels of interest as well as horizontal levels. Vertical levels of interest refer to local stakeholders, academics, and the private sector, amongst others. While horizontal interests might refer to discussions between line ministries in various countries.

87. With respect to the strengthening of civil society participation in water resource management projects, one area where there is clear development is the increase in membership in the IWRN from all sectors indicating greater involvement from NGOs, academics, the private sector etc. Civil society was involved in the 5th Dialogue Series in Jamaica (2004); however, this is less a result of the DELTAmerica project than a natural progression of the Dialogue series themselves (Table 4). Brazil and its structure of basin committees that has evolved, and Argentina in its consultation with the provinces over water

[40] An example was the hiring of a consultant to develop a 'strategy for IWRN' which turned out not to be very helpful, and further work was needed to create a more functional structure.
[41] In particular the final product of a document on lessons learned and best practices was not viewed in the same light by both executing and implementing agencies.
[42] See Additional meeting post 2005 not directly funded by DELTAmerica in Table 4.

resources are concrete examples of partnerships between local organizations and governmental agencies to set forth the principles of the ISP as initially envisioned at the onset of the project. The issue of civil society involvement, component 4, was seen as a cross cutting issue in terms of sharing experiences, articulating lessons learned – which included civil society involvement – and strengthening IWRN. To this extent it was removed as a 'component' from some of the later reporting documents.

88. Initial project documents indicated that 5 pilot projects would be established to test the principles of the ISP within the IWRN framework. These were initially conceived to be undertaken with NGO's and be realized as on the ground projects. While not undertaken, the establishment of the 5 regional web-nodes, with free public access to all documents and free membership to forums should be considered as a step towards incorporating the ISP principles, at least in terms of transparency and inclusively.

89. Overall, **the achievement of project outputs and activities is deemed satisfactory.**

Table 2: Output indicators and achievement

Components with Output indicators[43]	Reported Achievement[44]	Verification
1. Dialogue amongst GEF-IW and other LAC Water Resource Management Practices i) Define a strategy with IWRN with IWRN focal points ii) 3 regional meetings to discuss criteria, methodology and identification of best practices, and exchange information and experiences. iii) Development of virtual forum – IWRN iv) Development and disseminations of reports and products, CDs, brochures, and outline resource practices and lessons learned. v) Encourage and facilitate project twinning exercises.	i) Agreement reached in Arequipa, Peru (2003) ii) Inter-American Dialogue process continued with meetings in Kingston (2004) and Guatemala City (2007), - Sub-regional meetings have taken place in Arequipa (2003) Brasília (2003), Montevideo (2003), and St Lucia (2004) iii) Web based nodes established for - Central Page - - Brazil, Brazil - South Cone, Argentina - South Pacific and Amazon, Peru - Central America, San José - Caribbean, St Lucia. iv) CD, brochure and published reports produced. Work showcased in various meetings: Rio (2005) v) Project Twinning was reported in the PIR 2007 between San Juan-Freplata; san Juan-Sao Fransisco; Sao Fransisco-Lerma Chapala; Agreements set up between Bermejo-Cuenca del Plata and Pantanal-Cuenca del Plata.	i) Meeting reports ii) Meeting reports (see bibliography Annex B), interviews confirmed achievements; iii) Web site access and interviews confirmed achievements. Note that the Caribbean Node was never fully functional and is no longer running. The Central American node is no longer responding to URL access as it may have altered domain name. High level of monthly hits to Brazilian, Cono-Sur, and Pacifico Amazonas nodes. iv) Brochure and published reports viewed, interviews confirmed CD and other products. (Annex B) v) Interviews confirmed some twinning occurred, The initial cost estimate was $25,000 and the final travel figure was $55,000 indicating travel occurred.
2. Inclusion of lessons learned and best practices into water resources management practices. i) Develop criteria for best practices criteria and system for identifying 'best practices'. ii) Develop specific guidelines for inclusion of 'best	i) The concept of 'best practices', criteria for defining 'best practices' was achieved, and identification of them in GEF and non GEF activities was written as a final report and translated into 3 languages. ii) Achieved through promoting access to relevant	i) Criteria developed,[45] Lessons Learned and Good Practices in Integrated Transboundary Waters Resources.[46] Documents in all 3 languages viewed. ii) IWRN Nodes were operable (save

[43] Based on project documentation: OAS (2002). *MSP Project Document 'Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean'*. 22 September 2002, OAS/UNEP (2007). *UNEP GEF PIR for year 2006-2007*. Project Internal Review, OAS,

[44] OAS/UNEP (2007). *UNEP GEF PIR for year 2006-2007*. Project Internal Review, OAS

[45] Manuela, M. (2004). *Critérios para identificação de Boas Práticas*.

[46] OAS (200?-b). *Lecciones Aprendidas y Buenas Practicas en Proyectos GEF Aguas Transfronterizas en America Latina y Caribe*. OAS, Washington DC?

practices' in water resources management activities. iii) conduct three regional workshops with a view to promoting the inclusion of lessons learned in water resource management	information under the revitalized IWRN ensuring that each node ensuring that each node is functioning as a depository of the available information to be updated by countries. iii) Four workshops conducted: Brasilia, Montevideo, St. Lucia, and San José.	Caribbean), how far these have aided in 'specific guidelines' for inclusion of Best Practices in national management activities is difficult to discern. Interviews confirm that several nodes have had some influence in encouraging national agencies to adopt new information technologies, and develop new legislation. iii) Meeting reports and confirmed in interviews.
3 Strengthened IWRN as the main hemispheric communication tool for integrated water resources management. i) Refinement of the framework to strengthen the IWRN ii) In close coordination with IW: LEARN and IW: Best Practice Database, Redesign / improvement of the IWRN web site, (incomplete) iii) Establish a sub-regional node in Brazil and possibly as well with one or several potentially identified thematic centers of excellence. iv) Convene one workshop to assess the needs for training and equipment for water resource professionals and NGOs within Brazil and thematic centres of excellence. v)Assist countries to secure financing for the establishment of IWRN regional nodes in the Americas vi) Ensure adequate linkages between IWRN and other regional and sub-regional networks (e.g. SIDSNet, CIC, ILEC/WB Lakes network GEF project	i) & ii) The architecture for the new IWRN Information System and data storage with regional nodes coordinated by a central one was defined using the GEF IW project "model" (San Juan GEF project) selected in agreement between IW:LEARN/UNEP and DELTA. iii) Web based nodes established for - Central Page - - Brazil, Brazil - South Cone, Argentina - South Pacific and Amazon, Peru - Central America, San José - Caribbean, St Lucia. iv) User and operator manuals were formulated and staff trained in different workshops. v) The nodes are supported for most part by the countries themselves or else regional institutions (SSRH in Ar, SRH in Br, CRHH for Central America, National Water Agency in Peru and CEHI for Car) vi) Active nodes have web links to various organizations, both national regional and international.	i) & ii) verified through web use and interviews, and reports.[47] (Table 3.) iii) Verified through web use and interviews, and reports. Visited node and confirmed both software and hardware. iv) Manual reviewed,[48] workshop held in Brasilia, interviews. v) Nodes for Pacific-Amazon, Brazil and South Cone are working (See table 3) vi) Links in the active nodes have been tested (see Table 3)
4. Facilitating the inclusion of the principles of the Inter-American Strategy for Public Participation[49] in water	i) No pilot projects conducted ii) -Activities was undertaken with in consultation with a	i) Case studies examples written in Lessons Learned and Best Practices.- Also, the 5

[47] FCES (2005). *Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Experiences in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean - DELTAmerica Project-*
WEBSITE - Administrator Manual - Inter America Resources Network - IWRN. Florida Centre for Environmental Studies, Florida Altantic University, Palm Beach Gardens,
[48] OAS (200?-c). *Manuais do Sistema Manual do Administrador do Nó Brasil*. OAS, Washington DC?

resource management projects and helping to reduce misunderstandings and conflicts i) 5 pilot projects to test principles of ISP. ii) Organize a special meeting of GEF-IW and other water resources management project managers and ISP focal points, seeking proper consultation with the civil society	wide range of stakeholders. -V Dialogue held in Montague Bay under the auspices of DELTA emphasized the importance of ensuring measures to promote and include civil society actively in Integrated Water Resources Management. -IWRN also counts on a participation system promoting active involvement in the decision making process of the following 5 groups: i) gov. representatives, ii) academia, iii) private sector, iv) civil society org. and v) multilateral agencies.	nodes may be viewed as pilot projects unto themselves. ii) It is not entirely evident what 'wide' range of stakeholders suggests. Participant lists from meetings indicate predominantly national agency staff. - Nodes were designed to have active participation, anyone can become a member, and the Brazil node was designed to have members post information directly.
5. Monitoring and Evaluation In addition to the monitoring and evaluation activities exercised by the GEF Implementing Agency, and in addition to the day-to-day monitoring of activities by the GS/OAS as the Executing Agency, GS/OAS will co-ordinate a mid-term and final evaluation of the project activities	Diligent monitoring and evaluation exercised by both UNEP and the OAS. Although the project had only two steering group meetings, UNEP-OAS met 5 times with the technical Unit to review progress, adjust work plan and budget, as well as discuss corrective measures. A mid term review took place in October 2004 and the final report took place at the end of 2007	Verified through quarterly reporting, financial reporting, annual reports and PIRs; interviews and email communication, mid-term terminal evaluations.

[49] OAS (2001). *Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development*. Unit for Sustainable Development and Environment, OAS, Washington DC, 2001

Table 3: Summary of IWRN nodes

Node	URL	Comments
Central Node for IWRN	http://www.iwrn.net/	Houses information regarding the election process and executive secretariat and Board of Directors. The operating secretariat currently operated by UNESCO, in Montevideo. It provides links to other nodes. Very superficial and does not contain links to products.
South Cone Node (Cono Sur)	http://conosur.rirh.net	Housed at the Sub-Secretariat for a Water Resources in Buenos Aires. It is fully functioning and updated on a regular basis. High level of hits monthly, >1000.[50]
Brazil (Brasil)	http://brasil.rirh.net/	Run and maintained by the Secretariat of Water Resources in the Ministry of Water Resources, and is working well, information is primarily updated on a volunteer basis. The site has useful links regarding legislation. The forum in not being used to the degree possible.[51]
South Pacific and Amazon	http://pacificosur.rirh.net	Operated and paid for by the Autoridad National de Agua in Peru. It is running well with numerous hits each month, and is up to date with information on courses in May and September 2010. However, they would like to have better linkage with other nodes and develop and increase use of the forums as a means of information exchange.[52]
Central America	http://centroamerica.rirh.net/	Was managed by the Regional Commission for Water Resources and housed (operated) in the National Meteorological Institute. Although having a web link (URL address) it was not able to be loaded. It can be loaded through IP address only:201.193.202.133[53]
Caribbean	http://iwrn.net/caribe	It was set up in St Lucia and hardware, software and training where given. Interviews suggest that it was never really functional, mostly due to language problems – the manuals and documentation being in Spanish. [54]

[50] Scuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010
[51] Duque, B. G. (2010) Technical Assistant, Secretary of Water Resources Brazil., Brasilia, Personal communication 27 April, 2010, Zinato, M. d. C. (2010) Exectutive Secretary, ApexBrasil, Brasilia, Personal communication 26 April, 2010
[52] Jesús, J. (2010) Technical Administration IWRN, Autoridad Nacional del Agua, Peru., email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April, 2010
[53] Sanchez, R. (2010) Jefe Departamento de Computo, Instituto Meterológico Nacional de Costa Rica, Email contact, Personal communication 6 may 2010
[54] Aquing, P. (2010) Coordinator, Caribbean Environmental Health Institute, Saint Lucia (telephone interview), Personal communication 12 May 2010

Table 4: Meetings held (see references for complete list of documents reviewed)

Meeting	Title	Where and When
National focal point meeting	Reunión Puntos Focales Nacionales de la RIRH	Arequipa, Peru, 7-8 June 2003
	2 Reunión Puntos Focales Nacionales de la RIRH	Montevideo, Uruguay, 2003 (not verified by report – but referenced)
	3 Reunión Puntos Focales Nacionales de la RIRH	Lima, Peru, May, 2005 (not verified by report – but referenced)
Sub-regional meetings	Diálogo Subregional Vertiente del Pacífico Sur y Amazonía.	Brasilia, Brazil, 23-24 July, 2003
	Diálogo Subregional Cono Sur, Proyecto DELTAmérica. Montevideo	Montevideo, Uruguay, 26-27 September, 2003
	Sub-regional Dialogue on Integrated Water Resources Management in the Caribbean and Meso América: DELTAmerica Project	Saint Lucia, 4-5 March 2004
	2nd Meeting of IWRN Nodes: Cono Sur	Buenos Aires, 13-14 October, 2004
Steering Committee Meetings	Primera Reunión del Consejo Director del Proyecto DeltAmérica.	Arequipa, Peru, 7 June 2003
	Segunda Reunión del Consejo Director del Proyecto DeltAmérica	Montevideo, 27 September, 2003
	Reporte de Reunión del Consejo Director (3rd)	Lima, 9-10 May, 2005
Technical meetings	IWRN Planning Meeting	Miami, 10-12 January, 2005
	Development of Caribbean Node	Saint Lucia, 26-24 January, 2004
	GEF Project Coordinators – Lessons Learned and Best Practices from GEF Projects	Buenos Aires, 10-11 November, 2005
Additional meetings post-2005 not directly funded by DELTAmerica	1er Reuníon Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH.	Guatemala City, 11-12 August, 2007 (Funded by Austria)
	Segunda Reuníon Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH.	9-10 September, 2008
	2 Reuníon de Punots Focales Nacionales de Agua antes de OEA y ante de la RiRH: Centro América y México	25-26 fevrero, 2009
Inter-American Dialogue on Water Resources Management	Dialogue I	Miami, USA, 1993
	Dialogue II	Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1996
	Dialogue III	Panama City, Panama, 1999
	Dialogue IV	Foz da Iguazu, Brazil, 2001
Funded under DELTAmerica	Dialogue V	Montego Bay, Jamaica, 9-12 October 2004
	Dialogue VI	Guatemala City, Guatemala, 2007

D. Catalytic Role

90. The DELTAmerica project is a foundational project in that it focuses on policy development, institutional capacity, exchange of information and enhancing mechanisms for better water management. As such, the project has been able to demonstrate the value to government agencies of adopting integrated water management policies.

