Final Report

SOIL AND WATER

670 40 162

July 4, 2004

Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project

RER/01/G32

Danube Regional Project: Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin

JAAKKO PÖYRY INFRA
Soil and Water

PREFACE

This report provides a mid-term evaluation of the UNDP/GEF funded Danube Regional Project. The report is delivered in compliance with the Terms of Reference developed by UNOPS, who are tasked with managing the DRP on behalf of UNDP. The evaluation is based upon collected reference materials from the project, as well as a series of interviews carried out during an evaluation mission to the region, during April 13–26 2004. The conclusions and recommendations set out in the following pages are solely those of the evaluators and are not binding upon the project management & sponsors.

Contacts:

Alan Fox & Antti Rautavaara
Soil and Water Ltd.
P.O.Box 50 (Jaakonkatu 3)
FIN-01621 Vantaa
Finland
Domicile Helsinki, Finland
Business ID. 0196118-8
Tel. +358 9 682 661
Fax +358 9 682 6600
E-mail: sw@poyry.fi
soilandwater.poyry.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation 7
1.2 Key issues Addressed 7
1.3 Methodology of the Evaluation 7

2 THE DRP AND IT'S DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT 9

2.1 Project Start and its Duration 9
2.2 Problems that the Project Seeks to Address 9
2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project 10
2.4 Main Stakeholders 10
2.5 Expected Results 11

3 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 13

3.1 Project formulation 13
3.1.1 Relevance of the project design within the framework of GEF guidelines and global concerns 13
3.1.2 Appropriateness of the concept and design 13
3.1.3 Contribution of the project to the overall development objective 14
3.2 Implementation approach 15
3.2.1 Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) 15
3.2.2 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation 15
3.2.3 Country ownership/Driveness 15
3.2.4 Stakeholder participation 16
3.2.5 Replication approach 16
3.2.6 Cost-effectiveness 16
3.2.7 UNDP comparative advantage 16
3.2.8 Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector 17
3.2.9 Management arrangements 17
3.3 Implementation 18
3.3.1 The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool 18
3.3.2 Effective partnership arrangements established with relevant stakeholders 19
3.3.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management 19
3.3.4 Financial Planning 20
3.3.5 Monitoring and evaluation 20
3.3.6 Execution and implementation modalities 21
3.3.7 Management by the UNDP country office 21
3.3.8 Coordination and operational issues 21
3.4 Results 22
3.4.1 Attainment of objectives 22
3.4.2 Sustainability 23
3.4.3 The likely sustainability of project interventions 23
3.4.4 Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff 24

4 RECOMMENDATIONS 31

4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project 31
4.2 Comments and recommendations on the current proposed activities for project Phase II 31
4.3 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project 34
4.4 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives 34

5 LESSONS LEARNED 35

5.1 Best /worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success 36

ANNEXES

Annex 1 – TOR for Mid-Term Evaluation

Annex 2 – Mission Itinerary

Annex 3 – List of Persons Interviewed

Annex 4 – List of Documents Reviewed

Annex 5 – Overview of Results of DRP Phase 1

Executive Summary

The full title of the evaluated UNDP-GEF funded and UNOPS executed project is the Danube Regional Project: Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin. The project is known as the Danube Regional Project (DRP).

The overall objective of the DRP is to reduce nutrient loadings into the Danube River and its tributaries, in order to improve water quality in the Danube, and in the Black Sea. The DRP is designed to complement the activities of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), an international commission established through the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC), providing a regional approach to the development of national policies and legislation and the definition of priority actions for nutrient reduction and pollution control with particular attention to achieving sustainable transboundary ecological effects within the Danube River Basin (DRB) and the Black Sea area.

This Mid-Term Evaluation Report (MTE report) constitutes the combined outcome of a literature review and evaluation mission, including a series of interviews with stakeholders, carried out in April 2004. The evaluation team interviewed selected stakeholders in Vienna (Austria), Budapest (Hungary), Belgrade (Serbia-Montenegro) and Sofia (Bulgaria). These four countries out of the thirteen signatory countries to the DRPC were selected as representative of regional diversity, providing an EU member state, a soon to be EU member, an accession country and one country not currently in the EU accession pipeline. This delineation of countries vis-à-vis EU membership has direct relevance as implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) across the Danube River Basin has become one of the driving forces for regional cooperation.

At this juncture in the project cycle, with the 2nd phase already underway based upon an approved project document, the evaluation is not intended to serve as a gatekeeper for continuation of the project. Rather, the objective is to assess the status of project management and implementation, to make recommendations for consideration during the 2nd phase, to derive lessons learnt from the effort, and to consider the sustainability of project interventions after the DRP has concluded.

The main conclusion gleaned from the evaluation effort is that the project is being managed very well, and is providing valuable assistance to the ICPDR and the Danube River Basin (DRB) participating countries. The key challenge for the DRP team during the 2nd phase will be to ensure that the project's monitoring, awareness raising, and capacity building efforts translate into real and lasting environmental improvements.

GLOSSARY

ECO/EG	Ecology Expert Group
APC/EG	Accident Prevention and Control Expert Group
APR	Annual Project/Program Report
AQA	Analytical Quality Assurance
AQC	Analytical Quality Control
BAP	Best Agricultural Practices
BAT	Best Available Technology
BEP	Best Environmental Practices
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
BSP	Black Sea Program
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
DANUBIS	Danube Information System
DBAM	Danube Basin Alarm Model
DEF	Danube Environmental Forum
DPRP	Danube Pollution Reduction Program
DRB	Danube River Basin
DRP	Danube Regional Project
DRPC	Danube River Protection Convention
DWQM	Danube Water Quality Model
EC	European Commission
EMIS/EG	Emission Expert Group
EPDRB	Environmental Program for the Danube River Basin
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographical Information System
HELCOM	Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission)
HoD	Head of Delegation
ICPBS	International Commission for the Protection of the Black Sea
ICPDR	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River
IFI	International Financing Institution
IPPC	Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive
IW	International Waters
JAP	Joint Action Program
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MLIM/EG	Monitoring Laboratory and Information Management Expert Group
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE Report	Mid-Term Evaluation Report
NGOs	Non Government Organizations
OP8	Operational Program 8
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PRP	Pollution Reduction Program
RBM	River Basin Management
RBM/EG	River Basin Management Expert Group
REC	Regional Environmental Center
S/EG	Strategic Expert Group
SAP	Strategic Action Plan
SAPARD	Special Accession Program for Agriculture and Rural Development
TDA	Transboundary Diagnosis Analysis
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USD	United States Dollar
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose and objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Danube Regional project (DRP) is to enable the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), the government bodies of 13 participating countries and EC, UNDP-GEF and UNOPS to assess the project progress and to take decisions on the future orientation and emphasis of the project during its remaining three year implementation period, to be completed by the end of 2006.

1.2 Key issues Addressed

The evaluation is an activity in the project cycle that attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The achievements of the DRP are assessed against objectives, including a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and project design.

Based on discussions with the stakeholders and literature review, special attention has been given to:

- Relevance of the project activities, and outputs, with respect to the overall objective of reducing nutrient loading and controlling industrial pollution sources
- Mechanisms under development for post-project sustainability
- Extent to which other key stakeholders (e.g. from agriculture, industry, etc.) are engaged in the project implementation process
- Likelihood of DRP reaching 2nd phase numerical targets, and the factors that may impede success
- Changing political circumstances in the region, and the extent to which such changes have and will influence project implementation
- Cooperation and linkage between the two GEF funded projects, DRP and Black Sea Program (BSP)
- Coordination and cooperation amongst overlapping water and sanitation initiatives in the region
- Key lessons learnt for consideration in future GEF International Waters focal area projects

1.3 Methodology of the Evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation of Danube Regional Project was carried out using a two folded methodology (i) literature review and (ii) interviews with stakeholder representatives who are either affiliated to the project as direct beneficiaries or who have or might be expected to be influenced by the DRP.

The evaluators visited four of the Danube states: Austria, Hungary, Serbia & Montenegro and Bulgaria, to interview ICPDR experts, ministry officials, consultants and NGO's. The list of persons interviewed and list of documents reviewed are presented in Annex 3 and Annex 4 respectively. DRP staff in Vienna organized the interviews based on re-

quests by the evaluation team. The interviews were structured taking into account methodological guidance by GEF and UNDP.

The Mid-Term Evaluation team consisted of two international consultants both employed by Finnish consulting and engineering company Soil and Water Ltd, which is part of the Jaakko Pöyry Group. The evaluators, as well as the company and group they represent, have not been involved in any way in the design or implementation of the DRP.

1.4 Structure of the Evaluation

The evaluation has been structured in accordance with UNDP Guidelines for Evaluators. It covers the issues set out in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation, and takes into account the expectations of the UNOPS project manager, Andrew Menz.

The use of stakeholder interviews as the lead vehicle for evaluation has been done recognizing that the DRP is a capacity building and "influencing" project, designed to build stakeholder support for improved river basin management.

At this juncture in the project cycle, with the 2nd phase already underway based upon an approved Project Document, the evaluation is not intended to serve as a gatekeeper for continuation of the project. Rather, the objective is to derive lessons learnt from the 1st phase, which can be applied to the 2nd phase efforts, and to other GEF International Waters focal area projects.

2 THE DRP AND IT'S DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project Start and its Duration

Phase 1 of the Danube Regional Project was commenced as planned in December 2001 and the majority of activities were completed, according to the Project Document, by the end of October 2003. Phase 2 was designed to commence in December 2003 shortly after completion of Phase 1 and span a three-year period until 2006; the expected duration of the DRP thereby totaling 5 years. Due to unexpected delays in the final commenting and approval process of the Project Document for Phase 2, approval for phase 2 funding was still pending during the evaluation.

2.2 Problems that the Project Seeks to Address

The Danube River is the second largest river in Europe (2 780 km) and drains an area of 817 000 km^2. It includes entirely or partly Austria, Germany, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Serbia & Montenegro, Bulgaria, Romania, Moldova and Ukraine. The river discharges into the Black Sea through a delta, which is the second largest natural wetland in Europe. It is also of high social, economical and environmental value and supports drinking water intake, agriculture, industry, fishing, tourism, power generation, navigation, tourism and others.

As indicated in the Project Summary (Phase 1 & 2), "the overall objective of the Danube Regional project is to complement the activities of the ICPDR required to provide a regional approach and global significance to the development of national policies and legislation and the definition of priority actions for nutrient reduction and pollution control with particular attention to achieving sustainable transboundary ecological effects with the DRB and the Black Sea area". Recognizing this overall objective, it can be seen that the problems the project seeks to address relate to pollution loading into the Danube from sources along the river and its tributaries.

The DRP seeks to address the human impacts on the Danube and its tributaries, from agricultural and urban activities. The project objectives have been developed recognizing that pollution remains a serious problem, with the volume of nutrients – mainly from agricultural fertilizers, household projects and urban sewage - still too high. Toxic substances are also a key threat, especially from mining operations. These pollution problems not only affect the ecology of the Danube, and put at risk the drinking water sources for millions of inhabitants; they also place the Black Sea at serious risk – to eutrophication, algal blooms, and contamination. The long history of human settlement in the region has significantly altered the river's natural flow and filtering mechanisms. Some 80% of the Danube's wetlands and floodplains have been lost since the end of the 19th century, threatening bird and fish habitats and compounding the devastation from periodic floods.

Control and reduction of pollutants requires addressing specific "hot spots" as well as establishing an under girding of cooperation, commitment and capacity among key stakeholders at the government, industry and community levels. While the World Bank, the European Union and bilateral supporters have focused on the investment side, it has been the role of the DRP to consider these "softer" but no less crucial aspects of pollution reduction.

2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

Long Term Development Objective

The DRP is designed to contribute to sustainable human development in the Danube River Basin (DRB) through reinforcing the capacities of the participating countries in developing effective mechanisms for regional cooperation and coordination in order to ensure protection of international waters, sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity.

Overall Objective

The DRP is to complement the activities of the ICPDR required to provide a regional approach and global significance to the development of national policies and legislation and the definition of priority actions for nutrient reduction and pollution control with particular attention to achieving sustainable transboundary ecological effects within the DRB and Black Sea area.

The ICPDR is the legally established institutional mechanism for regional environmental cooperation among the 13 riparian states and EC, to manage water resources in the Danube River Basin. Among other activities, the DRP provides financial assistance in support of the ICPDR expert groups. Many of the DRP activities are de facto complementing, sustaining and building continuity to the regional environmental cooperation architecture established.

Specific Objective of Phase 1 (September 2001 – August 2003)

The Project Document for Phase 1 includes preparation and commencement of basin-wide capacity building activities, which are top be consolidated and completed during Phase 2. Altogether 20 project components with 80 activities were to be carried out during Phase 1

The following four project components were designed to respond to the overall development objective:

a) Creation of sustainable ecological conditions for land use and water management;

b) Capacity building and reinforcement of transboundary cooperation for the improvement of water quality and environmental standards in the Danube River Basin;

c) Strengthening of public involvement in environmental decision making and reinforcement of community actions for pollution reduction and protection of ecosystems;

d) Reinforcement of monitoring, evaluation and information systems to control transboundary pollution, and to reduce nutrients and harmful substances.

2.4 Main Stakeholders

There are various stakeholder groups that can be considered within the Danube River Basin

- As the DRP's major objective is to support the ICPDR, the signatory member countries to the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC) and their respective designated ministries participating in the ICPDR are key stakeholders.

- A second segment are the other ministries with direct relevance to ICPDR cooperation, such as ministries of agriculture and research units that are semi-active participants in the regional cooperation process through inter-ministerial cooperation mechanisms established by the participating countries.
- A third segment includes non-governmental organizations, who are actively incorporated into the DRP through such components as: institutional development of NGOs; support for the NGO umbrella organization Danube Environmental Forum (DEF), and the Small Grants Program (SGP).
- A fourth segment are the public at large, whom the DRP seeks to influence through such public information and participation initiatives as the Danube Day initiative, and the magazine Danube Watch.
- A fifth segment of stakeholders are the farmers, fishermen, mine operators, shippers, transportation planners, developers and others whose activities directly impact on the river basin and water quality. The ICPDR and DRP are working towards identifying means and mechanisms to work proactively with private sector entities. The agriculture sector as a whole and individual producers are one of the key stakeholder groups.

2.5 Expected Results

The project document for Phase 1 sets out a series of objectives and expected outputs. These are as follows:

Objective	Output
1. The Creation of Sustainable Ecological Conditions for Land Use and Water Management	1.1 Development and implementation of policy guidelines for river basin and water resources management 1.2 & 1.3 Policies for the control of agricultural point and non-point sources of pollution and pilot projects on agricultural pollution reduction. 1.4 Policy development for wetlands rehabilitation under the aspect of appropriate land use 1.5 Industrial reform and development of policies and legislation for the application of BAT (best available techniques, including cleaner technologies) towards reduction of nutrients (N and P) and dangerous substances 1.6 & 1.7 Assessments and development of water and wastewater tariffs and effluent charges – focused on nutrient reduction and control of dangerous substances
2. Capacity building and reinforcement of transboundary cooperation for the improvement of water quality and environmental standards in the DRB	2.1 Inter-ministerial coordinating mechanisms for nutrient reduction and pollution control 2.2 Operational tools for monitoring, laboratory and information management with particular attention to nutrients and toxic substances 2.3 Improvement of procedures and tools for accidental emergency response with particular attention to transboundary emergency situations 2.4 Support for reinforcement of the ICPDR information system (DANUBIS) 2.5 Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding between the ICPDR and the BSC relating to the discharge of nutrients and hazardous substances to the Black Sea 2.6 Training and consultation workshops for resource management and pollution control with attention to nutrient reduction and transboundary issues

Objective	Output
3: Strengthening of public involvement in environmental decision making and reinforcement of community actions for pollution reduction and protection of ecosystems	3.1 Support for institutional development of NGOs and community involvement 3.2 Applied awareness raising through community-based Small Grants Program 3.3 Organization of public awareness-raising campaigns on nutrient reduction and control of toxic substances
Objective 4: Reinforcement of monitoring, evaluation and information systems to control transboundary pollution, and to reduce nutrients and harmful substances	4.1 Development of indicators for project monitoring and impact evaluation 4.3 Monitoring and assessment of nutrient removal capacities of riverine wetlands 4.4 Danube Basin study on pollution trading and corresponding economic instruments for nutrient reduction

The logical framework for Phase 1 includes verifiable indicators for each project objective and output. The Annual Project Review (APR) for 2003 indicates that all expected objectives and outputs for Phase 1 will have been met prior to the start of Phase 2.

For phase 2, the verifiable indicators have been refined to include numerical goals for the reduction of nutrients and phosphates.

- The verifiable indicator for the overall project objective will be a reduction of nitrogen loading into the Black Sea by 21.1% and 32% for phosphorous.
- For Objective 1, the expectation is that all ICPDR countries will have developed and ratified policies and legal instruments for sustainable water management and nutrient reduction. In particular, the EU Water Framework Directive is to be applied in the frame of RBM plans.
- Objective 2 will be verified through fully operational institutional and organizational mechanisms in each ICPDR country, for transboundary cooperation, improved water quality monitoring, emission control, emergency warning, accident prevention and information management.
- Objective 3 is to be verified through the active engagement of civil society in national pollution reduction program, as indicated through an operational and self-sustained DEF secretariat and fully implemented Small Grants Program, with 80% of all projects showing sustainable results.
- Objective 4 is to be verified through a "considerable" increase in knowledge on sedimentation, transport and removal of nutrients and toxic substances, and acceptance at national and regional levels of economic instruments to encourage investment for nutrient reduction. Specific verification sources include projects and measures in place to reduce toxic substances in the Iron Gates reservoir, and endorsed wetlands management programs.

3 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Project formulation

As per GEF and UNDP procedures, the new project was prepared in consultation with the participating governments and UNDP and underwent final reviews and input by UNDP-GEF (principally Andrew Hudson), the GEF STAP panel reviewer and the GEF Secretariat prior to approval for inclusion in the GEF work program in 2001.

Based on the interviews conducted, it is apparent that wide stakeholder participation was solicited prior to and during development of the DRP. Members of the ICPDR expert groups and the Heads of Delegation were active participants in project development and their recommendations were taken into account. Input was also solicited and received from other project partners, including the World Bank, Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) Regional Environmental Center (REC) and Danube Environmental Forum (DEF).

During the inception phase, the project included an inception workshop, held February 6-8, 2002 in Austria, which brought together a large stakeholder group to consider and refine the specific activities under each project objective. In all, 67 technical experts, specialists, decision-makers and support staff attended the facilitated workshop, including representatives of all 14 signatories to the DRPC and from the NGO community. During preparations for the 2nd phase, the utility of holding a second stakeholder implementation workshop was considered. Based on the time, expense and difficulty to achieve consensus with such a large group, it was decided instead to discuss the project objectives and planned outcomes by topic area, using the ICPDR expert groups. The expectation is that smaller more focused groups can engage the subjects in greater depth, and provide more specific recommendations. The change to smaller more focused meetings is appropriate for the 2nd phase. A large stakeholder workshop, which serves the greater purpose of inclusion, information sharing and momentum building at the onset of a project, is not necessary at the midpoint.

Project Document

The project document for Phase 1 is comprehensive and generally well conceived. It takes into account and builds on the historical GEF work on the Danube. It is generally well written, with consistent formulation and elaboration of project objectives, activities, expected outcomes, timetables and budgets.

3.1.1 Relevance of the project design within the framework of GEF guidelines and global concerns

GEF's objective in the international waters (IW) focal area is to contribute primarily as a catalyst in the implementation of a more comprehensive, ecosystem based approach to managing international waters and their drainage basins as a means to achieve global environmental benefits.

According to the Water-Based Operational Program 8 (OP8) the GEF funded activities are to meet the incremental costs of:

a) assisting groups of countries to better understand the environmental challenges of their international waters and work collaboratively to address them;

b) building capacity of existing institutions, and

c) implementing measures that address priority transboundary environmental concerns.

The goal of OP8 is to assist countries in modifying the ways that human activities are conducted in a number of sectors so that a particular water body and its international drainage basin can sustainably support human activities.

The Project Documents for Phases 1&2 are in principle both describing a single project which has been divided into two separate but very closely linked project phases due to GEF and UNDP operational reasons. Both the Long-Term Development Objective and the Overall Objective of DRP are fully in line with GEF guidelines, the Phase 1 Specific Objective is *to prepare and initiate basin-wide capacity building activities.* The project has four Immediate Objectives, breaking down to 20 project components and 80 activities during the 1st Phase, which are designed to respond to overall and long-term development objectives.

Through its launching of the DRP, GEF has played a catalytic role for the Danube River Basin and as such the project design largely reflects the guidelines of GEF and UNDP. The project design has allowed participating countries to receive timely assistance on implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) as well as hands on experience and knowledge sharing at a basin-wide scale. The public participation and public awareness issues have been given thorough consideration and support through several project components and pilot projects have been developed to demonstrate best available practices

Most importantly, the DRP has enabled the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC) to become operative through financial and technical support to the ICPDR.

3.1.2 Appropriateness of the concept and design

The project concept is appropriate, and builds upon the previous GEF support for the Danube River Basin (DRB). During the past three years, as Phase 1 has been prepared and implemented, the economic, institutional and environmental situation has been in a state of transition across the region, especially with respect to EU expansion. Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic and Slovenia are now EU member states, and the future inclusion of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia is anticipated. This transition has made implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) a binding objective for most of the DRB countries. The design of the DRP has enabled it to play a leading role in regional preparations for WFD implementation. The project's emphasis on nutrient reduction is appropriate in consideration of the high nutrient loadings into the Danube, the lack of attention to best agricultural practices in some Danube countries, and the resulting deterioration of water quality along the Danube and particularly in the Black Sea as a result.

3.1.3 Contribution of the project to the overall development objective

The overall development objective is to improve the water quality of the Danube by reducing nutrient and other pollution discharges into the river and its tributaries, and by preserving and rehabilitating natural ecosystems in the river basin area. The project is focused on building the necessary governmental and civil society structures to ensure that attention is paid to reducing human impacts on Danube water quality.

The Project Document sets out a series of expected outputs that should positively contribute to meeting the overall development objective. In particular, it places emphasis on building public awareness and support for improving and protecting water resources in the region.

3.2 Implementation approach

The implementation approach as formulated can be considered satisfactory. The DRP provides technical, material and financial assistance to the ICPDR. The DRP does not include large-scale investments for pollution reduction, nor are its recommendations binding on the participating countries. The DRP instead provides a support mechanism for countries to meet their obligations under the DRPC and increasingly within the legal structures of the European Union. It succeeds in tandem with investment support mechanisms from the EU, World Bank, bilateral donors and the participating countries.

3.2.1 Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

The LFA for phase 1 was developed appropriately, providing generally clear objectives, outputs and activities. A noted shortcoming is the lack of clarity with respect to the attention to be paid to other pollutants in addition to nutrients. For example, Output 1.5.5 seeks to develop necessary complementing policy and legal measures for the introduction of Best Available Techniques (BAT) for the reduction of nutrients and dangerous substances. A nutrient focused effort would narrow this analysis to BAT for wastewater treatment facilities and concentrated livestock facilities (e.g. feedlots and dairies). The inclusion of dangerous substances opens the expectation to a broad array of industrial inputs, from mining, chemicals and other sectors.

The LFA also suffers from a lack of verifiable indicators of success for many of the outputs. In the above case, for output 1.5.5, the measure of success is completion of a report that includes a discussion of complimenting policy and legal measures. Success in this instance will not be measured by the adoption across the region of appropriate legal measures for BAT, or the extent of implementation of BAT in a given economic sector or at specific facilities. It is noted that the issue of verifiable indicators arose during review of the Phase 2 Project Document, and that greater emphasis will now be placed on quantifying results during phase 2.

In the frame of the Project Component 4.1 on indicators for project monitoring and impact evaluation, the LogFrame for the Phase II was revised and a set of indicators has been developed to be applied in the phase II in order to monitor the progress and results of the project.

3.2.2 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation

No indications are given in the project documents that lessons learnt from projects outside of the Danube area are taken into account. However, the Project Document was designed based upon the foundation established through the previous two GEF International Waters focal area projects for the Danube.

During the course of the interviews it was mentioned that water quality monitoring systems development for the Danube have benefited from assessing the monitoring efforts on the Rhine. In addition, overlapping ICPDR member involvement in the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM), have been useful to consider mechanisms for reducing nutrient loadings and the impacts of eutrophication.

As the Danube is considered a pioneering effort for transboundary water system cooperation, the DRP has hosted a stream of visitors from other regions, providing additional opportunities to share experiences e.g. hosting a GEF funded TumenNET (RAS/98/G31/A/31) study tour visit in 2002 and visit from Peipsi Center for Transboundary Cooperation in the frame of the GEF IW LEARN Inter-Project Stakeholder Exchange Pilot Program

3.2.3 Country ownership/Driveness

Country ownership of the program is an important aspect of the project formulation. The close linkage to the ICPDR recognizes that success will be measured by the extent to which the Danube countries apply the tool and techniques provided through the DRP.

There appear to be varying degrees of support from the DRB countries' governments in integrating the project objectives into their national development programs and other related projects. Countries motivated through EU accession are more engaged in the process, and view the project as fitting well within their national development policy. Others within the lower Danube basin may recognize the benefits of supporting the DRP objectives, but are constrained by financial considerations and competing interests. Country ownership of the DRP has been made difficult by the continuing political instability in several of the Danube countries. It is difficult to build governmental support at high levels when the responsible authorities are in political turmoil and in constant change.

Country ownership and participation is especially strong in relation to the development of legal instruments, and implementation of the Water Framework Directive. All of the DRB countries with the exception of Ukraine have indicated their intention to set in place legislation harmonized with the WFD. This common purpose towards WFD implementation provides a strong motivating force for transboundary collaboration on Danube water quality issues.

The support from ICPDR and/or DRP to member countries to participate in EG meetings has been well appreciated and in some cases countries have found national funding to send second participants to the meetings. As such the EG meetings have been seen as valuable information and knowledge sharing forums for the countries. Importantly the official networks, Experts Groups, have enabled informal networking between officials and experts in participating countries.

Based from the evaluation interviews, there should be some concern over the extent to which enthusiastic support extends beyond the environmental ministries and hydrological institutions that directly participate in the ICPDR EGs.