91. The promotion of the IWRN network has allowed Argentina to use the platform for consultation with the provinces in relation to water resource management; and in Brazil concepts of information and knowledge sharing, particularly with respect to legislation, are being transferred to government web sites. This indicates a shift in institutional behavior towards a more integrated approach to water management in that the interests of various sectors, including community stakeholders, are taken into consideration. For example, CEHI is now heavily involved in the implementation of a large regional project dealing with Integrated Water and Coastal Area Management. In undertaking the project the Institute is bringing in the experience and lessons learned from its involvement in the DELTAmerica project.

92. In terms of direct policy change, while difficult to attribute solely to the DELTAmerica project, there has been a general advance of water management legislation throughout the region, but notably in Peru, Columbia, Argentina and Brazil – evident from new legislation available on the IWRN node sites.

93. Following the implementation of the bulk of activities from the DELTAmerica project, governments and international donors, including the private sector, have stepped forward to continue supporting elements of the DELTAmerica project. The VI Dialogue in Guatemala City (2007) was seen as a great success and the government of Austria assisted with recent meetings of the National Focal Points for the IWRN.[55] This illustrates that the governments of the region, as well as international donors, see the value in continuing the work that was promoted in the DELTAmerica project.

94. In terms of specific project champions, it is difficult to highlight key individuals without whom the project may not have achieved its results. Beyond the members of the project management team in OAS and UNEP, special reference should be given to Jão Bosco, Secretary of Secretariat of Water Resources of Brazil. His work was constantly brought up in terms of promoting and facilitating the goals of the DELTAmerica project, and in having a vision towards developing a common strategy and understanding of water resources throughout the region.

95. Brazil has developed its own, official, web page with links to a variety of legislation. Argentina is enacting its Federal Water Consultation Law (Consejo Hídrico Federal[56]), has replicated similar methods of information dissemination and is using the IWRN platform to perform consultations with the provinces on water resources.[57] In developing its new Water Law, Argentina initiated, and is continuing to conduct, consultations at the provincial level to facilitate water use and water management. As water is under federal jurisdiction in Argentina the national government has the authority to determine water management and use, however the actual management and implementation is conducted at the provincial level. To ensure appropriate use of water the federal government has solicited input through consultation at

[55] OAS (2007a). *1er Reunion Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH*. Guatemala City, 11-12 agosto, 2007

[56] SRH (2010). *Plan de Trabajo, Subsecretaria de recursos hiidricos, Agrentina*. Buenos Aires, 2009/2010

[57] Rodriguez, A. (2010) National Director, Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 29 April;

provincial level and through watershed – community groups. The website has been used to inform provincial level governments and organizations as well as local communities about the water review.

96. Within the OAS the concept of (sub-)regional web nodes is being discussed for other areas such as natural hazards and risk reduction.[58]

97. It is difficult to attribute the rise and style of information dissemination and web forums to the DELTAmerica project, as it came at a time of great advancement in the field. Nevertheless, it is likely that the DELTAmerica experience has helped inform regional forums as well as global ones, including IW:LEARN.

98. Overall, **the catalytic role played by the project has been satisfactory**.

E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

1. M&E design

99. Component 5 of the project deals with Monitoring and Evaluation describing the reporting requirements, including a mid-term and terminal evaluation. The project design did not include a log-frame matrix, as is currently standard practice, but did specify clear outcomes and outputs. The section also proposes the indicators to be used by the project for monitoring. Most monitoring indicators foreseen in the design were SMART (specific, measurable, attributable, relevant, realistic and time-bound), save:

- "National water authorities integrating holistic management approaches into policy." This indicator is not measurable, attributable nor realistic in the time frame of the project. While integrating holistic policies could possibly be measured by either policy documents, new legislation, this would require a significant degree of analysis to determine if they were holistic in nature, which would again require another set of criteria.[59] Moreover, to suggest that policies of nations would be influenced in a discernable manner over the course of three years does not appreciate the complexity in developing new policy or legislation, unless perhaps a project is specifically targeted towards developing legislation. Finally, even if integration of holistic management approaches in national policy could be discerned, it would be very difficult to attribute that to the DELTAmerica project. A SMARTer indicator might have been the number of national agency staff that had attended or been exposed to the lessons learned and best practices products of the project.
- "ISP principles are included in national decision-making; stakeholders participate in decision-making and water resources management." This indicator is not measurable, attributable nor realistic in the time frame of the project. It is beyond the scope of a project of this nature to measure how the principles of the ISP are included in national decision-making. This would require an in-depth study across the different participating countries to assess how well the principles of transparency, inclusively, etc. have been applied and integrated and how they have been influenced by the DELTAmerica project. A more realistic and logical

[58] Gonzalez, P. (2010) Director, Natural Hazards Risk Reduction, DSD, OAS, Washington, Personal communication 23 April,

[59] The term holistic can mean a number of things – holistic management implies that a very wide range of issues are being considered, but you would still need to define the scope of those issues to say it is holistic.

indicator might have been the number of national agency staff that had attended or been exposed to the concepts related to public participation during the project.

100. The Project Document contains also an assessment of the baseline situation and environmental benefits of incremental action. It shows the level of interaction and regional development occurring within the region based on the existing GEF projects at the time and relates them to how much expenditure there was in relationship to the project components and objectives. The alternative scenario, in which the project is funded, is also shown with the level of increased benefits to show how the incremental costs may have larger benefits. The incremental cost matrix itself is useful in terms of relating what would have happened if the project did not occur and what was expected to happen if the project occurred.

101. The monitoring and evaluation section of the Pro Document, while not explicitly describing the activities and documents, makes it clear that the project will follow the implementing agency's rules and procedures for reporting, which appear to be satisfactory and include quarterly reporting, annual reporting, steering committee meetings, amongst others.

102. Overall, **the M&E design is found satisfactory**.

2. M&E plan implementation

103. It is evident from the quarterly reporting, financial reporting, and PIR reporting that diligent monitoring and evaluation were conducted, except at the end of the project when the terminal report was prepared in 2007, but then took over a year to be submitted to UNEP.

104. There are several examples of where monitoring was able to alter activities and proved effective, including the first Steering Committee meeting when it was decided that instead of having Brazil as the regional node with several smaller pilot sites (web nodes) to test communication mechanisms and use, they would have five sub-regional nodes of equal size. There are also examples of alterations in spending and budget items that relate to decisions made through monitoring channels (see Financial Reporting).

105. While there was no Steering Committee meeting held in 2004, monitoring continued, as there was continual interaction between the Project Task Manager from UNEP and the executing agency.

106. The mid-term evaluation was carried out towards the end of the activities in 2005, it might have proved more effective if it had been done in the middle of the project to enhance activities.

107. Overall, **M&E implementation was satisfactory.**

3. M&E Budget and Financing

108. The Monitoring and Evaluation plan was budgeted with US$16,800 for External Monitoring and Evaluation (Terminal Evaluation) for both the mid-term and terminal-evaluation. This amount was barely sufficient for the Mid-Term Evaluation and another US$25,000 of project funds were to be set aside for the Terminal Evaluation. Monitoring and reporting were absorbed by the project staff costs, covered by in-kind contributions of the partner agencies. And the GEF Implementation fee for UNEP. Therefore, **M&E Budget and Financing were satisfactory.**

F. Preparation and Readiness

109. In general the components of the project were clearly defined, practicable and feasible within the timeframe of the project. That said, it was a very ambitious project, which initially had envisioned only one node in Brazil (with several centers of excellence or other pilot sites to test websites and communication tools)[60] but which early on determined that there should be 5 sub-regional nodes in Brazil (Brasil), Peru (Pacific – Amazon), Argentina (South Cone), San Jose (Central America) and Saint Lucia (Caribbean). Thus certain elements, such as a single training session in Brazil for professionals and NGOs to become acquainted with IWRN, had to be expanded and conducted sub-regionally. Indeed, the entire component 3, the strengthening of the IWRN, became logistically much more complex than initially envisioned.

110. This shift may have compromised energy and effort in other components, such as component 4 – involving civil society – where it was initially intended to have 5 pilot projects to test the principles of ISP within the IRWN framework in consultation with NGO's. These pilot projects were not carried out, and efforts were invested into the sub-regional nodes themselves.

111. As confirmed by interviews and project documentation lessons learned from previous, or on going, activities (e.g. the San Juan River project) informed the development of the web-nodes.

112. Project partnerships appeared to be well thought out and planned. The capacity and expertise of the Secretariat of Water Resources and the National Water Agency in Brazil, and their involvement in several GEF projects regionally, made them the right choice from where to run the technical secretariat of the project. Likewise, regional agencies such as CEHI and the Regional Commission for Water Resources in Central America, were logical choices for partners due to their experience and regional mandates. National agencies such as IRENA (now National Water Agency) in Peru, and the Sub-secretariat for Water Resources in Argentina, were also well positioned to carry out their roles effectively in the project due to both their capacity and their involvement in international GEF activities.

113. Partnership arrangements were developed in advance, though at least in the case of the CEHI in the Caribbean, there was a feeling that they were not entirely involved in the development and thus direction of the project, even though they were to be partners in the implementation. Roles, responsibilities, funding and facilities in this case were not felt to be clear. Nevertheless, there was a clear sense of inclusiveness and integration of the Caribbean with the Latin American partners as the project progressed.

114. Other people who were interviewed felt that more integration into project design might have facilitated implementation. That said, it was acknowledged that initially the project had been envisioned with a single node in Brazil, and that institutional and technical partners needed to be found in other sub-regions. This occurred after the initial design phase so to speak.

115. In sum, **in terms of preparation and readiness, the project is judged satisfactory**.

[60] See output 3.3 of prodoc: Establish a sub-regional node in Brazil and possibly as well in one or several potentially identified thematic centers of excellence (see 1.2 above)—as pilot sites within this activity—to test the website and related communications tools.

G. Country ownership

116. Due to the nature of the project there is a great deal of overlap between this section and section 4.3.3, institutional sustainability.

117. There is clear ownership of the nodes on the part of Argentina and Peru where updating and maintenance is occurring; Brazil continues to maintain the node, though updating is more on a voluntary basis; the Central American node in Costa Rica is expected to be operational again, and the Caribbean is keen to help advance the project (Table 3). New technologies have taken over the older ones put in place in 2003, greatly simplifying the possibility of developing web sites and transferring information. The development of web-based linkages will become increasingly easy.

118. Countries such as Argentina have been actively using the website and exchange technologies to enhance their own national water management. Brazil has used web-based means to enhance dialogue of the basin committees in the Sao Fransisco basin, as well as throughout the country. Brazil has also adopted web-based databases for legislation that was likely stimulated by the DELTAmerica project.[61]

119. In terms of supporting and continuing to promote dialogue associated with water management and enhancing the exchange of knowledge; countries have continued to support the Dialogue Process as well as hosting and attending meetings supporting the IWRN (see Table 4).

120. **In short, country ownership is rated satisfactory**.

H. Stakeholder participation / Public awareness

121. Under the DELTAmerica project, the IWRN (both the Dialogue Series and the web-sites) was seen as the primary mechanism for developing public awareness and dissemination of data. Therefore, the discussion of stakeholder participation needs to take place at various levels. Firstly, in terms of the interests and goals of nations and the international organizations to promote concepts of Integrated Water Resources Management and advance the goals of the existing GEF projects. To this end, the project was highly successful in identifying and engaging relevant stakeholders as indicted by project documents and from participant lists of meetings (Annex B). It should be noted, that in the case of the Caribbean, more dialogue at the initiation of the project could have been held, to address the specific needs of the island nations as separate from those of Latin America.

122. In terms of public involvement and civil society engagement, the project was successful in identifying and engaging appropriate stakeholders. Several mechanisms were set in place to promote stakeholder involvement such as the open access of the IWRN sites, the open membership, and the innovative governance structure that has evolved as a result of the by-laws that were developed under the DELTAmerica project. As stated earlier, however, the IWRN, as a mechanism for stakeholder involvement will depend upon the support that it receives both financially and institutionally.

[61] Zinato, M. d. C. (2010) Executive Secretary, Apex Brasil, Brasilia, Personal communication 26 April, 2010

123. The project was involved in assisting the Dialogue Series meeting in Jamaica (2004), which promoted public participation and in which a number of civil society organizations participated. In addition, presentations were conducted at the World Water Forum in Mexico (2006).

124. However, the project fell short in terms of actively building public awareness and fostering public involvement as envisioned in the approved Project Document. The approved project document envisioned pilot projects on the ground that would enhance public awareness and public input. Even though the 5 similar sub-regional web nodes were open to the general public, they were not engaging the civil society such as in the Sao Fransico project in Brazil.