3.2.4 Stakeholder participation

The level of stakeholder participation in the DRP should be considered satisfactory. There is active participation amongst most stakeholder segments, and a strong emphasis on public participation. NGO's are closely involved in many DRP activities, and the project is actively working to build local and regional NGO capacity.

The DRP has endeavored to work with the Heads of Delegation of the ICPDR to get the Danube countries to establish inter-ministerial committees. There has also been some effort to bring agricultural officials to best agricultural practices (BAP) workshops. These efforts notwithstanding, there appears to be a gap in the stakeholder base, in that agricultural, mining, transportation and urban development interests have not been specifically targeted to build support for DRP objectives. These stakeholders need to be brought into the discussions if real and lasting pollution reduction is to be achieved. One area of direct engagement with industry is expected through the DRP effort to phase out the use of phosphate detergents in the DRB (Phase 1 output 1.8).

3.2.5 Replication approach

Phase 1 of the DRP is the information collection and stage-setting phase. During phase 2, the project is then to include a series of pilot projects, covering wetlands restoration, best agricultural practices, and tariff and water pollution charges. The project's emphasis on

pilots is an effective approach to replication. But piloting useful techniques is only the first step. The DRP team will then need to effectively publicize the findings and outcomes, and make recommendations to the relevant country stakeholders on how to expand and sustain these activities. Replicability has already been demonstrated in the setting up of the Sava pilot river basin management project, and the interest expressed by Hungary and Romania to develop an RBM effort for the Körös / Cris river. Especially the efforts to harmonize Danube participating country legislation with the EU-WFD should ensure strong replicability as each country strives to implement its own river basin management legislation.

The DRP replication approach should provide tools and lessons for other GEF projects. Here attention should be paid to the efforts to develop performance indicators. As these performance indicators are not yet in place, and have not been made operational outside of the consultants recommendations, it is premature to gauge their efficacy. However, it is expected that such indicators will be important to incorporate into future transboundary water resource projects.

3.2.6 Cost-effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness can be considered in terms of the amount spent on a particular activity, what was accomplished using these funds, how much additional funding was leveraged as a result of the activity, and whether the costs would have been greater or lesser using other means.

Cost effectiveness is difficult to determine in projects such as the DRP where the expenditures are for analysis, training and public relations rather than sewage pipes and pumps. It is also difficult to consider cost effectiveness midway through a project where the key interventions are not yet complete, and where the verifiable indicators for project success have been largely process focused, rather than results focused.

The issue of whether the DRP has been set up in a cost effective manner can and should be narrowed to exclude a comparison to construction and investment projects. Large-scale investment efforts are not within the GEF scope for the DRP, and funding support for these efforts is being supplied from the EU, the World Bank and bilateral donors. The question then is whether the project is designed properly to attain its expected outcomes in a cost effective manner. In this case, evidence of cost effectiveness is provided by the thin project overhead structure, the close partnership with ICPDR, the extensive use of local consultants ministries and institutes, and the expanding use of internet communication.

Annex 1 to the Project Document for Phase 2 identifies baseline and incremental costs for the project. It is noteworthy to consider that approximately USD 17 million in Project and PDF-B funding through GEF for phase 1&2 is expected to leverage just under 20 million USD in co-financing from the ICPDR countries.

The cost breakdown for Phase 2 also estimates USD 279 million USD of baseline costs for structural projects in participating countries to achieve compliance with national and EU water quality standards during the period 2003-2006. Other baseline costs, for non-structural activities, are estimated at USD 251 million. The resulting total cost figure for the period 2003-2006 is USD 554 million (baseline and incremental costs).

It is important to note that this baseline cost assessment in Annex 1 is less than compelling. While the incremental cost figures and the specific outputs they will be directed to are straightforward and verifiable, the additional baseline cost breakdowns, which give the appearance of specificity and validity, are based on old data and rough estimates. The baseline figures have been derived from a 1993 sector study, and it is unclear to what ex-

tent factors such as inflation, expanding EU membership, the breakup of former Yugoslavia, and World Bank support activities have been taken into account.

3.2.7 UNDP comparative advantage

There is considerable advantage to having UNDP sponsorship for the DRP. As a global organization, the UNDP brings no geo-political baggage that might limit the participation of certain basin members. And the aid is not tied or otherwise encumbered by expectations to use specific country consultants. The management flexibility provided through UNDP is also an advantage, as it enables the project team to adjust to changing circumstances, time frames and beneficiary needs. The UNDP is furthermore well considered for its leadership in the international waters and river basin sector, so its imprimatur adds additional stature to DRP efforts. Perhaps most important, the UNDP has funded three successive projects now in the Danube Basin and has been the catalyst for a cooperative effort that is the benchmark against which other basin initiatives compare themselves.

3.2.8 Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector

In addition to supporting the ICPDR, other essential links are with the European Commission, relating to implementation of EU legislation (the WFD in particular). Explicit linkages include the UNDP/GEF Black Sea Regional Project and the World Bank Investment Fund for Nutrient Reduction, in the frame of the GEF – World Bank Danube/Black Sea Partnership Program. Linkages are also established with the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) in the area of wetlands protection and restoration. The extent and success of these linkages over the 1st phase varies. Indications from the evaluation point to a very successful linkage with the WWF, made all the more close with the selection of the former director for WWF's Danube and Carpathian program(Philip Weller) as ICPDR executive secretary. Linkages with the Black Sea efforts are increasing but as yet not extensive nor considered a high priority.

Linkages with the European Commission appear to be narrowly focused through DG-Environment, and aimed at WFD implementation. It was apparent during the interviews that DRP professional staff are well informed of the key regional interventions occurring within the sector, but are not generally aware of country investment projects. Comments from the GEF reviewer of the Project Brief for the 2nd phase highlighted the need for better coordination with the World Bank Investment Fund. The DRP Project Manager has indicated a "stock-taking" meeting is to be set up in 2004 to consider improved coordination.

3.2.9 Management arrangements

The management arrangements formulated for the project are satisfactory. A full time dedicated staff was employed to manage the DRP. Direct project oversight is provided through UNOPS, including financial management. Technical supervision is provided through UNDP, based first from the International Waters offices in New York, and since the beginning of 2004 through the UNDP/GEF Offices for Europe and CIS in Bratislava. Guidance for DRP activities is also provided by the ICPDR.

3.3 Implementation

The evaluation has occurred after approval of the 2nd phase project brief, but prior to the awarding of the second tranche funding. Accordingly, the discussion on implementation

considers the full project to date. In general, implementation is highly satisfactory, with only minor concerns relating to completion of several project outputs.

As indicated in the DRP Phase 1 Project Implementation Plan, the implementation approach for the DRP is focused on "supporting the ICPDR and the DRB countries in developing appropriate policies and legal instruments for river basin management, appropriate land use, improved water management and water quality control with particular attention to nutrient reduction and toxic substances (e.g. agricultural, industrial, and municipal policy and legislative reforms, wetlands management) and in developing mechanisms for exacting compliance with policies and legislation." Implementation of this approach has been highly satisfactory. The DRP team has successfully forged close cooperation with ICPDR and has achieved most of the expected outputs.

One of the focus points for implementation, mentioned above, concerns appropriate land use. The project includes efforts to identify hot spots, to promote wetlands restoration, and to improve agricultural practices, however it has not been designed to create the kinds of interactions with land use and urban planners in the region that could lead to more appropriate land use. A particular concern raised during the evaluation mission is the potential negative impact on wetlands and flood plain areas as a result of trans-European transportation planning.

3.3.1 The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool

The Project Documents for both phases include detailed logical frameworks and also Project Management Sheets per Output, detailing activities, implementation steps, specific outputs, timeframe, and implementation arrangements. Project progress is compared back-to-back with Project Management Sheets by the DRP management.

While the Phase 1 logical framework is consistent with the project's objectives, it suffers from a lack of verifiable indicators and by rather vague expectations in terms of certain project outputs. These two shortcomings hinder the use of the LFA as a daily planning tool. The DRP team indicates that they use the LFA periodically to gauge progress against expectations.

3.3.2 Effective partnership arrangements established with relevant stakeholders

Partnership arrangements appear to be excellent with the ICPDR and the water quality focused governmental agencies. Partnering has been satisfactory with other identified stakeholders, including the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the Regional Environmental Center (REC). During the evaluation mission it was noted that the DRP and REC were negotiating management structures and fees for the RECs responsibilities under the Small Grants Program. The DRP indicates that these negotiations have been successfully concluded.

Other stakeholders include the Danube Environmental Forum, and NGOs that have secured SGP funding for national and regional projects in the Danube River Basin. Partnering arrangements with NGO's appear to be effective, although the funding holdup for the Small Grants Program during the 2nd phase has created some strain.

The European Commission is a key member of the Project Steering Committee and currently holds the chair for the ICPDR, nevertheless interviews during the mission suggest that some EU water sector operatives within the Danube countries are not generally aware of DRP activities. Coordination with World Bank Investment Fund activities has also been singled out as an opportunity for more effective partnering arrangements during the 2nd phase.

Regarding cooperation with their counterparts working to implement the Black Sea convention (ICPBS), and affiliated UNDP/GEF project, it is noteworthy that an MOU has been signed in 2002, promoting joint monitoring and assessment efforts. Based from interviews during the evaluation mission, it seems that there is a willingness to promote closer ties between the Danube and Black Sea efforts, but this has not been a high priority.

3.3.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Feedback from monitoring and evaluations has been captured in revised work plans and project documents. The team has demonstrated a capability to adapt to shifting demands and expectations. For instance:

- Comments and recommendations during the Inception Phase workshop were factored into the project work plans;
- The team has adapted to changing circumstances, in particular to support the ICPDR on implementation of the WFD;
- The delayed arrival of Serbia Montenegro into the ICPDR in 2003 was quickly supported and reinforced by the DRP.

3.3.4 Financial Planning

Based on authorization from UNOPS, the DRP office can manage and contract up to USD 30 000 threshold, which allows DRP to plan and execute smaller scale activities, such as workshops and short consultancies directly from Vienna. This flexibility enables the DRP team to quickly address the needs of the participation countries.

The drive to maximize value for money is strong among the DRP team in Vienna, e.g. consultants are only paid against deliverables and the maximum advance payment is 10%, however not exceeding USD 60 000.

The level of financial planning during project inception can be considered satisfactory, with detailed budgets set for each project activity and output. There has also been room given to reallocate funds from one output to another within each of the 4 objective areas, based on changing circumstances and unforeseen costs or savings. So for instance, the budget for output 1.1.1 to develop river basin districts map, was not needed as the ICPDR was undertaking this effort. Consequently, funding was shifted to 1.1.5, GIS needs assessment.

The initial budget for the DRP was set at a sufficient level for achieving project objectives. However, the financial planning did not take into account the fact that most DRP expenditures are in EUR and USD has depreciated by 30 per cent against the EUR over the past year. This substantial shortfall may mean that some 2nd phase project activities cannot be funded as anticipated.

3.3.5 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluations have been carried out in a satisfactory manner. The DRP is reviewed annually and was evaluated at the commencement and conclusion of Phase 1. All annual reviews and evaluations have indicated so far a high degree of satisfaction with project implementation.

It was acknowledged as part of the initial project document that this project could be very useful in establishing benchmarks to gauge performance in relation to quantifiable measures for water quality improvement projects. During Phase 1, the DRP commissioned a

report that has recommended a set of monitoring benchmarks, which will be used during the 2nd phase. At the conclusion of phase 2 it will be useful to consider the effectiveness of this benchmarking process and whether it can be replicated in other UNDP/GEF International Waters focal area projects.

A Tripartite Review (TPR) for DRP was conducted in February 2003 for the period December 2001 to January 2003. The meeting was attended by ICPDR, Hungary, Serbia and Montenegro, Bulgaria, DEF, UNOPS, UNDP and the DRP team.

UNDP STAP reviews were carried out prior to the launch of Phases 1 & 2. The same reviewer authored both, and rendered highly positive reviews concerning the project formulation and likelihood of meeting objectives. Internal financial reviews are carried out annually by UNOPS, with no financial improprieties reported.

The joint project steering committee / annual meeting format with ICPDR and DRP has been very useful, reinforcing the assisting role that the DRP plays for the ICPDR, and saving resources through the combined meeting structure. Interestingly, the series of interviews with country experts highlighted the fact that many who are directly involved in the ICPDR do not distinguish between DRP and ICPDR activities, but rather view it as a combined and seamless effort in support of the Danube Convention. The Project Manager manages DRP activities in close cooperation with ICPDR management.

3.3.6 Execution and implementation modalities

Execution and implementation modalities for the DRP are complicated by the rapid political changes in the region. When the project commenced, it was not a foregone conclusion that half way through there would be four new DRB members of the EU; nor was there any certainty that all of the countries of the former Yugoslavia would be in a position to effectively cooperate within the ICPDR. One of the great successes of the DRP has been its elasticity, providing support and assistance to the ICPDR amidst the changing political landscape.

The DRP is well managed by its Project Manager Ivan Zavadsky who brought to the project an excellent background with respect to Danube issues, having participated in the development of the convention as a Slovak environmental official. The 6-member project team, based at the Vienna International Center, is comprised of a seasoned and capable group of experts. The project team for the 2nd phase will change, as a replacement is now sought for the departing DRP Environmental Specialist, Andrew Garner.

Close attention is paid by the DRP to the quality and outputs of outside consultants. The DRP has been able to utilize a highly qualified set of experts, who by and large have produced useful reports and conducted informative workshops. Some slippage has occurred with respect to completion of consultant reports (see below section 3-4-1 on attainment of results) however these delays in completion have not materially impeded project progress.

3.3.7 Management by the UNDP country office

UNOPS is tasked with ongoing project management and financial issues. The UNDP established the original project brief, and continues to exercise its management responsibilities on the technical project aspects, providing scientific and programmatic guidance, and commenting on work plans prior to approval. The UNDP participates in the twice-annual project steering committee meetings and there is frequent contact with the DRP team leader. The management structure from UNDP through UNOPS to the DRP team has been considered a success. All parties have expressed satisfaction with the arrangements. UNDP has indicated satisfaction with UNOPS management, and both UNDP and

UNOPS project supervisors have indicated they have the confidence in the DRP staff to manage the project effectively.

Delays in approval of the 2nd phase Project Document pose a risk to the attainment of objectives during the 2nd phase. At the date of this evaluation, the DRP had not yet received funding under the second tranche, despite having submitted the 2nd phase document in September 2003. It is understood that the DRP was requested to revise the 2nd phase Project Document, in particular to include greater emphasis on performance indicators. The revised Project Document was then reportedly re-submitted within two weeks. It appears that the delays have been largely incremental in nature, with no one specific issue holding up the process. The 6-month delay in Project Document approval has had a negative impact especially on the Small Grants Program. The selected 65 NGO nutrient reduction projects have been stalled since the beginning of the calendar year. For time sensitive NGO projects, where activities were timed for the spring planting season, this delay causes major problems.

3.3.8 Coordination and operational issues

Assistance has been given to 11 of the DRB countries (excepting Germany and Austria), enabling them to participate fully in the ICPDR expert group meetings, and to attend DRP workshops. A common theme of the stakeholder interviews was an appreciation of the quality and timeliness of DRP assistance.

All participating countries are expected to increasingly fund their own participation in the ICPDR, and to actively assist the DRP in providing information and assistance to achieve expected project outputs. The DRP has been slowly phasing out its direct assistance to attend meetings, with the expectation that the DRB countries themselves will meet all logistical expenses for participation, prior to the end of the 2nd phase.

Interviews during the evaluation mission suggest that inputs through the ICPDR expert group have been variable, with more complete and reliable data from the EU member and accession countries implementing the WFD. It appears that several of the DRP reporting efforts have experienced difficulties in obtaining complete and reliable data. For example, the impacts and stresses report covering 1.1.2, 1.1.6 & 1.1.7, developed by experts at Essen University, includes responses from country questionnaires with many omissions. This suggests either no available data, or insufficient attention from the member countries, or insufficient follow-up from the consultants. Access to data remains problematic in many of the DRB countries, with some institutes and ministries reluctant to share information without compensation.

Restricted access to water quality data posses a real challenge to the DRP and ICPDR. At issue is the veracity of information published by the DRP on Danube water quality, as well as successful implementation the Aarhus Convention and the public access provisions of the WFD.

3.4 Results

The results for Phase 1 of the DRP needs to be considered in the context of a unified project that was artificially split into two phases due to financial constraints at UNDP/GEF.

3.4.1 Attainment of objectives

Attainment of specific objectives during the project 1st phase is highly satisfactory – as measured against the completion of expected outputs. However, it is unclear at this stage the extent to which the project has had and will have a demonstrable impact on water quality and is helping to achieve the overall objective of substantially reducing nutrient

and other pollutant loadings into the Danube. It is also unclear whether a future economic resurgence in the region could boost farm production and exacerbate Danube pollution problems regardless of the assistance that is being provided by the DRP.

The evaluation team received from the DRP team a status assessment, included as Appendix 5. All 20 identified outputs are nearly or completely achieved.

There are some minor variations between the expected outcomes as indicated in the project document, and the attached status list. These include:

- **Output 1.1.1** indicates the team should develop a river basin districts map. This output was actually carried out by ICPDR experts. The resources for this activity were then shifted to reinforce the development of the Danube GIS for output 1.1.5;
- **Output 1.5.1** indicates an expectation that the team will update the basin-wide inventory of hot spots. This effort is still incomplete but reportedly soon to be finished. Delays were reportedly due to difficulties in obtaining data in the countries of former Yugoslavia. The effort is soon to be completed, with expert input from Serbia & Montenegro;
- **Output 1.5.4** indicates an expectation for identifying gaps between EU and national legislation concerning BAT. This output has been included in the recently issued draft final report for objective 1.5, which is soon to be finalized;
- **Output 1.8.4** requires that a workshop be organized basin wide to consider the implementation of recommendations for phasing out phosphorus in detergents. The workshop is still to be held, with the DRP team having taken additional time to select the proper facilitation assistance for the workshop;
- **Output 2.3.3** includes the design of preventative measures for accidental emergency response after having identified all high-risk accident spots within the basin (2.3.2). The project consultant , after visiting several sites with the APC small working group on inventories, developed a checklist and agreed methodology for the design of preventative measures. Training and implementation using the checklist approach is planned for the 2nd phase. In particular, the project team has indicated it is developing an approach that can be effectively utilized by inspectors to assess high-risk sites;
- **Output 2.6** sets out a specific list of training courses. The DRP team has not strictly adhered to this list, but rather instituted during the 1st phase a needs assessment to gauge the capacity building priorities in each country. The needs assessment has been reviewed with the ICPDR to establish a priority list of training activities to be carried out during the 2nd phase. Training for implementation of the WFD has been carried out during the 1st phase, as well as facilitator training. In addition to specific priority training programs, there will be training included as needed for completion of other project outputs;
- **Output 3.3.3** sets an expectation for the publication of scientific papers. The DRP team have included on its web site many of the technical reports now completed, but have not specifically published scientific papers. It is anticipated during the 2nd phase that results from pilot projects will lend themselves towards publication;
- **Output 4.1.3** sets expectations that the team will have a monitoring system in place which will utilize specific project indicators (benchmarks) for project implementation. The DRP received the final consultant report for objective 4.1 in March, 2004. The DRP, in consultation with ICPDR are now instituting a new monitoring program, including recommended indicators for process, stress, pressure, status and legal reform.

3.4.2 Sustainability

It is reasonable to assume that after the DRP there will be no further funding from GEF. As a consequence, the DRP Phase 2 wraps up more than a decade of GEF support, and elevates post-project sustainability as a key success criterion.

As a result of GEF support, the Danube states have made great strides in achieving the aims set out in the Danube River Protection Convention. Monitoring and emergency alert systems are in place across the region, stresses, pressures and hotspots have been identified, and pilot projects for wetlands restoration, and best agricultural practices are under development. Of equal importance, there is a stable core of water experts across the region who are working cooperatively to improve Danube water quality.

Sustainability of the project activities amongst most of the Danube riparian states is strongly supported by their accession plans for the European Union. It is clear that implementation of the WFD has grown to become a dominant focus of ICPDR and DRP activities. This focus exists not only for the EU member states, but also for the accession states, Romania and Bulgaria, as well as the aspiring states, Croatia, Serbia & Montenegro and Bosnia & Herzegovina. Moldova has also indicated its interest to harmonize legal codes with the WFD.

A common legal and regulatory basis for water resource planning and management among the 13 countries should greatly assist the ICPDR in keeping momentum after the DRP has concluded. It is noteworthy that a new Water Act has recently been drafted in Serbia and Montenegro and the Bulgarian Water Act has been s been amended to respond to WFD requirements. The institutionalization of ICPDR and related processes is a major objective for GEF support in general and the DRP in particular.

WFD harmonization across the basin can ensure sustainability by codifying river basin management, water quality and public participation requirements at the country level. Sustainability requires that the merits of improved Danube water quality be accepted and supported by persons who would not otherwise consider themselves environmentalists. This poses a challenge for the DRP during phase 2, to expand its outreach efforts to communicate with farmers and miners and the public at large.

Lower Danube Basin countries, especially non-EU and non-accession countries, are likely to face difficulties to continue their ICPDR participation at current levels after the DRP is completed. Consequently, financial sustainability of established structures and processes of ICPDR should be given highest priority during Phase 2.

The DRP is taking a phased approach towards fading out of financial assistance for experts to attend ICPDR expert group sessions. Of the initial 11 states receiving logistical assistance under the project, 4 (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia) are now entirely covering their own participation costs. The plan is for this phasing out to continue so that by the end of the project all 11 states have budgeted sufficient funds for their ICPDR participation.

3.4.3 The likely sustainability of project interventions

The likely sustainability of specific project interventions is mixed, but on the whole there is reason to believe much of the work will continue beyond the conclusion of the DRP. In the following table, each of the specific Phase 1 interventions is considered in terms of issues that may impact on their sustainability.

Objective	*Output*	*Sustainability*
1 **The Creation of Sustainable Ecological Conditions for Land Use and Water Management**	1.1 Development and implementation of policy guidelines for river basin and water resources management	This is the project intervention that stands the greatest likelihood for long-term sustainability, as the policy setting aspects for water resource management are being driven by implementation of the WFD. However, setting legislation in place is only the first step. Each of the states must then implement and enforce their legal provisions. Interviews in several of the Danube states suggest that monitoring and enforcement of environmental laws are problematic, due to insufficient staff and a lack of rigor in the levying of sanctions and fines. The WFD has a fairly extensive set of reporting requirements. The DRP team have been instrumental in coordinating with ICPDR the annual roof reports, to be submitted to the EC, as required under the WFD. It should be expected that after several years, the national experts, working through the ICPDR, should be able to effectively meet their reporting requirements, without funding by GEF. There will be a significant effort required to complete an integrated RBMP for the basin (2009)
	1.2 & 1.3 Policies for the control of agricultural point and nonpoint sources of pollution and pilot projects on agricultural pollution reduction.	A key issue in terms of sustainability will be the extent to which agricultural best practices for nutrient reduction are supported and carried out within the farming community. There is a risk that increasing farm output, spurred by EU farm supports, could increase pollutant loading into the Danube, unless improved fertilizer and pesticide management is practiced. To date, the DRP activities have been largely aimed towards the environmental community – at the government and NGO level. This stakeholder focus needs to be broadened to directly connect with agricultural interests. As indicated in the DRP report on this subject, focus should be placed now on the utilization of agri-environmental funds under the EU's CAP (Common Agricultural Policy , and SAPARD (Special Accession Program for Agriculture and Rural Development), to assist farmers in developing best agricultural practices.
	1.4 Policy development for wetlands rehabilitation under the aspect of appropriate land use	At this stage it is difficult to determine whether there will be a sustained effort to rehabilitate wetlands along the Danube corridor. The envisioned pilots should help to underscore the filtering, flood controlling, and habitat usefulness of wetlands. The key issue will be whether isolated pilot projects can translate into a widespread effort to protect and rehabilitate wetlands areas. The problem is one of land use competition. Farming, transportation, industrial and urban development interests have and will continue to compete for available lands in the flood plain, and many of the Danube states do not have in place legislation that compels these interests to mitigate for wetlands losses.

Objective	*Output*	*Sustainability*
	1.5 Industrial reform and development of policies and legislation for the application of BAT (best available techniques, including cleaner technologies) towards reduction of nutrients (N and P) and dangerous substances	Industrial reform and the application of BAT among the Danube states are being driven by EU membership. Member states and accession countries are required to harmonize their legislation with the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive (IPPC) and the Seveso II Directive. Sustainability should therefore be greatly assisted by the accession goals of most Danube countries. The interventions to date in this area include a workshop and a report on the implementation of BAT in the Danube region (draft Final recently submitted). In addition major pollution hot spots have been delineated. Sustainability depends very much on identifying practical techniques and implementing them at these specific hot spots. The key drivers will be the regulatory requirements in place, coupled with financial assistance. During the evaluation interviews, repeatedly raised were concerns about needed improvements in mine management in the region, especially in Romania.
	1.6 & 1.7 Assessments and development of water and wastewater tariffs and effluent charges – focused on nutrient reduction and control of dangerous substances	The DRP interventions have so far been useful in developing financial models for use in the Danube states and highlighting the basket of options that municipalities can consider with respect to water and wastewater funding. The DRP has also continued the important effort of capacity building in the area of environmental finance. The WFD sets out an expectation, but not obligation, that states will work towards full cost recovery. It will be up to each state, and to the municipalities themselves, to set tariffs and effluent charges as they see fit. The pilot projects envisioned should help improve municipal financial management in these municipalities, and it will be important to communicate the lessons learnt along the Danube corridor. Sustainability will depend on the extent to which financial assistance (national and international) to build and upgrade systems is made contingent on improved utility management and better cost recovery.
2 **Capacity building and reinforcement of transboundary cooperation for the improvement of water quality**	2.1 Inter-ministerial coordinating mechanisms for nutrient reduction and pollution control	The DRP is worked with the ICPDR secretariat and heads of delegation (HOD) to assess and establish inter-ministerial coordination in each of the Danube states. The 1st steps are in place – the current status review has been done, and the states have been offered assistance 5 countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia) have indicated they are all set in terms of inter-ministerial coordination. The other 6 have requested assistance. The sustainability of this effort will be determined by the objectives of political leadership in each state, as well as the legal changes underway due to EU membership (reporting and public access to information requirements).