125. Regarding collaboration with regional partners and institutions, the project was, for the most part, successful and developed partnerships which have been maintained and solidified at both the personal and institutional level. It is fair to say that collaboration has been strained to some extent during the strengthening of the IWRN, particularly in terms of the roles and responsibilities of the various board members. As mentioned in 4.2.1, finding the balance between different viewpoints and interests within IWRN has not been a simple task. Nevertheless, the majority of those interviewed agreed that the new relationships and the new governance structure of IWRN have created an innovative mechanism for working together.

126. In conclusion, **stakeholder participation in the DELTAmerica project is deemed satisfactory.**

I. Financial Planning and Management

127. A detailed final accounting table is presented in Annex E. It is beyond the scope and means of the evaluation to make a detailed assessment of different line items throughout the project, but some issues of note are discussed below, which give an indication of general financial planning.

128. As with any project as complex as the DELTAmerica project it is rather difficult to plan costs over a multi-year period, particularly when it involves technical development of tools such as the regional nodes and the installation of hardware, training of individuals, and software development. Despite this, overall project expenses were broadly in line with overall projected costs and the project did not go over budget, illustrating both flexibility and diligent use of resources. There were various alterations between budget lines as shown in Table 5 below, which were adequately justified.

Table 5. Alterations between planned and effective project expenses

	Financial reporting [62]			
	Final Acc	**Original Budget**	**Variance**	**Remarks**
Project Personnel	136,429	92,000	**48.29**	To cater for extension of project duration which was initially 22 months and then extended to 46.
Consultants	205,766	291,000	**(29.29)**	Some consultant contracts got downsized hence resulting in savings.
Sub-contracts	132,699	276,800	**(52.06)**	Upon request of the participating Governments more activities were handled internally instead of by sub-contractors.
Meetings/Conferences	402,158	261,100	**54.02**	The above required more meetings.
Expendable	2,637	3,000	**(12.10)**	

[62] Sent by Sandeep Bhambra 27 April 2010

Equipment				
Non-expendable equipment	11,982	13,400	**(10.58)**	
Reporting	40,907	0	**100.00**	Was not budgeted for in the original budget.
Sundry	39,422	34,700	**13.61**	
GRAND TOTAL	**972,000.00**	**972,000.00**	**-**	

129. A budget adaptation was made early in 2005 adding 45 per cent to the management and coordination budget[63]. Project budget lines were revised in the 2nd Quarter of 2006 to reflect changes in resource needs. Consequently, financial reports prepared after that date show little variance between projected and actual costs. The final assessment of the project expenses can be found in Annex G as supplied by GEF Control Unit in Nairobi.

130. Quarterly and annual reporting were conducted on a regular basis by the project. The system of financial control of the project worked at two independent levels: the project item level between the project and UNEP, and the project level between the project and OAS. Under the OAS system, the Board of External Audits was responsible for the external audit of accounts of the General Secretariat of the OAS and examined project spending annually, as presented in its Annual Reports[64]. Towards UNEP, the project quarterly reported spending on line items, which was then compared to the overall project expenditure reported annually by the Board of External Audits. Any discrepancies or differences were dealt with between UNEP and the project directly. This system of financial control worked well and has been able to address any minor reporting issues, such as alterations in reporting requirements and deviations in line items. There were no major issues that arose during the course of the project.[65]

131. The system for financial management, control and reporting also allowed for adequate flexibility in determining project activities. In the early stages of the project several activities exceeded the estimated budgets, such as the implementation of the virtual fora (activity 1.2), while other programmed activities had cost savings, such as the cost of consultants. Adjustments were made as required.

132. Final accounting for co-financing is given in Table 6. It was quite challenging for the evaluator to obtain accurate figures and verify co-financing, as the funds were not channeled through either the implementing or executing agencies. Verification of co-financing was conducted mainly by interviews and by a rough estimate of the resources required for the activities undertaken by the various organizations and governments involved in carrying out the project. No documentary evidence was obtained to triangulate the figures below. Overall, intended and effective co-financing seem to have been the equal.

Table 6. Co-financing Report

[63] Campos, M. (2005). Mid Term Evaluation of GF/1020-03-01). Washington DC, August 2005.
[64] OAS (2007b). *Report to the Permanent Council Annual Audit of Accounts and Financial Statements: For years 2006 &2007*. Board of External Auditors,
[65] Bhambra, S. (2010) Financial Coordinator, Divsion of GEF Coordination, email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April. 2010

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (US$)	Government (US$)	Other* (US$)	Total Disbursement (US$)
Grants: - GEF	972,000			972,000
Loans/ Concessional				
Credits				
Cash		170,000		170,000
Equity investments				
In-kind support	95,000	280,000		375,000
Other - OAS (in-kind)			100,000	100,000
Totals	**1,067,000**	**450,000**	**100,000**	**1,637,000**

133. However, it should be noted that in-kind contributions might have been under-estimated, both in planning and in reporting. The amount of time and effort it took to develop and set up the sub-regional nodes, as well as to maintain and operate these nodes would suggest that during the height of the activities between 2004 and 2005, 3-5 days per month per node were required. In some cases, such as Brazil and Argentina, which were more involved in developing the technical structure of the exchange mechanisms, this is probably an under-estimation. Consequently, it is likely that governments in the region collectively contributed much more than the planned US$280,000.

134. Contributions made by other GEF projects, such as the Sao Francisco, San Juan, and others should also be considered in terms of contributing to the overall success of DELTAmerica, and are not currently considered under in-kind contributions.

135. Overall, **financial planning and management is considered satisfactory.**

J. Implementation approach and adaptive management

136. For the most part the mechanisms outlined in the project documents were followed. A Steering Committee has been formed consisting basically of the institutions initially identified. However, it didn't meet as regular as originally envisioned[66]. Technical committees were established to work through the development of the nodes. Another committee was established to develop the strategy and by-laws document for the IWRN.

137. While live meetings were held, much of the work was conducted through web forums, even though this was viewed to have limited efficiency for discussing differences in vision and goals for the network and in building trust among stakeholders. It proved difficult to arrive at a common understanding through web-based communication.

138. The physical distance and the resulting communication difficulties between the technical coordinator, in Brazil, and the project manager, in Buenos Aires, may be at the origin of the lack of clarity and misunderstandings that surrounded the products and deliverables expected from consultants. This issue had already been highlighted by the Mid-term Evaluation[67], and although some improvements in communication were noted since then, there were still problems in reaching an agreement on how the final documents produced by consultants should look like, leading to the excessive delays in closing the project.

[66] The Steering Committee met twice in 2003 and once in 2005.
[67] Campos, M. (2005). *Mid Term Evaluation of GF/1020-03-01)*. Washington DC, August 2005

139. Clearly, the development of 5 sub-regional nodes was difficult to coordinate. Despite that, coordination and the management of relations with each of the countries was broadly successful. As previously mentioned, the lack of a Caribbean node appeared to be more related to language and technical issues, rather than a management issue per se. That said, if more dialogue had occurred with CEHI at the project development stage then the language issue might have been accommodated.

140. As with any project, the DELTAmerica project faced changing situations, both internally and externally. Over the course of the project, management changed, the overall design changed complicating logistics etc. It appeared from interviews and documents that various socio-economic issues in the countries of the region affected project execution.[68] For example, at the onset of the project Argentina was experiencing economic difficulties internationally. The project appeared to have responded and adapted sufficiently well to be able to achieve the bulk of its project outputs.

141. The adaptations made in the original design, such as the development of sub-regional nodes as opposed to one node as envisioned (with pilot nodes), illustrate adaptability and flexibility. Close coordination and cooperation between the UNEP Task Manager and the executing agency (OAS) allowed greater flexibility in adapting activities to achieve desired outputs and outcomes. Moreover, the successful strengthening of IWRN, particularly from a governance point of view and despite different visions of what IWRN should look like, shows the capacity of project management to adapt and to steer stakeholders towards a solution that is satisfactory to all.

142. Overall, **the implementation approach and adaptive management of the project were satisfactory.**

K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

143. The supervision and support by UNEP staff appears to have been effective and well received by the executing agency, OAS, as well as by the regional stakeholders. The UNEP Task Manager, in regular communication with OAS, provided continuous assistance. Assistance from technical staff from IW:LEARN was also given in the initial stages to help develop the web platforms. However, the integrated relationship with IW:LEARN that was envisioned at the onset of the project did not materialize other than through web links. This is possibly due to the fact that the UNEP database for best practices never materialized, and it was through this database that the DELTAmerica experiences of lessons learned and best practices would have been integrated.

144. There was a clear monitoring of the project outputs by UNEP. Based on the list of participants, UNEP representatives were present for most meetings, and obviously dialogue has occurred surrounding the final lessons learned document which was much delayed.

145. Project Implementation Reports were written and were in line with project activities and outputs. Financial support for the executing agency from UNEP was solid and consistent.[69]

146. In sum, **UNEP supervision and backstopping is considered satisfactory.**

[68] Ibid.

[69] Beatriz Ferro-Santos, Financial Officer, OAS, Personal Communication, 22 April, 2010.

L. Complementarities with UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work

147. The DELTAmerica project goals and objectives are completely in keeping with UNEP's vision and strategy for addressing the challenges of water resources management, particularly with respect to the use of technology, informed decision-making and cooperation.[70]

148. While conceived and implemented about six years before the development of UNEP's Medium Term Strategy[71] (MTS), the DELTAmerica project is a surprisingly solid step in the directions that the MTS point to. Transboundary water resource management remains a crosscutting theme which is related to several of the thematic areas indicated by the UNEP MTS, specifically:

- Climate change – Transboundary waters are integrally linked to alterations in climate. Many of the larger river systems, including those in Latin America, are expected to under go large hydraulic alterations.[72] Expected accomplishments from the MTS include:
    - The IWRN network means that adaptation and planning are supported by scientific information and have the ability to integrate climate data and assessments in terms of hydrological monitoring and exchange (35 (a), MTS)
    - Through the IWRN, Policy makers, negotiators, civil society and the private sector have access to relevant science and information for decision-making. (35 (e), MTS)

- Ecosystem management – Rivers, wetlands and riparian areas are some of the most productive and diverse ecosystems. The DELTAmerica project focused on building capacity and developing a common understanding regarding management of these systems across Latin America and the Caribbean. Specific accomplishments include:
    - Countries are increasingly adopting an integrated approach to the management of water resources, and thus wetland and riparian ecosystems (41 (a), MTS);
    - The DELTAmerica project has initiated discussions, in the form of the Water Directive amongst others, to align environmental programmes and policies to address degradation etc. (41 (c), MTS)

- Environmental governance – International jurisdiction complicates the governance of transboundary waters. One of the focal issues of the DELTAmerica project was the bringing together of local interests and stakeholder issues in combination with national and international issues.
    - The DELTAmerica project and increased support for the IWRN has strengthened national and international stakeholder access to sound science and policy advice for decision making (44 (d), MTS).

[70] UNEP (2007). *Water Policy and Strategy of UNEP*. Report of the Executive Dircetor, UNEP/GC/24/4/Add.1,
[71] UNEP (2009). *United Nations Environement Programme, Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013*. Environment for Development UNEP/GCSS.X/8,
[72] Arora, V. and G. Boer (2001). The Effects of Simulated Climate Change on the Hydrology of Major River Basins. *Journal of Geophysical Research.* 106:3335-3348; Arnell, N. (2003). Effects of IPCC SRES emissions scenarios on river runoff: a global perspective. *Hydrology and Earth Sciences.* 7 (5):619-641

149. The Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building (BSP)[73] highlighted the need for environmentally related technology support and capacity building in developing countries, as well as ensuring effective participation of countries. The objectives of the DELTAmerica project align well with the BSP in the sense that capacity building was both substantive, in terms of best practices, and process oriented, in terms of using web-based technology for information exchange and discussions. The BSP further indicates the need to build on existing strengths, encourage national ownership and provide a significant role to institutional arrangements at the regional level, all of which were accomplished under the DELTAmerica project.