Objective	*Output*	*Sustainability*
and environmental standards in the DRB	2.2 Operational tools for monitoring, laboratory and information management with particular attention to nutrients and toxic substances	The DRP has provided important assistance, especially to calibrate laboratory analysis across the states, to ensure quality and consistency. Several key issues arise in terms of sustainability. One relates to the lack of proper government laboratory and monitoring facilities among some Danube states. A second is the financial difficulties faced by the national institutes, whose budgets for water quality research have been slashed since the early 1990's. A third is the competition between ministries and institutes in many states for the authority (and funding) to lead the monitoring and analysis efforts.
	2.3 Improvement of procedures and tools for accidental emergency response with particular attention to transboundary emergency situations	The emergency response system is now in place, and should be well positioned to continue after the conclusion of the DRP. The system is internet and GSM based, and relies on communications at the expert level for pollution alerts. During the mission interviews it was indicated that work is still needed to calibrate the flow model for specific sections of the Danube. Also, there have been no simulations done to gauge state reactions in the event of a major pollution disaster.
	2.4 Support for reinforcement of the ICPDR information system (DANUBIS)	DANUBIS should be running smoothly when the DRP concludes. It will be up to the member states themselves, through the ICPDR, to provide the necessary operational budget for the system to stay current and continue adding features. The DRP assistance for hardware upgrades has been very helpful. Continuing upgrades, and especially increasing access rates and bandwidth may be challenges after the conclusion of DRP.
	2.5 Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding between the ICPDR and the ICPBS relating to the discharge of nutrients and hazardous substances to the Black Sea	The DRP has made efforts together with the ICPDR secretariat to improve cooperation with the ICPBS. The MOU requires a common Analytical Quality Assurance (AQA) system gets set in place, that input loads and ecological status are assessed annually, that strategies are developed for economic development which reduce nutrient and other pollutant loading, and that the joint efforts be reviewed in 2007. The ultimate goal is to roll back pollution loadings into the Black Sea equal to levels in the 1960's. From the DRP side, there should be little difficulty in establishing a joint AQA system and providing annual assessments. Sustainability rests on the monitoring efforts at the ICPBS ands more importantly, on the efforts of the Danube and Black Sea states to implement non-polluting economic strategies. Close cooperation with the ICPBS can continue beyond the conclusion of the DRP, however that does not ensure the MOU can be fulfilled, as success must be measured in terms of reduced nutrient and other pollutant loadings.

Objective	*Output*	*Sustainability*
	2.6 Training and consultation workshops for resource management and pollution control with attention to nutrient reduction and transboundary issues	The series of training and consultation workshops have been well appreciated and viewed as useful and informative by the participants. Continuation of such training and consultations is unlikely without the DRP, unless other multilateral or bilateral funding is found. Sustainability requires also that the audience for such workshops is enlarged to include agricultural interests.
3: Strengthening of public involvement in environmental decision making and reinforcement of community actions for pollution reduction and protection of ecosystems	3.1 Support for institutional development of NGOs and community involvement	DRP support has resurrected the Danube Environmental Forum. The DEF is now a formal organization, with branches in each Danube state. The DEF was assisted under the GEF's previous Danube program, but the organization dramatically decreased its activities after GEF funding ended. A key question will be whether at the end of this next (and last) GEF Danube support, it can stand on its own. A good sign in this direction is that the DEF has recently succeeded to obtain additional funding from the European Commission.
	3.2 Applied awareness raising through community-based Small Grants Program	NGO support and community involvement is also to be provided through the Regional Environmental Center (REC). The REC has managed for DRP the identification of 65 NGO small grants recipients. These 1st set projects have been delayed pending release of Phase 2 funding. A 2nd set of small grants is also expected. It is difficult to assess yet whether some or many of the NGO 's receiving small grant support will be able to continue their nutrient reduction projects without DRP funding. It is also difficult to ascertain whether the projects implemented will have a lasting impact on agricultural practices in the areas where they occur. The objective for DRP phase 2 sets out an expectation that 80% of the projects will be "sustainably successful". It will be important for the DRP team to determine how this is to be measured. A positive aspect of the small grants bidding procedure has been the requirement that proposals utilize proper bid documentation, including logical frameworks, with REC and DEF assistance in how to develop these documents. This should provide the grants recipients with useful training for future grant biding opportunities.
	3.3 Organization of public awareness-raising campaigns on nutrient reduction and control of toxic substances	Public awareness raising has so far been through the publication of brochures, the DRP web site and the initial launch of Danube Day. Obviously the dedicated web site and brochures will fade out at the end of GEF funding, recognizing of course that ICPDR has its own web site and the publication Danube Watch. Danube Day holds potential to become a popular fixture for public attention, assuming in subsequent years the celebrations can be replicated along the entire Danube.

Objective	*Output*	*Sustainability*
Objective 4: Reinforcement of monitoring, evaluation and information systems to control transboundary pollution, and to reduce nutrients and harmful substances	4.1 Development of indicators for project monitoring and impact evaluation	An initial report on indicators has been developed and is being applied within the DRP. Sustainability will depend on such indictors being used by the ICPDR and member states.
	4.3 Monitoring and assessment of nutrient removal capacities of riverine wetlands	Wetlands construction and restoration takes time, and the results of measures adopted may not be fully assessed for 5-10 years. This creates a challenge for the several pilot projects to be launched during the second phase. There will need to be continued support beyond the end of the GEF project.
	4.4 Danube Basin study on pollution trading and corresponding economic instruments for nutrient reduction	The pollution trading activity has not yet commenced. Interviews during the project mission suggest there is a great deal of skepticism over how nutrient trading would work along the Danube. It is also noted that one of the ICPDR members (Austria) has indicated its opposition to the use of pollution trading for nutrient reduction. Skepticism and outright opposition notwithstanding, the DRP together with the ICPDR are obtaining the kind of monitoring data that could enable a trading scheme to be instituted.

3.4.4 Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

DRP phase 1 efforts can be considered satisfactory in terms of skills upgrading. Interviews with ICPDR country experts highlighted great appreciation for the skills and knowledge transfer provided via the DRP through workshops, expert input and project reports. In particular, the assistance given on implementation of the WFD has been singled out.

It has been noted earlier that the DRP team took a different approach to training than was specified in the Project Document. The Project Document specified in output 2.6 a series of specific training efforts, for instance including training for innovative wastewater treatment techniques. The DRP team rightly requested and received approval to first identify the training needs in the region and then to establish a revised training program. A revised training regime is set out in the Phase 2 Project Document, which more accurately reflects needs within the region. It is also recognized that training is considered and included in each of the other expected outputs.

Participation of member government officials to DRP and ICPDR activities has without a doubt increased the skills of national staff to not just participate, but to effectively function and cooperate in an international organization. There are clear signs that this experience and know-how is being utilized in the daily work of those who are part of the EGs as well as their colleagues.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

As noted earlier, the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project are generally satisfactory, and no major changes are needed, assuming that the new indicators for project management and evaluation are carried out.

4.2 Comments and recommendations on the current proposed activities for project Phase II

- A critical issue for phase 2 will be how to deal with the budget shortfall resulting in the EUR strengthening against the USD, which may see as much as 30 per cent reduction in de facto available budget for phase 2. There will need to be cutbacks in some phase 2 project efforts to bridge this gap. The evaluation team recommends that a meeting be set up to discuss this matter, with DRP, ICPDR, UNDP and UNOPS representation. The meeting attendees should prioritize project outputs and establish a worst-case scenario on cutbacks that may be required. The workshop could be held just prior to the ICPDR annual meeting, with the results then communicated to member HODs at the annual meeting.

Sustainable Ecological Conditions

- To achieve project objectives it would be useful for the DRP to identify and promote agro-environmental support mechanisms under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the SAPARD program. EU enlargement may well trigger a resurgence in farm production along the Danube, with resulting increased nutrient loadings. Many farmers are not aware of opportunities through the agricultural support mechanisms to reduce pollution by improving on-farm practices.

- The wetlands rehabilitation and appropriate land use outputs (1.4), are well considered. Attention should also be paid to mixed-use opportunities and compensation issues, recognizing that wetlands rehabilitation can restrict economic opportunities for landowner. Lessons learnt in the US and elsewhere on the implementation of conservation easements, and mitigation requirements for building in wetlands, should be studied. Cost and benefit analyses should be part of the pilot rehabilitation efforts.

- Decisions need to be made as to the future thrust of the industrial pollution objective (1.5), as there has not been a clear consideration of what is to be achieved. During phase 1, the initiative has considered industrial pollutants in general and the current status of governmental actions, largely based on implementation of EU directives (WFD, Dangerous Substances, IPPC, Seveso II). The outputs identified for phase 2 continue this general approach, including developing a legal gap assessment and providing country-specific recommendations on legal measures. As an additional note, the final report for Phase 1 output 1.5 recommends establishing a multi-year assistance effort for industrial pollution reduction program development in the lower Danube countries. The current and proposed activities are not aimed specifically at the DRP's central focus - nutrient reduction, and they fail to account for efforts already underway in the EU accession states to transpose EU industrial pollution legislation. We suggest a narrowing of the scope, to specifically focus on nutrient loading, and the major industrial point sources within the Danube basin that contribute significant nutrient and phosphorous loading (e.g. large scale agriculture,

food processing, pulp and paper, detergents). Taking a more narrow sectoral approach would allow more effort to be directed towards identifying existing problem sites, and researching and presenting BAT options for the specific sectors and sites. Such an effort would lend itself towards additional piloting efforts, and recommended investments. This effort should build from data developed under output 2.2 (emission analysis from point and non-point sources of pollution with particular attention to nutrients and toxic substances)

- The workshop to discuss with industry the phase out of phosphate detergents (1.8) was originally planned for Phase 1, but has been carried over to Phase 2 as a result of the prolonged search to find the proper facilitation. This initiative holds the greatest promise for enabling the DRP to meet one of the overall project objectives - to substantially reduce phosphate loadings into the Danube, and thereby reduce the problems of eutrophication in the Danube delta and Black Sea. It needs to be given high priority during Phase 2, with consideration given both to regulatory and voluntary mechanisms.

- Several interviews during the evaluation mission highlighted questions concerning the nutrient trading project. Some have suggested it is not a viable option for the region, and one participating country (Austria) has reportedly indicated its opposition to the idea. Evidence from the US experience in SO_2 trading, and limited nutrient trading (Chesapeake Bay) suggest that the idea of pollution credit trading has merit if carefully applied. When dealing with a shared water such as the Danube, nutrient loading is a collective problem – resulting in degradation out to the Black Sea. If a certain percentage of nutrient reduction can be achieved at high cost through tertiary treatment and de-nitrification at an upstream wastewater treatment plant, while the same nutrient reduction levels can be achieved at substantially lower cost through improvements in farm manure management downstream, then a trading program can offer cost effective opportunities. We recommend that the effort be continued, but recognize it may be a low priority for the DRP. The Project Brief indicates that the DRP is committing no funds to this output during the 2nd phase, with all financing coming through the ICPDR. This suggests no DRP involvement, and only limited consultant assistance, which may ensure that little is achieved. The activity either needs to be run properly, or then taken off the list of expected outputs.

Capacity Building & transboundary cooperation

- The Phase 2 project brief assumes the setting up of inter-ministerial committees has been completed during Phase 1. In fact, this effort is incomplete and several countries have asked for continuing assistance with establishing inter-ministerial committee structures. The inter-ministerial committee development effort is an important output, requiring attention and financing still during the 2nd phase, and special emphasis needs to be placed on engaging agricultural interests.

- The river basin planning efforts that the DPR is spearheading for the region can provide great opportunities to establish more holistic and sustainable land use planning for the region. This will require that plans get designed not only to improve water quality, but also to stimulate economic development and employment opportunities. The economic benefits of a clean and healthy Danube river system need to be tangible for inhabitants to change behaviors and support costly improvements. The DRP during phase 2 will continue its work to complete the outputs under 1.4, dealing with wetlands and appropriate land use. Meanwhile, to complete section 1.1 the team will be working to develop an economic analysis of the region, consistent with WFD requirements for establishing the Danube RBMP. Within these two efforts there should be room to engage with spatial and regional planners in the countries to consider how economic development aims and environmental protection aims can be reconciled.

- Consideration should be given to how the DRP can increase assistance to the ICPDR and DABLAS task force in the prioritization, pre-feasibility preparation, and dissemination of information on investment projects for nutrient reduction. The ICPDR has drawn up a list of priority projects for nutrient reduction, within the Joint Action Program. Based from inputs of the 13 countries, it indicates that among 158 identified projects, 45 are fully funded with a total of 622 mil. EUR. The investment needs for the remaining 113 projects is 2,567 mil. EUR, of which 2,121 mil. EUR are not yet secured. Interviews during the evaluation mission highlighted that some IFI's are not cognizant of the basin-wide work done by DRP and ICPDR to identify nutrient reduction projects. The DRP Team Leader has indicated plans for a stock-taking meeting with persons in charge of the World Bank Investment Fund activities in the region. Stock-taking meetings should also be set up with other IFI's, including persons managing EC investment instruments such as ISPA and SAPARD in the lower Danube countries.

- Opportunities exist with current technologies to make the DRP and ICPDR web sites more interactive and user friendly. Real time information on flow rates, temperature and water quality can be attached. Real time video footage of beautiful and historic places along the river can now be viewed on line. Towards the end of the DRP, the project's dedicated web site will need to phase down, with information transferred into the ICPDR site.