150. The DELTAmerica project clearly emphasized the importance and utility of South-South cooperation. Its substantive activities and products underscored the need for greater cooperation in areas such as information exchange and training programs and the promotion of multi-lateral institutions.[74]

V. Conclusions and rating

Table 7. Overall ratings table

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	Overall the project attained most of the objectives.	**S**
A. 1. Effectiveness	The project was effective in establishing the majority of objectives and outputs.	**S**
A. 2. Relevance	The project was relevant to Country, GEF, UNEP priorities,	**S**
A. 3. Efficiency	Compared to similar projects, the project produced good value for money. However, the project incurred important delays in delivering its final documentation.	**MS**
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	The overall sustainability of the project objectives appears fair. 3 of 5 web nodes are functioning. The Dialogue series is continuing.	**ML**
B. 1. Financial	Financing for the IWRN nodes and Dialogue Series is hard to find, but continued interest from international organizations, increasing interest from the private sector and technological advances make the IWRN less dependent on national Government funding.	**L**
B. 2. Socio Political	The main risk is the lack of support for maintaining the IWRN from neighboring countries of the region, which undermines the vitality of the network and its potential for region-wide impacts. Another risk is the shifting priorities at the senior government levels due to changes in political or economic priorities.	**ML**
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	Nodes are maintained by national governments, but the IWRN is run from multi-stakeholder board. Governments may	**ML**

[73] UNEP (2004). *Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building*. 23 Session of the Governing Council, Global Ministerial Forum, 23 December, 2005

[74] OAS (2005). *Lecciones Aprendidas y Buenas Prácticas en Proyectos GEF - Aguas Transfronterizas en America Latina y Caribe*. Proyecto DELTAmérica, OAS,

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	not keep maintaining nodes if they do not see benefit. Continued interest from international institutions is crucial for sustaining the IWRN.	
B. 4. Environmental	Major environmental issues surrounding international waters have worsened and make the project results, the IWRN in particular, more relevant than ever.	**L**
C. Achievement of outputs and activities	Outputs were generally achieved as intended.	**S**
D. Catalytic Role	The project has an important catalytic role both regionally and nationally.	**S**
E. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) **Sub criteria (below)**	The overall M&E was well done.	**S**
E. 1. M&E Design	The design and funding for the M&E was broadly consistent with GEF criteria.	**S**
E. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	M&E allowed for adaptive management of the project.	**S**
E. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	Although not entirely planned for in the design, sufficient money has been set aside for M&E activities.	**S**
F. Preparation and readiness	The alterations in project management, activities, and budget lines from 2003 are generally in keeping with a 10-15% shift.	**S**
G. Country ownership / drive	The countries have indicated and demonstrated a willingness to move forward. Three out of five countries continue to maintain nodes.	**S**
H. Stakeholders involvement	The project focused on ministry level staff and was successful in their engagement. Local and NGO involvement was promoted through their participation in meetings and in the IWRN.	**MS**
I. Financial planning and management	The project remained within the budget, though shifts between budget lines were necessary to adapt to changing priorities, approaches and delays.	**S**
J. Implementation approach	The project management, OAS and UNEP, appeared adaptive at dealing with new situations.	**S**
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping	The support given to the project from UNEP was adequate.	**S**

VI. Lessons learned

Lesson 1: Communication between distant teams and functions

151. Key project team members were located in different countries for the bulk of the activities (2003-2005). The technical secretariat was situated in Brasilia, while project execution was conducted from Buenos Aires and administration was overseen from Washington DC. This was considered 'far from ideal' according to interviews and documentation.[75] As in any project, personalities and diverging views and opinions can

[75] Campos, M. (2005). *Mid Term Evaluation of GF/1020-03-01)*. Washington DC, August 2005

sometimes hinder collaboration, and these issues can be exacerbated when people are in different locations and communicating mainly over Email and the Internet. In contrast, it is interesting to note that the very close cooperation and coordination experienced by UNEP and OAS in Washington and their ability to have physical interaction worked to assist the project in achieving its goals.

152. In future projects of this type, regular communication and coordination between technical coordination, management and administration should be ensured, and this is best achieved through geographical proximity and regular live meetings and teleconferences.

Lesson 2: Clarity on deliverables

153. Interviews revealed that one of the principal causes for delays were lack of clarity in deliverables when hiring consultants, as well as lack of clarity of deliverables at the project level with respect to documents and final publication (Section 4.2.3).

154. It is important that in future projects, clear terms of reference delineating conceptual issues, including table of contents and expected size, should be determined and agreed upon between partners at an early stage.[76]

Lesson 3: Use of virtual fora

155. Virtual fora were used to varying degrees of effectiveness, particularly in the development of the by-laws and governance structure of the IWRN (which also included face to face meetings), as well as for the Project Steering Committee. With respect to the Steering Committee, for instance, virtual fora were considered as "wholly ineffective"[77], with members indicating that their perspectives were not appropriately related through the written word alone and that relationship and trust building was very difficult.

156. In future projects where virtual fora are used it is necessary to develop a more strategic utilization – as a means of accomplishing very specific tasks or addressing specific issues and or facts and data, within the context of a broader framework that is developed through meetings. For example a virtual forum could be used to comment on a draft, or discuss the merits of using certain systems of measurement for hydraulic information. However, if there are situations where 'values' are at the core of the discussion then facilitated meetings are needed. In any case, forum facilitators would be needed to help drive the email and virtual forums.

Lesson 4: Project design and timeframe

157. The entire project was originally to be delivered in 18 months. This was extended to December 2005, and then finally to June 2009. This indicates that the scope of the project was too ambitious for the original timeframe, and even the first extension (See section 4.7). This holds true, even when considering that the initial concept foresaw only one single node in Brazil. Multi-stakeholder agreements have to be reached, lessons learned and best practices extracted, web sites developed and managed, pilot projects undertaken with NGO's etc.[78]

[76] Note this echoes a recommendation set forth in the final report. Rucks, J. (2007). *Terminal Report*. OAS, Washington DC, 3 May, 2007

[77] Ibid.

[78] OAS (2002). *MSP Project Document 'Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean'*. 22 September 2002

158. Greater consideration should be given to balancing funding and timing with expected outputs, particularly on projects of hemispherical or global nature, where a multitude of activities are conducted and various partners are involved.

Lesson 5: Use all available media for dissemination

159. One of the great successes of the DELTAmerica project was the development of a variety of mechanisms for exchanging and disseminating experiences, lessons learned and best practices. It employed online data-bases and information for downloading, and created links with other web sites (the number of hits illustrates its utility); it held focused meetings aimed at the managerial level; and it publicized products and activities in wider international fora. What it perhaps lacked was a focus on information dissemination at the decision-making level, which remained outside the scope of the project.

160. A multi-media approach to sharing and disseminating lessons learned and best practices, using a well chosen mix of technologies and tools, is clearly more efficient than reliance on a single communication medium.

VII. Recommendations

161. As the project has been closed, and in particular the bulk of the activities have been completed for almost 5 years, these recommendations concern the enhancement of outputs of the project.

Recommendation 1: Further support to strengthen IWRN

162. Issue: IWRN is at a transitional stage. It has developed a new governance structure that allows for a board to consist of international organizations, national governments, academic institutions, NGOs, and the private sector. This is a highly diverse group. During the DELTAmerica project the OAS was the executing agency along with UNESCO in more recent years. There is now a more open structure of governance for the IWRN which could prosper and flourish, helping to implement and materialize many of the goals of involving civil society in decision making which international organizations aspire to; or it could dissolve into something less influential and less important in the region.

163. Recommendation: Careful consideration should be given by international organizations, particularly the OAS (as a regional leader) and UNEP, to help support the IWRN in its new format. The goals of the IWRN remain consistent with the goals of OAS[79] and UNEP in terms of civil society inclusion at high levels. It potentially provides an interesting and effective forum for soliciting and integrating inputs from civil society into discussions involving transboundary waters.

164. To be able to support the IWRN, however, the needs of the national and international organizations will have to be addressed in terms of meetings or maintaining dialogue at the appropriate level. Clearly, there is a time where government agencies require closed sessions. It is therefore conceivable that within the greater framework of the open and inclusive IWRN (Tier 1) there can be a forum for regulatory representatives alone (Tier 2). This does not necessarily indicates any hierarchical framework, rather respects the reality of implementing transboundary projects.

[79] In particular those of the *Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development*. Unit for Sustainable Development and Environment, OAS, Washington DC, 2001 in terms of transparency and inclusiveness in decision making.

165. Private sector support to the IWRn needs to be further promoted. However, it needs to be balanced with international donor, government and civil society support to ensure that commercial interests are not seen as leading IWRN.

Recommendation 2: Promote a dialogue for a common approach at the regional level for water resources management

166. Issue: The development of a common approach for water resources management was promoted during the DELTAmerica project. It did not advance as much as it might have, but was also not necessarily envisioned at the time of project initiation. The fact that it did receive attention and was initiated is commendable. The common approach would help to achieve the levels of outcome anticipated by directing attention to decision makers of the region.

167. Recommendation: A dialogue for a common, regional approach to water management should be further promoted, using the OAS as an appropriate executing agency with the necessary credibility, and employing the IWRN as a mechanism for information exchange between governments and with other sectors such as academics, NGOs and the private sector.

168. The greater outreach potential of the IWRN can be used to help solicit input into the formulation of a common regional approach (Web based, meetings etc.), while drafting and promotion at the decision making level can be conducted with appropriate national agencies and international organizations.

169. Not only would this be feasible, but also it would help develop a more holistic and supportive approach. Clearly, this would need to be achieved in stages, such as developing principles, and then developing processes, and finally more substantial elements.

170. The advantages of this approach lie in the potential for increased time and dialogue associated with using IWRN, and the potential for more input from civil society.

Recommendation 3: Finalize lessons learned and enhance their dissemination

171. Issue: A great deal of work was undertaken to identify lessons learned from the region particularly with respect to best practices in water management, both transboundary and nationally. The final product appears not to have been entirely practical in terms of providing information for future management or project development. This appears more to be an issue of presentation and analysis than a matter of poor substance or content.

172. Recommendation: With some further work the wealth of knowledge could be expanded and added to, and re-packaged to be more accessible and informative for practitioners. This could be done through a small follow-up project. The up-dated and repackaged knowledge base should be disseminated widely using the methods and mechanisms developed under DELTAmerica. It could also support, or be part of, the development process of a regional, common approach to water resources management (see Recommendation 2).

VIII. Annex A: List of people contacted and interviewed

	Name	Relation to DELTAmerica	Current Position and Contact	Date
1	Maximiliano Campos	Former focal point for the Central American Node.	Division Head Integrated Water Resource Management Section. Depart. Of Sustainable Development. OAS Tél : (202) 458 3687 mcampos@oas.org	22-23 April
2	Pablo Gonzalez	Former Project Manager (2003-2004). Initial stages of project.	Division Head Reduction of Risks and Natural Disasters. OAS Tel: (202) 458 3274 pgonzalez@oas.org	23 April
3	Beatriz Ferro-Santos	Official Administrator and accounting.	Official Administrator Department of Sustainable Development OAS Tel: (202) 458 3560 bsantos@oas.org	22 April
4	Bernhard Griesinger	OAS Project Manager (2004-2005)		
5	Gilberto Canali	Technical Coordinator Brazil	Av. Jorn. Rubens de Arruda Ramos, 1496 ap 1001 88015-700 Florianópolis,SC Tel: 55 48 99498140 E-mail: gvcanali@uol.com.br	26 April
6	Maria Zinato do Carmo	Former Focal Point/Coordinator for the Brazilian node. Remains active in updating the website on voluntary basis	Apex Brasil Executive Secretary, Brasil Commission Expo Shangai 2010 Tel: (55) 61 – 3426 0202 ex 591 Mobile (55) 61-9103 3696 mzinato@gmail.com	26 April
7	Alberto Palombo	Node designer and IWRN founding member.	Inter-American Water Resources Network Executive Committee Secretary Tel: (55) 61 – 3032-3200 Mobile (55) 61 – 9196 8565 apalombo@infohydro.com	26 April
8	Bráulio Gottschalg Duque	Assisted with the proposal and	Apoio à Tecnologia da Informação - ATI/GAB	27 April

		maintained the server and the Node	Secretaria de Recursos Hídricos e Ambiente Urbano - SRHU Ministério do Meio Ambiente - MMA (61) 2028-2038 braulio.duque@mma.gov.br	
9	Jorge Rucks	Project Manager 2004-2006	Director Nacional de Medio Ambiente Ministeri de Vivienda Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente Tel: 917 07 10 Email: jorge.rucks@gmail.com	28 April
10	Zelmira May	Operation of Technical Secretariat for IWRN in 2009	UNESCO Edficio de MERCOSUR Montevideo Tel: 2-413-2075 Email:zmay@unesco.org.uy	28 April
11	Enrique Bello	OAS Project Manager 2005-2007. Assistant Division Chief (OAS) - helped during the last stages in the coordination and publication of final documents	OAS Office Junin 1940, PB Buenos Aires, Argentina ebello@oas.org Tel: +54-11-48037606 to 08	29-30 April
12	Andres Rodriguez	Not directly related to outcomes and impacts of DELTAmerica,	National Director Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos Subsecrataria de Recursos Hídricos Tel: +54-11 - 4349-7436 Email: androd@minplan.gov.ar	29 April
13	Maria Josefa Fioriti	Technical Assistant for the Secretariat of the Southern Cone	Technical Assistant Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos Subsecrataria de Recursos Hídricos +51-11 - 4349-7453 Email: mfiori@minlan.gov.ar	29 April
14	Frederico Scuka	IT person in charge of technical aspects of the nodes. Based in Buenos Aires.	IT Engineer Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos Ministerio de Planificación Federal +51-11 - 4775 0135 Email: fscuka@minlan.gov.ar	30 April
15	Fernando Dopazo	Technical Assistant for the South Cone node 2003-2007	Project Chief for Hydraulic Studies Agua y Saneamientos Agrentinos, SA Tel: +54-11- 6319-2178 Fernando_Dopazo@aysa.com.ar	29 April
16	Maria Josefa Fioriti	Technical Focal Point for the	Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos	29 April

		Southern Cone node 2003-2006.	Ministerio de Planificación Federal Tel: 54-11-	
17	Patricia Aquing	Focal Point for the Caribbean Node	Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) Saint Lucia, W.I. Tel +1758 – 452-2501 Email: paquing@cehi.org.lc	10 May
18	Isabelle Van der Beck	Task Manager for UNEP	UNEP Task Manager GEF IW LAC projects Tel:+1-202-974-1314 Email: isabelle.vanderbeck@unep.org or uneprep@oas.org	March-, April-May.
19	Sandeep Bhambra	UNEP Financial Coordinator	UNEP Division of GEF Coordination UNEP Tel: 254 20 7623347 Fax: 254 20 7624041 Email: Sandeep.Bhambra@unep.org	26 April