Strengthening of public involvement

- Public awareness raising is an important objective during Phase 2. At this stage, the public awareness efforts have focused on the usual media package: create a series of brochures and develop a web site that provides static information. The DRP working with the ICPDR have the potential to do much more. Two planned initiatives are especially promising. First there is Danube Day, which is to take place annually, and has the potential to become a major media event in many if not all of the Danube countries, especially those with a major city along the banks of the Danube. The first year's events are centered in Vienna. It is recommended that a media package gets developed to help local efforts in each participating country. While the themes may be environmentally focused, the emphasis should be on events, activities and fun, to bring people out to celebrate the Danube.

- The public participation activities of ICPDR are supported partly by DRP and partly funded by ICPDR. During the DRP Phase 1, ICPDR has prepared the *Danube Basin Strategy for Public Participation in River Basin Management Planning 2003-2009* and *ICPDR Operation Plan to Ensure Public Participation in Implementing the EU WFD on the Basin Wide (roof) Level.* Both relevant and valuable papers outlining roof level public participation efforts with long-term perspective. During the DRP phase 2 ICPDR should gain further understanding on financing possibilities of these activities including other ongoing public awareness activities such as Danube Watch-magazine and Danube Day-initiative, both being activities where private interest to participate could be attracted.

- Several questions were raised during the interview regarding the large amount of funding directed towards the public participation and access to information output (3.4) which accounts for more than USD 1.7 million in GEF funds and just under USD 3 million in ICPDR costs. It is understood that this subproject was initially a stand-alone initiative that was added to the DRP because of the close correlation between it and other DRP objectives. This initiative can be very useful if it takes a country-level and practical approach.

- For the new member states and accession countries, they are wrestling with public access and reporting requirements across dozens of new statutes. Signatories to the Aarhus Convention have additional obligations. Establishing the proper mechanisms – both legal and practical, to meet these obligations presents a real challenge

for participating countries that the project can help to meet. One particular problem faced in many states is the lack of public access to, and participation in, not just spatial and regional planning but also to Environmental Impact Assessment processes for new development projects affecting them indirectly or directly.

4.3 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- UNDP/GEF should remain steadfast in winding up their Danube support effort at the conclusion of the DRP. However it is important to note that this constitutes a several million dollar a year loss of support towards achieving the goals and objectives of the Danube River Protection Convention. The ICPDR should already now be considering strategies for how it will proceed once the DRP concludes in 2007.
- Project assistance will be needed from multilateral and bilateral funders for specific pollution reduction measures, especially to deal with long standing problems such as insufficient wastewater treatment systems, inadequate construction of mine tailing ponds, and poor manure handling at animal feedlots. Additional funding will be required to expand wetland rehabilitation and flood plain habitat preservation.
- Special projects should be considered to expand agro-environmental cooperation, with the aim to successfully boost local farm economies without contributing to degradation of water quality. Phase 2 plans to have launched two tranches of NGO small grant assistance projects for nutrient reduction. Those with the potential for successful continuation, expansion and or replication should be further assisted. An important task for the DRP team, assisted by the REC and DEF will be to identify future funding sources for these projects.
- Based on the results of the Phase 2 Iron Gates reservoir assessment (output 4.2) there will likely need to be consideration for specific funding to address the series of problems present, including substantial deposits of contaminated sediments, silt and debris build which is eroding impoundments, and the impact of variable outflows on downstream aquatic species.

4.4 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

An important aspect of pollution prevention in the Danube basin is not being sufficiently addressed directly through the DRP or through other bilateral and multilateral support mechanisms. This aspect is the effective enforcement of environmental legislation once enacted into statute. The last 6 years have seen a plethora of new environmental laws enacted in a majority of the DRB countries, to harmonize with the EU Acquis. In many of these countries, inspection and enforcement mechanisms, and corresponding legal and court structures, are inadequate to ensure compliance; and the complexity is growing, as the IPPC directive requires that integrated permitting be established for major pollution sources. An important future direction for the ICPDR, in conjunction with EU structures, should be to assist participating countries as they strive to improve enforcement measures.

5 LESSONS LEARNED

Insights gained through the implementation of the DRP may be valuable elsewhere in the GEF portfolio of projects focused on International Waters (IW) and the operations program OP8. Lessons learnt include:

- The quality and capability of the project team is paramount. If experienced and talented people are managing the effort, the chances of success are greatly improved.
- Success requires close cooperation between the assisting project team and the ICPDR executive secretariat. If one or the other parties is reluctant to share information or work towards consensus, the project is imperiled. Peer to peer relationships between project staff and key stakeholders can be instrumental to meeting objectives.
- A common basis for participation in transboundary water commissions needs to be achieved amongst all participating countries even if it means outside funding is used to ensure the participation of all countries in expert working groups. A related aspect is that stability and consistency of expert group personnel is essential, The same group of qualified experts, showing up consistently, has ensured a high quality of outcomes for the ICPDR.
- If countries receive assistance to attend meetings, such assistance should be phased out during the course of the project to build sustainability.
- Replication opportunities should be very much considered with respect to the coordinated assistance given on implementation of the water framework directive. While the WFD is region specific (Europe), the process underway to harmonize legal frameworks can also be considered in other regions.
- At the conclusion of the project it will be useful to ascertain the outcomes of the small grants assistance program to NGO's for nutrient reduction. The effort may hold real promise as a model to increase the effectiveness of environmental NGO's working on water resource issues and to direct their energies specifically to work with agricultural and other commercial / industrial interests to implement pollution reduction measures.
- When developing small grants programs in the future, attention should be given to minimizing the management structures involved. In the current configuration, management authority passes from the UNDP to UNOPS to the DRP to the REC and then dispensed to the grant recipients. This presents a large overhead structure for the dispensation of funds.
- Logical Frameworks are the building blocks to effective project management, enabling the team to link objectives to outputs, verifiable indicators, timing, budgets and risks. The DRP efforts to establish a more robust project monitoring program, using environmental benchmarks, should create useful planning tools to be incorporated into future water resource project LFAs.
- Where possible, arrangements should be made to launch and conduct international water projects in a single phase, or then establish an abbreviated approval process for the second phase in order to avoid long and debilitating financial gaps;.
- Mid term evaluations should be done prior to the approval of 2nd phase project briefs, so that resulting recommendations can be fully taken into account for the second phase.

5.1 Best /worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Best practices include:

- The DRP is the product of a long-term UNDP/GEF presence in the region and the Project Document was the result of a participatory logical framework and project planning process, which has enabled successful project implementation.
- There are excellent levels of communication and cooperation exhibited by the DRP, with respect to the ICPDR and the beneficiary countries.
- Experience from earlier GEF assignments has been carried over to the DRP resulting in professional management of workshops and the dispensation of funds.
- Attention given to NGO development in the region has been addressed through existing (REC and DEF) organizations, strengthening their capacities to become self-sustaining organizations that are well placed to foster growth of civil society awareness and activity in the member countries.
- The flexibility in DRP design, execution and implementation modalities has allowed the DRP to adjust it's content to match the changing political environment, such as welcoming Serbia and Montenegro to become an active member and most importantly providing the ability to utilize UNDP/GEF funding to assist countries to implement the WFD.

UNOPS United Nations Office for Project Services
11-13 Chemin des Anémones, 1219 Châteleine-Genève
Postal Address: Palais des Nations, CH-1211 Genève 10

Consultants' Terms of Reference

For the Mid-term Independent Evaluation of the
Danube Regional Project

Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin RER/01/G32

1. Introduction & Background

The long-term development objective of this GEF International Waters Project is to contribute to sustainable human development in the DRB and the wider Black Sea area through reinforcing the capacities of the participating countries in developing effective mechanisms for regional cooperation and coordination in order to ensure protection of international waters, sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity.

In this context, the GEF Regional Project, being divided into two Phases, should support the ICPDR, its structures and the participating countries in order to ensure an integrated and coherent implementation of the Strategic Action Plan 1994 (revised SAP 1999), the ICPDR Joint Action Programme and the related investment programmes in line with the objectives of the DRPC.

The overall objective of the Danube Regional Project is to complement the activities of the ICPDR required to provide a regional approach and global significance to the development of national policies and legislation and the definition of priority actions for nutrient reduction and pollution control with particular attention to achieving sustainable transboundary ecological effects within the DRB and the Black Sea area.
The Danube Regional Project, in its Phases 1 and 2, shall facilitate implementation of the Danube River Protection Convention in providing a framework for coordination, dissemination and replication of successful demonstration that will be developed through investment projects (World Bank-GEF Partnership Investment Facility for Nutrient Reduction, EBRD, EU programmes for accession countries etc.).

The specific objective of Phase 1, December 2001 – December 2003, is to prepare and initiate basin-wide capacity-building activities, which will be consolidated in the second phase of the Project. This second Phase will be implemented from April 2004 – April 2007, building up on the results archived in the first Phase. During the first Phase, altogether 20 project components with 80 activities have been carried out and thus establishing a solid base for the implementation of Phase 2.

2. Objectives and scope of the mid-term evaluation

The objective of the mid-term evaluation is to enable ICPDR, the Government bodies in the participating countries, UNDP-GEF and UNOPS to assess the progress and to take decisions on the future orientation and emphasis of the project during its remaining time.

The evaluation is an activity in the project cycle which attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the project

against its objectives, including a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and of the project design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important, the in-depth evaluation is expected to lead to detailed recommendations and lessons learned for the future.

The mid- term evaluation will address the following issues :

Project design

- relevance of project design within the framework of GEF guidelines and global concern regarding the Danube river basin;
- appropriateness of the project's concept and design to the current economic, institutional and environmental situation in the target region;
- contribution of the project to the overall development objective as declared in the Project Document; and
- the likely sustainability of project interventions;

Project implementation

- general implementation and management of the UNDP/GEF project by the PCU in terms of quality of inputs and activities, adherence to workplans and budgets, major factors which have facilitated or impeded the progress of project implementation
- adequacy of management arrangements as well as monitoring and backstopping support given to the project by all parties concerned;
- institutional set-up through the ICPDR and various Expert groups and the degree to which it has encouraged full involvement of the countries;
- inputs of the Governments of the Thirteen countries at national and local levels;
- responsiveness of project management to changes in the environment in which the project operates;
- UNOPS and ICPDR execution;
- co-operation among project partners (UNDP/GEF, Project Team, ICPDR, National Governments and international and national organisations and NGOs. specifically with regard to the integration and support of ICPDR

Project impact

- achievements of the project against the original objectives, outputs and activities as detailed in the project document and the Project Implementation plan;
- awareness of the participating countries regarding project outputs;
- level of ownership of the project by the participating countries;
- commitment of countries to support the ongoing project and ICPDR JAP and EU WFD implementation;
- likely degree of support from the Countries' Governments in integrating the project objectives and into their national development programmes and other related projects, and how well the project fits into their national development policy;
- impacts on policy and strategy of countries;
- project impact on improving the capacity to prepare and implement collaborative, targeted and effective efforts for the management of the Danube River Basin
- project impact on enhancing inter-agency and inter-ministerial co-operation in each country and on regional cooperation;
- cooperation among international organisations, NGOs and other stakeholders;
- cooperation with sister projects in the GEF IW portfolio esp. Black Sea Ecosystem Recovery Project.
- sustainability of the project's impact.

Final phase of the project

The mid-term evaluation mission will review the current proposed activitites for the remainder of the project Phase II and provide comments and recommendations.

3. Methodology

The evaluation will consist of three activities:

- document review
- field visits and
- interviews with individuals who are either affiliated to the project in some way or who have or might be expected to be impacted by the project.

Document Review

The evaluator(s) shall familiarise themselves with the project through a review of relevant documents prior to the field visits. These documents include inter alia:

- Project Document, PIP Phase 1
- GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR)(APR) 2002 and 2003
- Minutes of meetings of Steering Committee and Standing Working Group 2002-2003 (Ordinary Meetings)
- UNDP Handbook for Programme Managers: Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation
- Information can also be found at the project web site: www.icpdr.org/undp-drp

Hard copies of selected documents, which are not available through the internet, shall be sent by courier to the evaluator(s) in advance of the mission.

Field visits

The evaluator(s) will visit the participating countries of Hungary, Bulgaria and Serbia and Montenegro, Vienna for debriefing.

Interviews

The evaluator(s) will carry out interviews with:

- Project Staff (Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) and team.
- Experts from the ICPDR PS
- Selected members of the ICPDR Steering Committee and Standing Working Groups
- Selected members of the ICPDR Expert Groups
- Representatives of the relevant NGOs, DEF, WWF
- Other constituencies and stakeholders not directly involved in the project who may have experienced, or may be expected to experience, its impacts.

Although the independent evaluators should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to their assignment, they are not authorised to make any commitment on behalf of UNOPS, UNDP or GEF.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the above objectives and methodology, the evaluation mission should provide conclusions and recommendations, including:

- general recommendations on the implementation of the project
- the degree to which the project objectives have been satisfied
- significant lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not
- recommendations on further action upon completion of the current project

5. Mission Report

The evaluation mission will complete the Project Evaluation Information Sheet (PEIS) according to the existing format and produce a report according to the structure outlined in the UNDP Guideline for Evaluators. In addition, the final report should contain at least the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference for final evaluation
- Itinerary
- List of meetings attended
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Any other relevant material

As the report is the product of an independent evaluation, it is up to the evaluator(s) to make use of the information provided during the mission. However, the evaluator is responsible for reflecting any factual corrections brought to his/her attention prior to the finalisation of the report. Therefore, in order to ensure that the report considers the view of all parties concerned, is properly understood, and is factually accurate, it is necessary for the evaluator to submit draft reports to the project , UNDP/GEF and UNOPS. UNOPS will revert promptly with collective feedback from project partners in order that the evaluator may finalise the report.