IX. Annex B: References, Documents Reviewed and Personal Communications.

Personal Communication

Aquing, P. (2010) Coordinator, Caribbean Environmental Health Institute, Saint Lucia (telephone interview), Personal communication 12 May 2010

Bhambra, S. (2010) Financial Coordinator, Divsion of GEF Coordination, email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April. 2010

Campos, M. (2010) Director, Integrated Water Resource Management, DSD, OAS, Washington DC, Personal communication 22 April, 2010

Carnali, G. (2010) Water Consultant to Brasilian Government, Teleconference, Personal communication 26 April, 2010

Dopazo, F. (2004). *Email communication with Focal Points of DELTAmerica*. 3 August, 2004

Duque, B. G. (2010) Technical Assistant, Secretary of Water Resources Brazil., Brasilia, Personal communication 27 April, 2010

Ferro-Santos, B. (2010) Financial Coordinator, Administrative Office, DSD, OAS, Washington DC, Personal communication 22 April,

Gonzalez, P. (2010) Director, Natural Hazards Risk Reduction, DSD, OAS, Washington, Personal communication 23 April,

Hamid, M. (2010) Technical Adminstrator, IW:LEARN, Personal communication email - 27 April, 2010

Jesús, J. (2010) Technical Administration IWRN, Autoridad Nacional del Agua, Peru., email correspondence, Personal communication 26 April, 2010

Palombo, A. (2010) Executive Committee Secretary, IWRN, Brasilia, Personal communication 26 April, 2010

Rodriguez, A. (2010) National Director, Conservación y Protección de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 29 April

Rucks, J. (2010) National Director of Environment, Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente, Uruguay, Montevideo, Personal communication 28 April, 2010

Sanchez, R. (2010) Jefe Departamento de Computo, Instituto Meterológico Nacional de Costa Rica, Email contact, Personal communication 6 may 2010

Scuka, F. (2010) IT Engineer, Subsecretaria de Recursos Hídricos, Buenos Aires, Personal communication 30 April, 2010

Project Documentation and Reports

Bewers, J. (2005). Overview of Five International Waters Projects in the Latin America and Caribbean Region. OAS, May, 2005

Campos, M. (2005). Mid Term Evaluation of GF/1020-03-01). Washington DC, August 2005

FCES (2005). Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Experiences in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean - DELTAmerica Project-

WEBSITE - Administrator Manual - Inter America Resources Network - IWRN. Florida Centre for Environmental Studies, Florida Altantic University, Palm Beach Gardens,

Goldstein, S. (2005). Estratégias de ação e temas básicos para estabelecimento do compromissos entre as nações para a garantia de água para os povos de América Latina e Caribe. 9 March, 2005

Humberto (2005). Video Aguas en las Americas: Resultados de los Projectos GEF. (presented at Reunión del Consejo Director del Poryecto DELTamerica Lima, Peru, 16-17, May, 2005)

IWLEARN (2010). International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network. retrieved April 12, 2010, 2010 from http://www.iwlearn.net

IWRN (2010). Interamerican Water Resources Network. retrieved 25 March, 2010 from http://www.iwrn.net/

IWRN Pacific (2010). Red Interamericans de Recursos Hidrícos - Nodo Pacifico Sur y Amazonas.

Manuela, M. (200?). Critérios para identificação de Boas Práticas.

OAS (200?-a). Common Strategy for Water Management among the Countries of Latin America and the Carribean (preliminary proposal). OAS, Washington, 200?

OAS (200?-b). Contribuição às definições de boas prácticas, experiências bem sucedidas e ligação de uma biblioteca virtual de estudos de casos em boas Práticas em gerenciamento integrado de Recurso Hídricos na América Latina e no Caribe. Washington DC, 200?

OAS (200?-c). Lecciones Aprendidas y Buenas Practicas en Proyectos GEF Aguas Transfronterizas en America Latina y Caribe. OAS, Washington DC?

OAS (200?-d). Manuais do Sistema Manual do Administrador do Nó Brasil. OAS, Washington DC?

OAS (200?-e). Mecanismos para fortalecer a rede internactinoal de Recursos Hídricos - RIRH e Disseminar experiências bem sucedidas, lições aprendidas e boas práticas em gerenciamento integrado de recursos na Latin America e Caribe. OAS, Washington DC?

OAS (200?-f). Mechanismos para fortalecer a RIRH e Disseminar experiências bem sucedidas, licöes aprendidas e boas prácticas em gerenciamento integrado de recursos na America Latina e Caribe. OAS, Washington, 200?

OAS (2001). Inter-American Strategy for the Promotion of Public Participation in Decision-making for Sustainable Development. Unit for Sustainable Development and Environment, OAS, Washington DC, 2001

OAS (2002). MSP Project Document 'Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean'. 22 September 2002

OAS (2003a). Diálogo Subregional Cono Sur, Proyecto DELTAmérica. Montevideo, 26-27 septiembre, 2003

OAS (2003b). Diálogo Subregional Vertiente del Pacífico Sur y Amazonía. Brasilia, 23-25 julio, 2003

OAS (2003c). Primera Reunión del Consejo Director del Proyecto DeltAmérica. Arequipa, 7 junio, 2003

OAS (2003d). Reunión Puntos Focales Nacionales de la RIRH. Arequipa, 7-8 junio, 2003

OAS (2003e). Segunda Reunión del Consejo Director del Proyecto DeltAmérica. Montevideo, 27 septiembre, 2003

OAS (2004). Sub-regional Dialogue on Integrated Water Resources Management in the Caribbean and Meso América: DELTAmérica Project. Rodney Bay, Saint Lucia, 4-5th March, 2004

OAS (2005a). 1 Reunião de Coordenação - nodo Brasil, Brasilia.

OAS (2005b). Reporte de Reunión del Consejo Director. Lima, 9-10 mayo 2005

OAS (2007a). 1er Reuníon Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH. Guatemala City, 11-12 agosto, 2007

OAS (2007b). Report to the Permanent Council Annual Audit of Accounts and Financial Statements: For years 2006 &2007. Board of External Auditors,

OAS (2008). Segunda Reuníon Puntos Focales nacionales de GIRH de Las Americas ante la OEA y ante la RIRH. 9-10 septiembre, 2008

OAS (2009). 2 Reuníon de Punots Focales Nacionales de Agua antes de OEA y ante de la RiRH: Centro América y México. 25-26 fevrero, 2009

OAS/UNEP (2007). UNEP GEF PIR for year 2006-2007. Project Internal Review, OAS,

SRH (2010). Plan de Trabajo, Subsecretaria de recursos híidricos, Agrentina. Buenos Aires, 2009/2010

Rucks, J. (2007). Terminal Report. OAS, Washington DC, 3 May

UNEP (2004). Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building. 23 Session of the Governing Council, Global Ministerial Forum, 23 December, 2005

UNEP (2007). Water Policy and Strategy of UNEP. Report of the Executive Dircetor, UNEP/GC/24/4/Add.1,

UNEP (2009). United Nations Environement Programme, Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013. Environment for Development UNEP/GCSS.X/8.

X. Annex C : Interview Questionnaires

Questionnaire 1

General impressions: (Achieving immediate objectives – intermediate states to long term goals and impacts)

i. To what extent did the project promote South-to-South learning, and develop and implement mechanisms (web sites, discussion, meetings) to disseminate the lessons learned in GEF International Waters-related (GEF-IW) projects in Latin America and the Caribbean.

ii. To what extent did the project serve to illustrate how systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned, and best practices can improve integrated land and water resources management?

iii. How did the project strengthen and improve mechanisms for the dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects and other experiences in integrated land and water resources management within the Latin America and Caribbean region? How was IWRN supported, and how were the Dialogue series supported?

iv. What mechanisms are in place to ensure stakeholder ownership and sustainability of the benefits of the project activities and associated technical support?

A. Effectiveness, Relevance, Efficiency (ROtI Analysis)
Step 1 – project outcomes and intended impacts *If nothing more is done, will the project achieve positive long-term impacts for the region (5-10 years)?*
Step 2- intermediate states and their status *Has the project been effective in, directly or indirectly, assisting policy development or decision-makers in applying information from IWRN?*
What has been the impact of the project on integrated transboundary management of water resources in Latin America and the Caribbean?
Step 3 – factors responsible to success or failure *Assumptions – what external factors are present to help achieve, or undermine the goals, of the project? Political, social, environmental?*
Impact Drivers – what are project partners and stakeholders doing, or could, do to assist with goals?
Where the project's outcomes consistent with GEF priorities?
Was the project cost effective?
Was the project implementation delayed , and did that have an effect on cost effectiveness?
Did the project build on earlier initiatives, make use of scientific information and data?
B. Sustainability
Financial *Are there financial risks that have jeopardized sustenance of project outcomes?*
To what extent will the outcomes of the project be dependent upon continued financial support?
Socio-political *Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?*
What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow the project outcomes to be sustained?
Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?
Institutional *To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?*
What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?

Are the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical expertise in place to continue.
Environmental *Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?*
Are there any activities in the project areas that will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes?
Step 1 – project outcomes and intended impacts
Step 2- intermediate states and their status
Step 3 – factors responsible to success or failure ***Assumptions-***
Impact Drivers-
C. Achievement of outputs and activities
Where all expected outputs of the project delivered as programmed?
Where all expected outputs of the project delivered useful and on time?
Were the methods used to develop technical documents sound and effective?
Do the technical products have the scientific weight and authority in influence decision makers, national level?
D. Catalytic Role
To what extent have the project activities provided incentives to catalyzing change in stakeholder behaviour?
To what extent have the project activities contributed to change in institutional behaviour?
To what extent did the project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from government-other doners?
Project Champions – to what extent have changes been due to particular institutions and individuals.
Step 1 – project outcomes and intended impacts
Step 2 - intermediate states and their status
Step 3 – factors responsible to success or failure ***Assumptions-***
Impact Drivers-
E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems
What was the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation tools? Reporting etc.
Where risks adequately addressed
M&E design - was it well designed
Implementation
Budgeting and funding? Adequate and timely?
F. Preparation and Readiness
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation?
Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?
G. Country ownership
Have the countries taken on the role of continuing the activities and exchange of information?
To what extent have the countries used the information generated by the IWRN for decision-making.
What is the level of country commitment to facilitating financial and in-kind contributions to the project?
H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:
Where the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country successful?
Were collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project effective?

Were public awareness activities undertaken during the course of implementation of the project effective?
I. Financial Planning
Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
Actual project costs compared to budget
Present major findings from financial audit
Sources of cofinancing – verification.
Appropriate standards of diligence.
Final and actual costs -
J. Implementation approach:
Were implementation arrangements effective?
Have project documentation been followed, committees etc…
Including: effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management – day to day as well.
K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping
Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF. • *Project supervision* • *Outcome monitoring – results based management* • *PIR ratings are accurate?* • *Quality of documentation and project supervision* • *Financial, administrative etc.*
Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.
L. Complementary with UNEP MTS and Programme of Work
Linkage between UNEP's expected Accomplishments
Complimentary with Bali Strategy

XI. Annex D: ROtI Analysis

The following annex was used as a basis for developing narrative associated with sections 4.2.1 (Effectiveness), 4.3 (Sustainability),

Table D-1 Summary or Project ROtI Analysis

Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions	Impact Drivers	Intermediate States	Impacts
-3 regional meetings to discuss criteria, methodology and identification of best practices, and exchange information and experiences. - developmet of virtual forum – IWRN - development and disseminations of reports and products, CDs, brochures, and outline resource practices and lessons learned. - Encourage and facilitate project twinning exercises.	**Outcome 1**Better informed water resources management communities in the Americas; enhanced sharing of critical water resources management knowledge, experiences, and best practices; and strengthened collaboration amongst riparian countries leading to improved water resources management.	The concepts of collaborative development of shared resources and Integrated Water Resources Management are increasingly common regionally and globally.	OAS, international organizations, and national ministries are able to advance collaborative water resource management on the national agendas.	New projects and collaboration is occurring. Increased information sharing is occurring relating to hydraulic and socio-economic information. Political policy is moving towards treaty development and increased cooperation.	Improved water resources management and collaboration over shared resources based on the concepts of Integrated Water Resources Management.
- developmet of virtual forum – IWRN - creation of web platforms and data bases - Concepts of Integrated Water Resources Management are being discussed at meetings and larger forums.	**Outcome 3** Increased capacity of water management organizations and river basin authorities for sharing information and experiences via the Internet as well as through other media.	The internet is increasingly being used as a vehicle for information dissemination globally. There is increased dialogue associated with water issues globally	National governments and ministries are using the internet. Regional interest in water continues to be a priority	Countries are attending meetings Managers are using web to find and exchange information, more than simply email forums.	Water managers and organizations maximize the benefits and technologies of the internet for information sharing.
- 'best practices' in water resources management activities available from websites. - three regional workshops with a view to promoting the inclusion of lessons learned in water resource management	**Outcome 4** Lessons learned and experiences from GEF-IW projects disseminated using the IWRN as a platform.	The lessons learned are similar to lessons learned in other regions and are broadly supported	The institutions involved in DELTAmerica continue to promote the lessons learned.	The lessons learned are promoted at meetings. They are downloaded from the webs.	Inclusion of lessons learned and best practices into water resources management practices
- Redesign / improvement of the IWRN web site and establish nodes	**Outcome 2** Processes for sharing experiences and lessons learned from GEF-	There is generally increased use of internet and web-	Governments and countries have continued to support	Countries are using the established web- nodes in Brazil, Argentina,	Strengthened IWRN as the main hemispheric

for -- Central Page - -- Brazil, Brazil -- South Cone, Argentina -- South Pacific and Amazon, Peru -- Central America, San José - Links established with other relevant sites, including IWLEARN	International Waters (GEF-IW) projects are refined and disseminated and provide pilot site for IW:LEARN **Outcome 4** Lessons learned and experiences from GEF-IW projects disseminated using the IWRN as a platform. **Outcome 5**Strengthened IWRN	based sources of information and knowledge sharing.	IRWN Focal Point meetings after the main activities of DELTAmerica were completed.	and Peru. Greater use of IWLEARN may increased knowledge of IWRN	communication tool for integrated water resources management.
- Refinement of the framework to strengthen the IWRN with inclusion of civil society governance structure - open membership and access to IWRN sites - reinforcement of ISP principles at international forums	**Outcome 6:** Strengthened civil society participation in water resources management projects.	There is increased awareness of public participation on the global agenda to help drive the ISP principles at the regional level	The institutions involved in DELTAmerica continue to promote the ISP principles.	ISP principles are promoted at meetings and on the web. Projects are developed which enhance ISP principles	Public participation in decision making regarding water resources both nationally and transboundary are well established.

Table D-2: Rating Scale for outcomes and progress towards 'intermediate states'.

Outcome Rating	Rating on progress toward Intermediate States
D: The Project's intended outcomes were not delivered	**D:** No measures taken to move towards intermediate states.
C: The Project's intended outcomes were delivered, but were not designed to feed into a continuing process after Project funding	C: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started, but have not produced results.
B: The Project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after Project funding	B: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which give no indication that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.
A: The Project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, with specific allocation of responsibilities after Project funding.	A: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which clearly indicate that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.

A Project will end up with a two letter rating e.g. AB, CD, BB etc. In addition the rating is give a '+' notation if there is evidence of impacts accruing within the life of the Project. The possible rating permutations are then translated onto the usual six point rating scale used in all UNEP Project evaluations in the following way.

Table D-3. Shows how the ratings for 'achievement of outcomes' and 'progress towards intermediate states translate to ratings for the 'Overall likelihood of impact achievement' on a six point scale.

Highly Likely	Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Unlikely	Highly Unlikely
AA AB BA CA BB+ CB+ DA+ DB+	BB CB DA DB AC+ BC+	AC BC CC+ DC+	CC DC AD+ BD+	AD BD CD+ DD+	CD DD

XII. Annex E: Final Budget Figures in $US

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
PROJECT COMPLETION REVISION

1.1	**Sub-Programme Title:**	International Waters - 10: Contaminants
1.2	**Project Title:**	Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Experiences in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean
1.3	**Project Number:**	IMIS: GF / 2732 - 03 – 4624 Rev 5 PMS: GF/1020-03-01 Rev. 5
1.4	**Geographical Scope:**	National: Brazil
1.5	**Implementation:**	General Secretariat of the Organization of American States (GS/OAS)

Reasons for Revision

a) To reflect actual expenditures to the GEF Trust Fund.
- Year 2007 of US$31,510.50
- Year 2008 of US$0
- Year 2009 of US$13,408.25

The total cost of the project to the GEF Trust Fund remains **unchanged**.

b) To mark December 2008 as completion of the project but major project activities were completed by December 2006. To extend the project to June 2009 for accounting purposes. Project closure will be done upon receipt of final audit and terminal evaluation report.

Amendments to sections, 1.6 (Duration) and 3.2 (Budget)

1.6	**Duration of the Project:**	76 months Commencing: March 2003 Initial Completion: December 2004 Revised Completion: June 2009 (formerly March 2008)

1.7 Cost of the Project (US$):

Cost to the GEF Trust Fund **remains**	972,000
Co-financing (in-kind) **remains**:	
Govt. of Brazil	470,000
GS/OAS	100,000
UNEP	95,000
Sub-total	*665,000*
Total Cost of the Project	**1,637,000**

3.2 Budget Annex I

For UNEP

Maryam Niamir-Fuller
Director, DGEF Coordination, UNEP
Date: 8.07.09

Reference: 2009 project accounts

			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total	Variance 2009
10	PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT										
1100	Project Personnel	w/m									
1101	Technical Co-ordinator (18 p/m)		30,315	67,473	23,011	15,003	0	-	627.01	136,429	627.01
1199	Sub-Total		30,315	67,473	23,011	15,003	0	-	627.01	136,429	
1200	Consultants	w/m									
1201	Facilitataor activity 1.2	3p/m	6,442	54	10,400	8,400		-	503.00	25,799	503.00
1202	Consultant activity 1.3	18p/m	-	42,615	13,117	9,356	76	-	0.43	65,164	0.43
1203	Consultant activity 1.4	3p/m	-	-	-	-		-	-	0	-
1204	Consultant activity 2.1	3p/m	-	-	-	-		-	-	0	-
1205	Consultant ativity 2.2	10p/m	-	32,629	5,000	-		-	-	37,629	-
1206	Consultant activity 2.3	4p/m	-	6,500	-	9,791		-	(0.37)	16,291	(0.37)
1207	Consultant activity 3.1	4p/m	-	12,689	6,903	-		-	-	19,592	-
1208	Consultant activity 3.2	3p/m	-	8,625	8,625	-		-	-	17,250	-
1209	Consultant activity 3.3	4p/m	-	6,802	2,726	1,403		-	(0.18)	10,931	(0.18)
1210	Consultant activity 3.4	2p/m	-	-	-	0		-	-	0	-
1211	Consultant activity 4.1	3p/m	-	-	5,277	7,832		-	0.38	13,110	0.38
1299	Sub-Total		6,442	109,914	52,049	36,783	76	-	503.26	205,766	
1999	Component Total		36,757	177,387	75,060	51,786	76	-	1,130	342,195	-
20	SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT										-
2200	Sub-contracts										-
2201	Contract Virtual fora activity 1.3		-	-	-	0		-	-	0	-
2202	Contract Translation Dox activity		-	-	-	3,680		-	-	3,680	-
2203	Contract Editing and printing Dox		-	-	-	21,844	128	-	(0.18)	21,971	(0.18)
2204	Contract Electronic edition activity		-	-	-	-		-	-	0	-
2205	Contract Dox translation activity 2.1		-	989	3,108	-		-	-	4,097	-
2206	Contract Editing and printing Dox		-	73	2,624	3,383		-	0.66	6,080	0.66
2207	Contract Electronic edition activity		-	0	48,826	-		-	(0.09)	48,826	(0.09)
2208	Contract Lease electronic equipment		-	-	-	-		-	-	0	-
2209	Contract Dox translation activity 3.1		267	-	-	-		-	-	267	-
2210	Contract Editing and printing Dox		-	1,212	-	20,255	120	-	0.31	21,587	0.31
2211	Contract Website design activity 3.2		-	1,670	2,230	-		-	(0.16)	3,900	(0.16)
2212	Contract Webmaster activity 3.3		-	17,225	930	-		-	(414.49)	17,740	(414.49)
2213	Contract Webmaster activity 3.5		-	-	-	4,551		-	(0.29)	4,551	(0.29)
2299	Sub-Total		267	21,169	57,717	53,712	248	-	(414)	132,699	
2999	Component Total		267	21,169	57,717	53,712	248	-	(414)	132,699	-

30	**TRAINING COMPONENT**										-
	3300	**Meetings/conferences**									-
	3301	Workshop activity 1.1 (travel related costs)	68,068	20,018	3	-			80.40	88,169	80.40
	3302	Workshop activity 1.2 (travel related costs)	34,963	32,346	-	4,420	809		0.17	72,537	0.17
	3303	Workshop activity 1.5 (travel related costs)	-	6,095	15,908	34,371			(888.72)	55,485	(888.72)
	3304	Workshop activity 2.3 (travel related costs)	3,901	40,510	100,552	1,362			(0.73)	146,324	(0.73)
	3305	Workshop activity 3.4 (travel related costs)	5,048	27,512	2,183	4,643	257		(0.18)	39,643	(0.18)
	3399	**Sub-Total**	**111,980**	**126,480**	**118,647**	**44,795**	**1,065**	**-**	**(809.06)**	**402,158**	
	3999	**Component Total**	**111,980**	**126,480**	**118,647**	**44,795**	**1,065**	**-**	**(809.06)**	**402,158**	
40	**EQUIPMENT & PREMISES COMPONENT**										
	4100	**Expendable Equipment**									
	4101	Computer Software	0	-	2,600	-	-	-	37.00	2,637	37.00
	4199	**Sub-Total**	**0**	**0**	**2,600**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**37.00**	**2,637**	
	4200	**Non-expendable equipment**									
	4201	Computer	4,382	1,000	360	3,560	2,680	-	0.07	11,982	0.07
	4299	**Sub-Total**	**4,382**	**1,000**	**360**	**3,560**	**2,680**	**-**	**0.07**	**11,982**	
	4999	**Component Total**	**4,382**	**1,000**	**2,960**	**3,560**	**2,680**	**-**	**37**	**14,619**	
50	**MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT**										
	5200	**Reporting costs (publications, maps, newsletters, printing, etc)**									
	5201	Editing and printing of Project final publications					0	27,442	-	13,465.32	40,907	13,465.32
	5299	**Sub-Total**					**0**	**27,442**	**-**	**13,465.32**	**40,907**	
	5300	**Sundry**									
	5301	EA Overheads	16,873	15,252	7,298	-	-	-	(1.11)	39,422	(1.11)
	5399	**Sub-Total**	**16,873**	**15,252**	**7,298**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**(1.11)**	**39,422**	
	5999	**Component Total**	**16,873**	**15,252**	**7,298**	**-**	**27,442**	**-**	**13,464.21**	**80,329**	13,408.25
GRAND TOTAL			**170,259.00**	**341,287.03**	**261,681.88**	**153,853.34**	**31,510.50**	**-**	**13,408.25**	**972,000.00**	-
Previous Budget			170,259	341,287.03	261,681.88	153,853.34	31,510.50	13,408.25	-	972,000.00	
Variance			-	-	-	-	-	(13,408.25)	13,408.25	-	

XIII. Annex H: Qualifications of Evaluator

Glen Hearns,M.Sc. Ph.D (cand) - Consultant, Compass Resource Management Ltd.
Overview of Skills

- Strategic and decision analyst with ten years of experience specializing in multi-stakeholder resource management decisions and integrated assessment.
- Policy, legal, and institutional analyst.
- Facilitator, focusing on resolution of conflicts and negotiation, with over ten years experience at various governance levels with communities, local governments, First Nations, international level, and with diverse stakeholder groups.
- Local economic development and participatory planning specialist
- PhD thesis: governance models for shared resource.
- Extensive knowledge in the water resources, genetic resources, fisheries and environmental management.
- Honed communications and research skills, including, writing, presentations, and designing workshops and forums.
- Computer knowledge in database management and analytic tools.

Education

- **Doctor of Philosophy in *Resource Management*** candidate (2003-present), University of British Columbia
- **Masters of Science in *Environmental and Natural Resource Policy*** (1990-1992), International Institute for Hydraulic and Environmental Engineering, Delft, The Netherlands.
- **Bachelor of Applied Science in *Geophysics***(1983-1988), University of Waterloo, Ontario.

Languages
English, French, Spanish, Portuguese (working knowledge)

Summary of Professional Experience
Associate, Compass Resource Management Ltd., 2007-present
Associate, EcoPlan International Decision, 2004-2007
Water Specialist and Project Coordination, Médecins Sans Frontières 2001-2003
Policy Analyst and dispute resolution, Apodaca Associates, 1999-2000
Research Fellow, Faculty of Law, UBC, 1993-1995
Hydro-geologist, Piteau Associates, 1990

Selected Recent Consulting Assignments
Metro Vancouver – Water Use Plan , (2008)
Client and Partner Organization: **Metro Vancouver**
Lead consultant: Responsible for developing a programme to promote conduct a water use management plan for the Capilano and Seymour reservoirs and balance drinking water and residential use, with power considerations, recreational uses and fisheries concerns.

Aquifer Management – Water Use Planning, (2008- on going)
Client and Partner Organization: **City of Merritt and Ministry of Environment**
Lead consultant: Responsible for developing a multi-objective water use plan for aquifer use in the arid region of British Columbia. This three year initiative involves many different stakeholders and user groups and is only the second such planning initiative in BC.

Terminal Evaluation of Iullemenden Aquifer System, (2008)
Client and Partner Organization: **UNEP/ GEF**
Lead consultant: Responsible for terminal evaluation of the IAS system. Included travel to Tunisia, Niger, Nigeria, and Mali.

Collaborative Stewardship – Fish and Wildlife, (2008)
Client and Partner Organization: **Ktunaxa First Nation Land Resource Agency**
Lead consultant: Responsible for developing a programme to promote collaborative stewardship of fish and wildlife between the Ktunaxa and the Province of BC, and the Government of Canada. Literature, interviews and facilitated workshops and meetings were undertaken in conducting the project.

Aquifer Management – Torreon, Mexico, (2008)
Client and Partner Organization: **UN Habitat and SEDASOL**
Lead consultant: Responsible for developing and delivering a stakeholder process for highlighting action areas in the management of a near surface aquifer accessed by the municipalities of Torreon, Gomez Palacio, Laredo, and Matamoros, with a combined population of 1million people.