The final version of the evaluation mission report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) and hard copy to UNOPS no later than June 15th.

6. Composition of the mid-term evaluation mission

The evaluation will be performed by two internationally recruited consultants. The consultants will have considerable knowledge and experience regarding GEF IW operational programme, including water legislation, policy, and EU WFD. A good knowledge of river basin management issues and relevant scientific understanding and in-depth experience of project evaluation techniques, particularly of those projects which are funded by GEF. One consultant will be designated the lead consultant and will be responsible for the production of the final report.

The consultants shall not have been directly involved in the design or implementation of the project.

7. Indicative mission timetable and itinerary

The duration of the consultancy working days, including travel time, based on the following itinerary:

Date	Time	Location/Description	Institution

8. Contact information

Contact information for DRP, UNOPS and UNDP/GEF:

DRP:

Ivan Zavadsky
Chief Technical Advisor
UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project
Vienna International Centre
D0418, P.O Box 500
A-1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel: +431260605615
Fax: +431260605837
Ivan.Zavadsky@unvienna.org

UNOPS

Andrew Menz, Ph.D
Senior Portfolio Manager
Division for Environmental Programmes
UNOPS
11-13 Chemin des Anemones
1219 Chatelaine, Geneva
Tel. +41 (0)22 917 8556
Fax. +41 (0)22 917 8062
andrewm@unops.org

UNDP-GEF

Mr. Andrew HUDSON
Principal Technical Advisor – International Waters UNDP-GEF
Global Environment Facility
United Nations Development Programme
Room FF-1076
One United Nations Plaza
304E 45th Street
New York, NY 10017, USA

Telephone: +1 212 906 6228
Fax: +1 212 906 6998
E-mail: andrew.hudson@undp.org

ANNEX 2

MISSION ITINERARY

Evaluators:
Mr. Alan Fox, Lead Evaluator
Mr. Antti Rautavaara, Evaluator

Tuesday 13.4.2004

08.30	Mr. Alan Fox arrival to Vienna – LH 3530;
09.35	Mr. Antti Rautavaara arrival to Vienna – OS 348;
11.00 – 12.00	meeting with DRP staff;
12.00 – 16.00	meeting with Mr. Ivan Zavadsky, Project Manager, Danube Regional Project (DRP)
16.00 – 18.00	meeting with Mr. Philip Weller, Executive Secretary, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR);

Wednesday 14.4.2004

09.00 – 10.00	meeting with Ms. Monika Kovacova, DEF Secretariat;
10.00 – 11.00	meeting with Dr. Fritz Holzwarth, Head of Delegation Germany, ICPDR President 2003;
11.00 – 12.30	meeting with ICPDR staff: Mr. Karoly Futaki, Info and Admin; Ms. Mihaela Popovici, Technical Expert and; Ms. Ursula Schmedtje, Technical Expert;
12.30 – 14.00	lunch meeting with DRP staff Mr. Andy Garner, Environmental Specialist and Ms. Kari Eik, Finance / Administration Officer;
14.00 – 14.30	teleconference with Mr. Charlie Avis, World Wildlife Fund (WWF);
14.30 – 15.30	meeting with Mr. Johannes Wolf, DEF Speaker;
15.30 – 17.00	meeting with Ms. Jasmine Bachmann, ICPDR;

Thursday 15.4.2004

08.35 – 11.30	travel by train to Budapest, Hungary;
14.30 – 15.30	meeting with Dr. Ferenc László, MLIM EG, Director of Institute for Water Pollution Control, Water Resources Research Centre Plc. (VITUKI Plc)
16.00 – 17.00	meeting with Ibolya Gazdag, RBM / ECON ESG, VEOLIA Water Hungary;

Friday 16.4.2004

09.30 – 11.00	meeting with Mr. Gyula Holló, Head of Delegation Hungary, Ministry of Environment and Water; and Ms. Mária Galambos, Ministry of Environment and Water
11.00 – 12.30	meeting with Mr. Peter Kovacs, RBM EG, and Mr. Zsuzsa Steindl, EMIS EG, Ministry of Environment and Water;
13.30 – 15.00	meeting with Mr. Georgy Pinter, APC EG, Water Resources Research Centre Plc. (VITUKI Plc)
15.30 – 17.00	meeting with Ms. Aureola Ivanova, Deputy Director, and Ms. Entela Pinguli, SGP Manager, Regional Environmental Centre (REC);

Saturday 17.4.2004

reading and report writing;

Sunday 18.4.2004

travel by train to Belgrad, Serbia-Montenegro;

Monday 19.4.2004

09.30 – 10.30	meeting with Mr. Zdravko Tuvic, former Head of Delegation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
11.00 – 12.45	meeting with Ms. Jovanka Ignjatovic, APC EG, Ministry of Protection of Natural Resources and Environment
13.30 – 17.00	meeting with Mr. Milan Dimkic, Director, Jaroslav Cerni Institute and Mr. Miodrag Milovanovic, Deputy Director, RBM EG, Jaroslav Cerni Institute

Tuesday 20.4.2004

09.30 – 11.00	meeting with Mr. Nikola Marjanovic, Head of Delegation, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Management – Directorate for Water
11.30 – 12.30	Ms. Emira Maljevic, MLIM EG, Republic Hydrometeorological Service of Serbia
14.00 – 15.30	meeting with Mr. Miroslav Spasojevic, National Consultant for DRP, Ministry of Science and Environment – Directorate of Environment
16.00 – 18.45	meeting with Ms. Natasa Djereg, Green Network of Vojvodina, Ms. Medve Agnes, Project Manager, Teras Natural Food Association and Representative of Regional Environment Centre – Serbia Country Office

Wednesday 21.4.2004

travel by flight to Sofia, Bulgaria

Thursday 22.4.2004

10.00 – 11.00	meeting with Ms. Vania Shopova, National Consultant, Bulgarian Building and Construction Chamber
11.30 – 12.00	meeting with Ms. Marietta Stoimenova was cancelled, brief talks with Ms. Viktoria Gaydarova Administrator of Wetlands Restoration and Pollution Reduction Project (WRPRP)
14.30 – 15.00	meeting with Ms. Lise-Lau-Bang Nikolaisen, ISPA Environment, EC Delegation - Sofia

Friday 23.4 .2004

09.30 – 11.00	meeting with Mr. Nikolai Kouyumdzhiev, HoD of ICPDR, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Environment and Waters, Republic of Bulgaria
11.00 – 12.00	meeting with Ms. Violeta Roiatchka, Deputy HoD of ICPDR, State Expert, Ministry of Environment and Waters, Republic of Bulgaria
12.00 – 13.00	meeting with Ms. Tsevetelina Ivanova, ECO EG, Ministry of Environment and Waters, Republic of Bulgaria
13.00 – 14.00	meeting with Mr. Krasimir Gorchev, EMIS EG, Ministry of Environment and Waters, Republic of Bulgaria
15.30 – 16.15	meeting with Ms. Eli Tsvetkova, RBM ECON ESG, Ministry of Environment and Waters, Republic of Bulgaria

Saturday 24.4.2004

	report writing travel by flight to Vienna, Austria

Sunday 25.4.2004

	report writing

Monday 26.4.2004

08.30 – 09.00	debriefing with Mr. Ivan Zavadsky, Project Manager, Danube Regional Project
09.00 – 09.45	conference call with Mr. Patrick Murphy, Deputy President of ICPDR, DG Environment, European Commission
09.45 – 11.00	conference call with Mr. Mark Redmann, International Consultant for 1.2 and 1.3
11.00 – 12.00	meeting with Ms. Kari Eik, Finance and Administrative Officer, Danube Regional Project
13.00 – 14.00	conference call with Mr. Gerhard Sigmund, Vice Chair for ECO EG, ICPDR
14.00 – 15.00	conference call with Mr. Tom Owen, International Consultant for 1.5 Industrial reform and BAT
15.00 – 16.00	conference call with Mr. Glenn Morris and Mr. Andras Kiss, International Consultant for 1.6 and 1.7 Tariffs
16.00 – 18.00	debriefing meeting with Mr. Ivan Zavadsky, Project Manager, DRP debriefing meeting with Mr. Andrew Menz, Principal Portfolio Manager, UNOPS

Tue 27.4

13.00 – 15.00	meeting with Mr. Andy Garner, Environmental Specialist, DRP
15.00 – 17.00	meeting with Mr. Andrew Menz, Principal Portfolio Manager, UNOPS meeting with Mr. Ivan Zavadsky, Project Manager, DRP
19.15 -	Mr. Alan Fox return flight LH 6337
19.35 -	Mr. Antti Rautavaara return flight O S 347

ANNEX 3

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

1. Vienna, Austria

United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
Mr. Andrew Menz, Principal Portfolio Manager

UNDP-GEF Danube Regional Project (DRP)
Mr. Ivan Zavadsky, Project Manager
Mr. Andy Garner, Environmental Specialist
Ms. Kari Eik, Finance and Administrative Officer

International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)
Mr. Philip Weller, Executive Secretary, ICPDR
Mr. Fritz Holzwarth, Former ICPDR President
Mr. Karoly Futaki, Info and Admin
Ms. Mihaela Popovici, Technical Expert
Ms. Ursula Schmedtje, Technical Expert
Ms. Jasmine Bachmann, Public Relations Manager

Danube Environment Forum (DEF)
Ms. Monika Kovacova, DEF Executive Secretary
Mr. Johannes Wolf, DEF Speaker

Teleconferences with
Mr. Charlie Avis, World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
Mr. Patrick Murphy, Deputy President of ICPDR, DG Environment, European Commission
Mr. Mark Redmann, International Consultant for 1.2 and 1.3
Mr. Gerhard Sigmund, Vice Chair for ECO EG, ICPDR
Mr. Tom Owen, International Consultant for 1.5 Industrial reform and BAT
Mr. Glenn Morris and Mr. Andras Kiss, International Consultant for 1.6 and 1.7 Tariffs

2. Budapest, Hungary

Dr. Ferenc László, MLIM EG, Director of Institute for Water Pollution Control, Water Resources Research Centre Plc. (VITUKI Plc)
Ms. Ibolya Gazdag, RBM/ECON ESG, VEOLIA Water Hungary
Mr. Gyula Holló, Head of Delegation Hungary, Ministry of Environment and Water
Ms. Mária Galambos, Ministry of Environment and Water
Mr. Peter Kovacs, RBM EG, Ministry of Environment and Water
Mr. Zsuzsa Steindl, EMIS EG, Ministry of Environment and Water
Mr. Georgy Pinter, APC EG, Water Resources Research Centre Plc. (VITUKI Plc)
Ms. Aureola Ivanova, Deputy Director, Regional Environmental Centre (REC)
Ms. Entela Pinguli, SGP Manager, Regional Environmental Centre (REC)

3. Belgrad, Serbia-Montenegro

Mr. Zdravko Tuvic, former Head of Delegation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ms. Jovanka Ignjatovic, APC EG, Ministry of Protection of Natural Resources and Environment
Mr. Milan Dimkic, Director, Jaroslav Cerni Institute
Mr. Miodrag Milovanovic, Deputy Director, Jaroslav Cerni Institute
Mr. Nikola Marjanovic, Head of Delegation, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Management – Directorate for Water
Ms. Emira Maljevic, MLIM EG, Republic Hydrometeorological Service of Serbia
Mr. Miroslav Spasojevic, National Consultant for DRP, Ministry of Science and Environment – Directorate of Environment
Ms. Natasa Djereg, Green Network of Vojvodina,
Ms. Medve Agnes, Project Manager, Terras Natural Food Association
Representative of Regional Environment Centre – Serbia Country Office

4. Sofia, Bulgaria

Ms. Vania Shopova, National Consultant, Bulgarian Building and Construction Chamber
Ms. Marietta Stoimenova was cancelled, brief talks with Ms. Viktoria Gaydarova Administrator of Wetlands Restoration and Pollution Reduction Project (WRPRP)
Ms. Lise-Lau-Bang Nikolaisen, ISPA Environment, EC Delegation - Sofia
Mr. Nikolai Kouyumdzhiev, HoD of ICPDR, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Environment and Waters
Ms. Violeta Roiatchka, Deputy HoD of ICPDR, State Expert, Ministry of Environment and Waters
Ms. Tsevetelina Ivanova, ECO EG, Ministry of Environment and Waters,
Mr. Krasimir Gorchev, EMIS EG, Ministry of Environment and Waters
Ms. Eli Tsvetkova, RBM ECON ESG, Ministry of Environment and Waters

ANNEX 4

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

DPR Related Documents:

Project Document (Phase 1) – Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin, June 2001;

Project Document (Phase 2) – Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin, September 2003;

Project Brief for Danube Regional Project - Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin, 1 September 2000;

UNDP-GEF Danube Regional Project – Project Implementation Plan, Phase 1 (2002-2003), Revision 10.04.2002;

UNDP-GEF Black Sea Ecosystem Recovery Project – Project Implementation Plan, Phase 1 (2002-2004);