British Columbia – Alberta Transboundary Waters (2007-present)
Client and Partner Organization: **BC Ministry of Environment**
Consultant: Assisting the facilitation of a dialogue group at the provincial level with respect to managing transboundary waters between British Columbia and Alberta. All aspects of transboundary surface and ground-waters are being evaluated and discussed with respect to cooperation in management of water quality, quantity, and ecological integrity. Key elements involve research and analysis of technical problems and their administrative solutions.

Structured Decisions for Rural Care in BC - (2007-present)
Client and Partner Organization:**Northern Health**
Associate Consultant: Constructed a decision tool for Northern Health to determine care level and strategic options for maternity care in northern BC. The work involved interviews with different stakeholders including, care-givers, local community members, First Nations, Northern Health administration. The objective of the decision tool was to assist management in making complex decisions regarding the level of health care that can be provided in rural British Columbia.

Water Service Strategies for Medium sized Cities – Egypt - (2007)
Client and Partner Organization:**UN Development Programme**
Lead consultant: Primary consultant assisting local Egyptian teams to analyse and determine strategies for water services and local economic development in medium sized cities in Egypt. As water is a key element to development success in Egypt, the project involved training local teams in the field to conduct a participatory process for determining strategies for water provision in relations to local economic development. Over four years, the project is to develop development programs for 40 medium sized cities.

Nile Basin Information Exchange Agreement – Regional - (2007)
Client and Partner Organization:**World Bank**
Project Consultant: Responsible for resource analysis component in developing a 'road map' for initiating an information exchange agreement among the ten riparian countries of the Nile Basin. Work involved policy analysis as well technical hydrological data to develop a needs assessment and protocol for information exchange. The project in landmark, in that it is the first time in over 15 years of effort that the countries have agreed to move forward on a legal agreement.

Central Asian Water and Energy Commission – Regional - (2007)
Client and Partner Organization:**World Bank**
Project Consultant: Responsible for reviewing regional water and energy conditions and developing a strategy for conflict avoidance through institutional arrangements, namely the establishment of a Central Asian Water and Energy Commission.

Strategic Planning for Resource and Economic Development – Veracruz, Mexico – (2006-2007)
Client and Partner Organization: **UN Habitat / Estado de Veracruz**
Lead consultant, designer and facilitator for participative processes for municipal strategies for planning in Xalapa, Pozo Rico, Veracruz, Cordoba-Orizaba, and Coatzacualcos in Veracruz State, Mexico. Key responsibilities were designing hig- level stakeholder engagement processes incorporating decision analysis techniques for prioritisation of actions with respect to water supply and sanitation, municipal waste, and demand-management energy issues.

Nile Basin Negotiation and Decision-Making – Burundi – (2006)
Client and Partner Organization: UN Food and Agriculture Organisation.
Consultant in designing and delivering training workshops for forty negotiators and diplomats in the Nile Basin regarding decision-making for cooperative use of water resources. Key elements of the project were developing simulation tools to 'replicate' primary interests of basin states and conduct exercises to employ structured decision making techniques and analytical tools.

City Strategic Economic Development Planning (Strategy Planning and Local Economic and Resource

Development,). 2004 to 2008
Lead Consultant*:* Developed and implemented public participation strategies and training for developing programs stimulating local socio-economic development. Programs involved strategic planning, participatory approaches, decision-making and action prioritization, institutional and governance analysis. Programs were primarily focused on poverty alleviation actions incorporating environmental, social and economic determinants. Strategic policies included water resource, waste policies, energy assessment, green space conservation, municipal services, economic incentive creation, public-private partnerships, developing economic enabling environments, governance and institutional reform, amongst others. Municipalities included:

- **Matamoros, Mexcio** - UN-HABITAT Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (Brazil) and SEDSOL.
- **San Jose, Costa Rica** – Municipality of San Jose and UN-HABITAT Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (Brazil)
- **Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania**, Municipality of Dar Es Salaam and Sustainable Cities Initiative, Industry Canada
- **Valparaiso and Vina del Mar. Chile** - SERCOTEC and Sustainable Cities Initiative, Industry Canada
- **Iloilo, Philippines,** - . Municipality of Iloilo and the Canadian Urban Institute

Multi-City Strategic Planning Conference for LED (LED**,** Strategy Planning, Decision Making)
Quito, Ecuador 2005
Client and Partner Organization: UN-HABITAT, GTZ
Lead Consultant*:* Working with UN-HABITAT to deliver a three-day training event to on strategic planning for LED, including decision analysis and stakeholder engagement. Over 30 municipal officials from 7 different countries participated in the event in conjunction with a larger regional conference on LED and Latin America.
Socio-economic and Environmental Impact for Information Systems (Facilitation, Impact Assessment, and Project Planning)
Honduras 2004
Client and Partner Organization: Radarsat International, McDonald Detweiler, CIDA.
Project Consultant*:* Working with local partners, conducted a socio-economic and environmental impact assessment of a proposed integrated information system as part of a World Bank project to facilitate access to land information and tools to assist planning.

Publications (selected)

- Hearns, G (2007)Mahakali Treaty: Looking through a new lens at water resource development, in F. Rotberg and A. Swain (eds) *Natural Resources Security in South Asia: Nepal's Water*, Institute for Security and Development Policy, University of Uppsala, Sweden (October, 2007)
- Hearns, G (2003) 'Monsters of the Forest: Fighting Ebola in the Congo', Médecins Sans Frontières Dispatches, Spring.
- Hearns, G. (1999) 'Genetic Resources: Law and Morality' in Proceedings of SOS AMAZONAS Symposium, FUNDES**;** Tomas Cipriano de Mosquera, Bogota November 16-20, 1999.
- Hearns, G. (2000) 'Intangible Fences: Intellectual Property Rights over Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture', in C. Schofield et al. (ed) *Permeable Borders and Boundaries in a Globalising World: New Opportunities or Old Problems?* International Environmental Law and Policy Series, Graham & Trotman/Martinus Nijhoff.
- Hearns, G. (1998) 'Collective Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment: Experiences from the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas' in *Maritime Co-operation in the Asia Pacific*, AUS-CSCAP.
- Hearns, G. (1997) 'Transboundary Protected Area Coordination: Experiences in Central America and Opportunities in the South China Sea.' in G. Blake *et al.* (ed.) *International Boundaries & Environmental Security: Frameworks for Regional Co-operation*, International Environmental Law and Policy Series, Graham & Trotman/Martinus Nijhoff.
- Hearns, G. and Stormont, W. (1996). Managing Potential Conflicts in the South China Sea, *Marine Policy,* Vol. 20. No. 2. pp. 177-181.
- Hearns, G. and Tyedmers, P. (1995). Poseidon's Trident: Biological Diversity Preservation, Resource Conservation and Conflict Avoidance in the South Chins Sea, in G. Blake *et al*. (ed.) *The Peaceful Management of Transboundary Resources*, International Environmental Law and Policy Series, Graham & Trotman/Martinus Nijhoff.

XIV. Annex I: Terms of Reference for Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of UNEP GEF Project
"Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America (Delta America) - GF/1020-03-01 (4264)

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The project, "Development and Implementation of Mechanisms to Disseminate Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean", aimed to promote South-to-South learning, develop and implement mechanisms to disseminate the lessons learned in GEF International Waters-related (GEF-IW) projects in Latin America and the Caribbean, and improve capacity to integrate land and water resource management. This Medium Size Project served as a demonstration project using Latin America and the Caribbean region to illustrate how systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned, and best practices could improve integrated water resources management. Specifically, the project was to strengthen and improve mechanisms for the dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects and other experiences in integrated land and water resources management within the Latin America and Caribbean region.
Brazil, co-chair of IWRN and former host country for Dialogue IV, was well positioned to host a regional discussion of information dissemination and exchange with respect to GEF-IW projects. Brazil was involved in the execution of four GEF-IW projects—in the Sao Francisco, Upper Paraguay, Putumayo river basins and Guarani Aquifer—and, hence, had first hand knowledge of the nature and conduct of GEF-IW projects in the region. As these projects, as well as the other GEF-IW projects in the region, had achieved a level of maturity where information sharing would have been useful and beneficial to each of the projects, IWRN provided a unique opportunity for the conduct of discussions designed to facilitate such information sharing. Such discussions would not only have benefitted existing GEF-IW projects in the region but also lead to the establishment of a sustainable mechanism for consultation and co-operation in the fields of watershed management and information technology.
This project, based upon GEF-IW OP 10, specifically addressed the short-term objectives of "dissemination of lessons learned from ongoing projects, and sharing of learning experiences and best management practices, within groups of countries co-operating on transboundary water projects." It aimed to catalyse a process that could be replicated through the IW:LEARN project and related initiatives of UNEP and the GEF, using Latin America and the Caribbean as a privileged site within which to develop the necessary approaches, mechanisms, and infrastructure.

Relevance to GEF Programmes

The Project is in line with GEF-IW OP # 10, which specifically addresses the short-term objective of "dissemination of lessons learned from ongoing Projects and sharing of learning experiences and best management practices, within groups of countries co-operating on transboundary water Projects." This is achieved through establishment of a process that can be replicated through the IW:LEARN Project and related initiatives of UNEP (IW Best Practices Database) and the GEF, using Latin America and the Caribbean as a privileged site within which to develop the necessary approaches, mechanisms, and infrastructure.

With at least eight active GEF International Waters (GEF-IW) projects being executed in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Annex I), this project is a timely and useful complement to existing water management programs in the region. The dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW and other relevant water resources management Projects in the region, through an efficient information network, will contribute to enhancing capacity of water authority and river-basin organisation staffs in improving and implementing water resources management practices in the region.

Executing Arrangements

OAS was the Executing Agency and was to manage the funds provided to the project by UNEP, on behalf of GEF, consistent with UNEP and OAS budgetary and financial rules. The project was directed by a Project Steering Committee composed of seven members representing the Brazilian Agency for International Co-

operation, Secretariat of Water Resources, National Water Agency, UNEP, the General Secretariat of the OAS, the IWRN Secretariat, and the IW: LEARN project. For cost effectiveness, Brazil acted on behalf of the other LAC countries. The other GEF Implementing Agencies, participated in an ex-officio capacity.

A virtual technical committee was established with each participating country nominating a technical focal point as its national IWRN focal point. The project maintained a physical presence in Brazil, wherefrom all coordination activities were implemented under a Technical Co-ordinator, contracted with project funds.

The activities were executed by regional, sub-regional and local agencies of the countries where GEF-IW projects were under execution, as well as NGOs. The IWRN and the OAS supervised the coordination of the field activities, as directed by the Steering Committee, through co-ordinators appointed from their staff. The participation of civil society organisations was a very vital element of this project and was to be ensured through website connections, technical meetings, seminars, and workshops at different levels.

Project Activities

The project duration was initially from March 2003 to December 2005 but later extended to June 2009. The activities proposed in this project were identified through a consultative process conducted within Latin America and Caribbean and, are organised under project components. These activities addressed identified needs related to information on water management, and take advantage of the opportunities for discussion provided by Dialogue IV, the GEF IW-LAC project managers' forum as well as at the Water for the Americas meeting.

The project was a follow-up to GEF-IW-LAC e-forum (July and August 2001), prior to a complementary 2-day face to face meeting at the margins of DIALOGUE IV (September 2001) where over 30 GEF-IW project managers and technical co-ordinators in the LAC region expressed their interest in sharing best practices and lessons learned in water resources management.

Component 1 - Foster dialogue amongst GEF-IW and other related water resource management projects in LAC establishing a mechanism to share recent accomplishments, experiences from the planning and management of IW projects, lessons learned, and best practices.
The objective of this Component was to facilitate communication amongst and between GEF-IW project managers in order to address common concerns, but also to develop a mechanism whereby they could meet with government officials, local authorities, and other stakeholders to discuss the strategies for incorporating lessons learned in water resources management practices and policies. Five activities comprised this Component:

- Special sub-regional meetings, as a follow-up to Dialogue IV meeting (Brazil - September 2001), continued through Virtual Fora, integrated into a refined Inter-American Water Resources Network (IWRN).
- The IWRN redesigned as a more user-friendly network to enhance information exchange amongst water resources authorities and river basin authorities in the region. These actions were to make the IWRN a fast and reliable communications tool with a much broader range. Smaller communities, river basin authorities serving smaller river basins, and identified stakeholders to easily access water resources information.
- Virtual Fora established in the first instance to initiate this process, building upon the results of Dialogue IV. The Fora utilised, as appropriate, to obtain information on specific discussion points, leading to the formation of thematic centres of excellence and to provide a mechanism to refine and enhance the role of the IWRN. GEF-IW projects managers, IWRN focal points, river basin organisations, national water authorities; together with a variety of selected water stakeholders in LAC were to form the audience of such e-fora.
- As a result of both the face to face meetings and the Virtual Fora, a comprehensive document/brochure and CD in the four OAS languages outlining water resources practices and lessons learned in the Americas, prepared and disseminated *inter alia* at the Third World Water Forum and related meetings.
- In order to further foster lessons learned, best practices and knowledge sharing, project encountering similar environments were to be twinned (e.g. The Sao Francisco and the San Juan projects, Bermejo and Maritime Front projects).

Component 2 - Foster the inclusion of lessons learned and best practices into water resources management practices.
The objective of this Component was to develop a framework within which the experience acquired during the execution of GEF-IW projects could be shared and disseminated so as to minimise problems and issues of concern through improved communication and information-sharing. The outcome of this Component was shared

experiences and inclusion of lessons learned into routine water management practices in the region. Two activities comprised this Component:

- Specific guidelines for inclusion of best practices and lessons learned into policies and regulations developed and utilised in the formulation of new water resources management activities. The guidelines were to be developed in close consultation with IW:LEARN and specifically with the Best Practices Database component implemented by UNEP.
- Three regional training workshops were to be conducted with a view to promoting the inclusion of lessons learned and best practices in the formulation of new activities.