UNDP-GEF Danube Regional Project – Inception Workshop Report, 6-8 February 2002 Austria;

GEF Council Work Program Submission Project Executive Summary;

UNDP Annual Project Report (APR) – UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR) 2003;

Danube Regional Project Tripartite Review (TPR) Report for period Dec 2001 – Jan 2003, February 2003;

Status of Project Implementation – DRP Phase 1 (as of March 2004);

Checklist for Reports from the DRP Phase 1;

Final Report: Activity 1.1.2 "Adapting and implementing common approaches and methodologies for stress and impact analysis with particular attention to hydromorphological conditions":
Activity 1.1.6 " Developing the typology of surface waters and defining the relevant reference conditions";
Activity 1.1.7 "Implementing ecological status assessment in line with requirements of EU Water Framework Directive using specific bioindicators"

Pilot Project for Promoting Best Agricultural Practice (BAP) in the Central and Lower Danube River Basin Countries: Concept and Project Proposals,
February 2004, GFA Terra Systems in cooperation with Avalon;

Final Report: Policies for the Control of Agricultural Point and Non-point Sources of Pollution and Pilot Project on Agricultural Pollution Reduction (Project Outputs 1.2 and 1.3)
March 2004, GFA Terra Systems in cooperation with Avalon;

Recommendations for Policy Reforms for the Introduction of Best Agricultural Practice (BAP) in the Central and Lower Danube River Basin Countries,
February 2004, GFA Terra Systems in cooperation with Avalon;

1st DRAFT of Final Report: "Development of Indicators for Project Monitoring and Impact Evaluation", 12 March 2004, University of Leeuwarden;

Terminal Evaluation – Developing the Danube River Basin Pollution Reduction Program (RER/96/G31), June 1999;

ICPDR Related Documents:

Joint Action Programme for the Danube River Basin January 2001 – December 2005, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River / Permanent Secretariat;

Convention on Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the Danube River (Danube River Protection Convention);

Annual Report of the Activities of the ICPDR in 2002;

Strategic Paper for Development of a Danube River Basin District Management Plan, May 2002, RBM EG, ICPDR;

Danube River Basin Strategy for Public Participation in River Basin Management Planning 2003 – 2009, ICPDR, October 2003;

ICPDR Operation Plan to ensure Public Participation in implementing the EU Water Framework Directive on the basin-wide ("roof") level;

Stakeholder Analysis Workshop, Baden, Austria, December 10-12 2003, by Holger Nauheimer, BeraterKompetenz;

Workshop on Public Participation in the Danube River Basin, 4-5 April 2003, Slovakia;

Outline of Part A – Roof Report 2004, 22 March 22 2005 by RBM EG, ICPDR;

Outline of Part B – National Report 2004, 22 March 2005 by RBM EG, ICPDR;

Summary Report on the 6th Ordinary Meeting of the ICPDR, 1-2 December 2003, Austria;

Summary Report on the 1st Standing Working Group Meeting of the ICPDR, 12-13 June 2003, Germany;

Summary Report on the Ordinary Meeting of the ICPDR, 28-29 November 2002, Austria;

Summary Report on the 7th Steering Group Meeting of the ICPDR, 6-7 June 2002, Czech Republic;
Agenda of the 7th Steering Group Meeting of the ICPDR, 6-7 June 2002;

Common Platform for the Development of National Policies and Actions for Pollution Reduction under the DRPC, May 2000, ICPDR;

Status of the Project Implementation – DRP Phase 1 (as of March 2003);

List of National and International Service Contractors for DRP;

List of active Non-Governmental Organisations in the Danube basin;

List of Selected Projects for SGP Funding;

Danube Environmental Forum: NGO platform for the protection of the Danube River;

Annual Report on the Activities of the ICPDR in 2002;

Blue Print for the Reorganisation of Water Management in the Republic of Serbia and Montenegro, Jaroslav Cerni Institute, April 2003;

Other

International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)
http://www.icpdr.org/pls/danubis/danubis_db.dyn_navigator.show

UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project
http://www.icpdr.org/undp-drp/

Danube Environmental Forum (DEF)
http://www.de-forum.org

The Regional Environmental Center (REC)
http://www.rec.org/

Terras Natural Food Association (NGO) - Serbia and Montenegro
http://www.terras.org.yu

Danube Watch, The Magazine of the Danube River, ICPDR 2/2003 and 1/2004;

Evaluation and Monitoring Guidelines and Manuals

Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Evaluation Office, June 2002;

Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures, Global Environment Facility (GEF), January 2002;

Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators for GEF International Waters Projects, Monitoring and Evaluation Working Paper 10, Global Environment Facility (GEF), November 2002;

Integrating Capacity Development into Project Design and Evaluation – Approach and Frameworks, Monitoring and Evaluation Working Paper 5, Global Environment Facility (GEF), December 2000;
Incremental Costs, GEF/C.7/Inf.5, 29 February 1996;

ANNEX 5

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS OF THE DRP PHASE 1 (DRP - JANUARY 2004)

Project Component	Title of Component	Status at the End of Phase 1
Output 1.1	**Development and implementation of policy guidelines for river basin management**	See specific activities below
	1.1-2: Develop methodologies for stress and impact analysis (hydro-morphological etc.) 1.1-6: Develop the typology of surface waters and define the relevant reference conditions 1.1-7: Implement ecological status assessment in line with EU WFD using specific bio-indicators	- Criteria for significant hydromorphological pressures developed - Overview report on hydromorphological stress and impact analysis - Proposal (Study) for typology & reference conditions for the Danube River - Overview study on existing ecological status assessment and classification systems in the DRB
	1.1-3: Apply the EU Guidelines for economic analysis and arrive at a comparative overall economic analysis for the Danube River Basin	- Synthesis and National Reports on availability / quality of economic data for water use, data gaps, and existing national capacities to carry out specific tasks of the economic analysis
	1.1-5: Develop RBM tools (mapping, GIS) and related data management	- Report: Needs Assessment and Conceptual Design for a DRB GIS
	1.1-8: Characterization and analysis of transboundary groundwater bodies	- Report: Synthesis of Workshop, Analysis of the Results of the Groundwater Questionnaires, Findings, Recommendations
	1.1-9 Developing RBM Plan in a pilot project (Sava River Basin)	- Work plan for development of the Sava RBM plan
	1.1-11: Organize workshops and training courses in order to produce the River Basin Management Plan and to strengthen basin-wide cooperation	- Surface Water Workshop held and Report completed - Groundwater Workshop held and Report finalized - Public Participation Workshop held, Report finished including draft Danube River Basin Public Participation Strategy and draft ICPDR Operational Plan
Output 1.2 and 1.3	**Policies for the control of agricultural point and non-point sources of pollution and pilot projects on agricultural pollution reduction**	- Report on agricultural policies and state of enforcement in DRB - Pesticide and fertilizers and market products and use inventory - Report on existing situation in policy development and implementation of BAP in DRB - Concept for introduction of BAP - Guidelines for manure handling (also in national languages) - Criteria and selection procedure for pilot projects and pilot projects proposal
Output 1.4	**Integrated Land Use Assessment and Inventory of Protected Areas**	- Methodology for Integrated Land Use Assessment finalized - Protected Areas Inventory and Map including report completed - 3 Pilot Sites projects prepared (Case studies on land use in selected pilot areas completed, 3 On-site Stakeholder meetings held, Concepts for appropriate land use in 3 pilot areas developed (December 2003))

Project Component	Title of Component	Status at the End of Phase 1
Output 1.5	**Industrial Reform and the Development of Policies and Legislation Towards the Reduction of Nutrients and Dangerous Substances**	- Methodology on preparation of inventories of industrial pollution sources - Agreed methodology for determining "hot spots and SIAs" "Priority Action Areas" (PAA) - Report on Outdated Techniques in up to 5 key industries - Report on legislative and policy measures and enforcement mechanisms for industrial pollution control, - DRB Report on relevant complementary measures for the introduction of BAT
Output 1.6 and 1.7	**Assessment and Development of Water and Waste Water Tariffs and Effluent Charges Designs focusing on Nutrient Reduction and Control of Dangerous Substances in DRB**	- Reports on institutional capabilities and required arrangements at country level - Country-specific analysis and assessment on actual tariff and charges setting - Country-specific potentials, requirements, principles and recommendations for tariff and charges reforms - Adequate country-specific set of tools
Output 1.8	**Recommendations for the reduction of phosphorus in detergents**	- Report on the existing legislation, policies and voluntary agreements and on data received from detergents industry - Develop proposals for accomplishing a voluntary agreement between ICPDR and the Detergent Industry including proposed time frame
Output 2.1	**Setting up of Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Mechanisms for nutrient reduction and pollution control**	- Analysis report of existing inter-ministerial structures and mechanisms and of activities, competence and capacities of existing structures - Proposal for new structures or for improvement of existing structures
Output 2.2	**Development of operational tools for monitoring, laboratory and information management with particular attention to nutrients and toxic substances**	- Report on Environmental quality objectives and standards for nutrients and other Danube specific priority substances - Methodological concept for stress and impact analysis computerized application - Report on Analysis of the results of the EMIS inventory and their comparison with TNMN and JDS results with particular attention to the EU Priority List of Pollutants developed - Report on proposals for TNMN upgrade and proposal for SOPs for new determinants
Output 2.3	**Improvement of procedures and tools for accidental emergency response with particular attention to transboundary emergency situations**	- Standard forms and communication solution for information exchange in emergency cases PIACs / ICPDR (using ICPDR web site) developed - Discussion paper on ARS Inventory ranking system (methodology) - Discussion paper for development of basic guidelines and recommendations for old contaminated sites in potentionaly flooded areas in DRB - Concept paper for on-the-spot training (Case study) on application of check list methodologies at national level - Study/concept for calibration options and selection of pilot areas - Concept for DBAM calibration - Outline for the DBAM calibration manual

Project Component	Title of Component	Status at the End of Phase 1
Output 2.4	**Support for reinforcement of ICPDR Information System (DANUBIS)**	- Information System at the central level upgraded - New AEWS software implemented, tested and operational - Report on assessment of national national level prepared, including recommendations and detailed specifications for equipment - Use of DANUBIS at the national level enhanced via 11 national information trainings - Project web page developed and updated regularly - Reporting format integrated into DANUBIS
Output 2.5	**Implementation of the "Memorandum of Understanding" between the ICPDR and the ICPBS relating to discharges of nutrients and hazardous substances to the Black Sea**	- Joint Technical WG re-established and regular meetings held - TOR of the Joint Working Group and Work Program agreed - Status indicators to monitor nutrient and hazardous substances transport from the Danube and change of ecosyst. in the Black Sea developed - Reporting procedure defined and agreed upon
Output 2.6	**Training and consultation workshops for resource management and pollution control with particular attention to nutrient reduction and transboundary issues**	- Training Needs Assessment Report (Dec. 2003) - DRB Human Resource Development Plan (Jan. 2004) containing Proposed Training Courses defined for: i) Effectiveness and efficiency of transboundary institutions i.e. ICPDR and other key stakeholders (DEF etc.) ii) Technical training as needed related to river basin management issues - Two training courses held (Information Facilitator training and Facilitation Skills for ICPDR meetings)
Output 3.1	**Support for institutional development of NGOs and community involvement**	- DEF Secretariat established and fully operational - DEF Development Strategy & Media/Communication Strategy prepared - DEF brochure prepared in English and in 11 national languages - DEF newsletter established, published bi-annually in national languages - DEF Board Meetings (bi-annually)and General Assembly (annually) held - DEF Web-page expanded and translated into different national languages - Training Workshops on Wetland Rehabilitation and Nutrient Reduction held in 11 countries (Training materials in English & national language) - Preparations for the Publication on DRB Environmental Issues made
Output 3.2	**Applied awareness raising through community based "Small Grant Program"**	- Regional Grant Programme (1st call) Prepared, Announced and Projects Selected (5 regional projects) - National Grant (1st call) Programme Prepared, Announced, and Projects Selected (58 projects in 11 countries)
Output 3.3	**Organization of public awareness raising campaigns on nutrient reduction and control of toxic substances**	- DRB Communication Strategy developed (Dec. 2003) - Brochure on Danube Regional Project produced - Danube Watch on Public Participation in the DRB published - Report: Assessment of the Danube Watch with Recommendations made
Output 4.1	**Development of indicators for project monitoring and impact evaluation**	- Scoping Paper on elements to consider in a DRB M & E system - Framework for a general system of indicators including GEF system as well as other relevant indicator systems (WFD, DPSIR etc.)(Mar. 2004) - Framework for impact indicators to evaluate environmental effects of policy and programme implementation (Mar. 2004)

Project Component	Title of Component	Status at the End of Phase 1
Output 4.3	**Monitoring and assessment of nutrient removal capacities of riverine wetlands**	- Report including: Guidelines on Methodology for Monitoring Nutrient Removal, Recommendations for Monitoring in identified Pilot Areas
Output 4.4	**Danube Basin study on nutrient pollution trading and corresponding economic instruments for nutrient reduction**	- Analysis and assessment report regarding existing concepts of pollution trading or corresponding economic instruments - Report on general possibilities for establishing appropriate economic instruments for nutrient reduction in the DRB - Report on pollution trading potential and readiness on a country basis including principles for definition of discharge quotas - Assessment of general viability of the "pollution trading" concept in the DRB and recommendations to the ICPDR