Component 3- Strengthening of the IWRN as the principal hemispheric communication tool for integrated water resources management.

The objective of this Component was to develop specific processes for sharing and disseminating experiences and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects in Latin America and the Caribbean. The expected output of this Component included Internet as well as other media, refined for future use, with appropriate linkages to other networks and information systems and a sustainable financial and knowledge base. A strengthened and actively used IWRN, capable of meeting the needs of the stakeholder community, was to be the principal result of this Component. The Component comprised of six activities:

- A framework developed within which a strategic programme to strengthen the IWRN as a hemispheric communication tool for integrated land and water resources management would be identified.
- The IWRN web site redesigned as an interactive metadata site, ensuring information exchange rather than just information dissemination, using protocols for searching, accessing and acquiring information and data, enhancing its dialogue function.
- Sub-regional nodes established and equipped within Brazil and possibly as well within the potentially selected Thematic Centers of Excellence, as pilot sites, to test the refined IWRN website and related communications tools.
- A workshop to assess the needs for training and equipping of water resources professionals and NGOs convened within Brazil, a result of which would be the development and implementation of a programme of training where needed to promote access to, and use of, the IWRN by water resources professionals and NGOs.
- Assistance provided to the countries of Latin American and the Caribbean in securing financing for the establishment of up to five IWRN sub-regional nodes within the Americas. Each of the nodes was to be selected according to its specific area of expertise and developed into Centres of Excellence based upon a specific area of emphasis.
- Linkages between IWRN and other regional and sub-regional networks (e.g. SIDSNet, LANBO) involved in water resources management identified and established. Specific links to IW:LEARN established as this project was acting as a pilot site for IW:LEARN in general and specifically for its Best Practices Database component implemented by UNEP.

Component 4 - Involve civil society according to principles set forth in the Inter-American Strategy for Public Participation in Environmental Decision-Making (ISP).

The objective of this Component was to facilitate access to the IWRN by civil society, as a specific stakeholder within the region, pursuant to the principals of the ISP. The expected outputs included a meeting of IWRN focal points leading to the formulation of a strategy for the inclusion of the ISP principals within the information dissemination process. The results of this Component were to be enhanced participation by civil society in water resources management and decision-making. Two activities comprised this Component:

- A special meeting of GEF-IW and other water resources management project managers and ISP focal points convened to facilitate the inclusion of the principles of the ISP in water resources management projects, and help to reduce misunderstandings and conflicts through proper consultation with the civil society.
- Five sub-regional and/or national (one in each of the sub-regions of the Americas) nodes through which civil society could access the IWRN established in order to test the principals of ISP within the IWRN framework.

Component 5 - Monitoring and Evaluation

The objective of this Component is to ensure the implementation of the project and the achievement of its intended outcomes through a process of identifying and monitoring project progress, not only in terms of financial disbursements but also in terms of information distributed and knowledge transferred between GEF-IW projects and other projects in the region. The output will include regular monitoring reports. The results of this

Component will be increased dissemination and utilisation of information throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. This Component is comprised of one activity:

- In addition to the monitoring and evaluation activities exercised by the GEF Implementing Agency, and in addition to the day-to-day monitoring of activities by the OAS as the Executing Agency, UNEP in consultation with the OAS will co-ordinate a mid-term and final evaluation of the project.

Budget

GEF:	US $ 972,000
Co-financing:	US $ 470,000 (US $ 170,000 in cash and US $ 280,000 in-kind)
	US $ 100,000 (OAS, in-kind)
	US $ 95,000 (UNEP, in-kind)
Total:	**US $ 1,637,000**

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

- To what extent did the project promote South-to-South learning, develop and implement mechanisms to disseminate the lessons learned in GEF International Waters-related (GEF-IW) projects in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- To what extent did the project serve to illustrate how systematic exchange of project experiences, lessons learned, and best practices can improve integrated land and water resources management?
- How did the project strengthen and improve mechanisms for the dissemination of information and lessons learned from GEF-IW projects and other experiences in integrated land and water resources management within the Latin America and Caribbean region?
- What mechanisms are in place to ensure stakeholder ownership and sustainability of the benefits of the project activities and associated technical support?

2. Methods

This terminal evaluation (TE) will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/GEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/Evaluation Office and the UNEP/GEF Project Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the evaluation in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

2. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
   (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and relevant correspondence.
   (b) Review of specific products including the 'experience and guidance' publication, final reports from country executing agencies.
   (c) Notes from the Project Steering Committee meetings.
   (d) Relevant material published on web-sites maintained by GEF *www.thegef.org* and UNEP maintained website www.unep.org/eou

3. Interviews with project management and technical support (such as the UNEP-GEF Project Manager, Country Coordinators and members of the Steering Committee).

4. Face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an e-mail questionnaire.

5. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations by e-mail or through telephone communication.

6. Interviews with the UNEP/ project manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with International Waters related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant UNEP staff.

7. Field visits to Brazil, and focal points of selected LAC countries and Washington DC.

3. Key Evaluation principles

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions ***"what happened?***" and ***"what would have happened anyway?"*** These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition, it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes

and impacts to the actions of the project **or determine the contribution** of the project to the outcomes and impacts**.**

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases, this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance

4. Project Ratings

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:[80]

It should be noted that many of the evaluation parameters are interrelated. For example, the 'achievement of objectives and planned results' is closely linked to the issue of 'sustainability'. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts and is, in turn, linked to the issues of 'catalytic effects / replication' and, often, 'country ownership' and 'stakeholder participation'.

5. Evaluation parameters

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness:* Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the "achievement indicators". The analysis of outcomes achieved should include, *inter alia*, an assessment of the extent to which the project has directly or indirectly assisted policy and decision-makers to apply information supplied by the IWRN in their national planning and decision-making. In particular:
  - Evaluate the immediate impact of the project on the integrated transboundary water resources management in Latin America and the Caribbean and on national planning and decision-making and international understanding of land and water integrated management issues.
  - As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place 5 years after initial completion date of the project. Frame recommendations to enhance future project impact. UNEP's Evaluation Office advocates the use of the **Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI)** method (described in Annex 6) to establish this rating.
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational programme strategies? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the International Waters programme and the wider portfolio of the GEF.
- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Did the project build on earlier initiatives, did it make effective use of available scientific and /or technical information. Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

B. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that have contributed or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ended. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. **Application of the ROtI method** described in Annex 6 will also assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance. The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

[80] However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

- *Financial resources.* Are there any financial risks that have jeopardized sustenance of project outcomes? To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? Resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes
- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The Terminal Evaluation should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes. Would these risks apply in other contexts where the project may be replicated?

C. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries
- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national level.

D. Catalytic Role

The catalytic role of the GEF is embodied in its approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment, investing in activities which are innovative and show how new approaches and market changes can work, and supporting activities that upscale new approaches to a national (or regional) level to sustainably achieve global environmental benefits.

In general this catalytic approach can be separated into three broad categories of GEF activities: (1) "**foundational**" and enabling activities, focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity (2) **demonstration** activities, which focus on demonstration, capacity development, innovation, and market barrier removal; and (3) **investment** activities, full-size Projects with high rates of co-funding, catalyzing investments or implementing a new strategic approach at the national level.

In this context the evaluation should assess the catalytic role played by this Project by consideration of the following questions:

– INCENTIVES: To what extent have the Project activities provided incentives (socio-economic / market based) to

The three categories approach combines all the elements that have been shown to catalyze results in international cooperation. Evaluations in the bilateral and multilateral aid community have shown time and again that activities at the micro level of skills transfer—piloting new technologies and demonstrating new approaches—will fail if these activities are not supported at the institutional or market level as well. Evaluations have also consistently shown that institutional capacity development or market interventions on a larger scale will fail if governmental laws, regulatory frameworks, and policies are not in place to support and sustain these improvements. And they show that demonstration, innovation and market barrier removal do not work if there is no follow up through investment or scaling up of financial means

contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholder behaviours?

– INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the Project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?

– POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have Project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?

– CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the Project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different from co-financing)

– PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the Project would not have achieved results)?

(Note: the ROtI analysis should contribute useful information to address these questions)

What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Specifically:
If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

E. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems.

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in *Annex 5* to this Appendix). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

M&E during project implementation

- *M&E design.* Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- *M&E plan implementation.* A Terminal Evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logframe or similar); annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.
- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

F. Preparation and Readiness

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

G. Country ownership / driven-ness:

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating biodiversity information that

catalyzed action in participating countries to improve decisions relating to the management of water resources.

- Assess the level of country commitment to the use of the information generated by IWRN for decision-making during and after the project, including in regional and international fora.

H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

I. Financial Planning

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNEP/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project **(table attached in *Annex 2* Co-financing and leveraged resources).**

J. Implementation approach:

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Committee; (2) day to day project management in each of the country executing agencies and OAS.

K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

The purpose of supervision is to work with the executing agency in identifying and dealing with problems which arise during implementation of the project itself. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/substantive issues in which UNEP has a major contribution to make. The evaluator should assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF including:

- the adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes;
- the emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);

- the realism/candor of project reporting and rating (i.e. are PIR ratings an accurate reflection of the project realities and risks);
- the quality of documentation of project supervision activities; and
- financial, administrative and other fiduciary aspects of project implementation supervision.

In summary, accountability and implementation support through technical assistance and problem solving are the main elements of project supervision (Annex 4).

L. Complementarity with UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work

UNEP aims to undertake implementation of GEF funded projects that are aligned with its strategy. Whilst the Complementarity between UNEP's GEF projects and the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS)[81] /Programme of Work (POW) will not be formally rated, the evaluation should present a brief narrative to cover the following issues:

Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments. The UNEP Medium Term Strategy specifies desired results in six thematic focal areas. The desired results are termed Expected Accomplishments. Using the completed ROtl analysis, the evaluation should comment on whether the project makes a tangible contribution to any of the Expected Accomplishments specified in the UNEP MTS. The magnitude and extent any contributions and the casual linkages should be fully described.

Project contributions that are in-line with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP)[82]. The outcomes and achievements of the project should be briefly discussed in relation to the objectives of the UNEP BSP.

South-South Cooperation is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries. Briefly describe any aspects of the project that could be considered as examples of South-South Cooperation.

The ***ratings will be presented in the form of a table***. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS = Highly Satisfactory
S = Satisfactory
MS = Moderately Satisfactory
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory

6. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. ***The ratings will be presented in the format of a table***with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.
Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

iii) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
iv) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006,

[81] http://www.unep.org/PDF/FinalMTSGCSS-X8.pdf
[82] http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf

requires that a Terminal Evaluation (TE) report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.

v) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;

vi) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A − K above).

vii) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see *Annex 1* to this Appendix);

viii) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:

- Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
- State or imply some prescriptive action;
- Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)

ix) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

x) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
5. Details of the Project's 'impact pathways' and the 'ROtI' analysis
6. The expertise of the evaluation team. (brief CV).

Terminal Evaluation reports will also include any response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP/Evaluation Office.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports shall be submitted to the Chief of Evaluation, UNEP. The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations. UNEP/Evaluation Office collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

7. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief,
UNEP Evaluation Office
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +(254-20)762-3387
Fax: +(254-20)762-3158
Email: Segbedzi.Norgbey@unep.org

The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the following individuals:

Maryam Niamir-Fuller,
Director
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +(254-20)762-4166
Fax: +(254-20)762-4041/2
Email: Maryam.Niamir-Fuller@unep.org

Isabelle Vanderbeck
Task Manager GEF Projects in Latin America and the Caribbean
1889 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Room 723
Tel: +1-202-458-3772
Fax: +1-202-458-3560
Email: isabelle.vanderbeck@unep.orgor UNEPRep@oas.org

The final evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation Office's web-site www.unep.org/eou.

8. Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation Office, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on **22nd March 2010 and end on 6th June 2010 (29 days** spread **over 11 weeks** (12 days of travel, to Brazil,Argentina and Washington, 7 days desk study and 10 days of report writing). The evaluator will submit a draft report on **17th May 2010** to UNEP/Evaluation Office. The Chief of Evaluation Office will share the draft report with the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / Evaluation Office for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by **31st May 2010** after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than **6th June 2010.**

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with Evaluation Office and UNEP/GEF, conduct initial desk review work and later travel to Washington to meet with the GEF Task manager at the beginning of the evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluator is expected to travel to Brazil to meet with representatives of the project executing agencies and the intended users of project's outputs before visiting other project nodes in Latin America and the Caribbean.

In accordance with UNEP policy, all UNEP projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the Evaluation Office. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office, UNEP. S/he should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project and should have the following qualifications:

At least Masters degree (or its equivalent); experience in transboundary waters management or conservation with a sound understanding of international waters issues; experience in management and implementation of donor funded projects (especially projects that enhance learning and information sharing for policy influence and

decision-making); and experience with evaluation of UNEP/GEF Projects. Knowledge of Latin America and the Caribbean region is an advantage. Fluency in oral and written English and Spanish is a must.

9. Schedule Of Payment

Lump-sum option
The evaluator will receive an initial payment of equivalent to the lump sum travel upon signing of the contract, 40% of the SSA fee upon submission of draft report and final payment of 60% upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.
In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

Annexes of the TORs can be obtained on request from the UNEP Evaluation Office