**Annex 5**

**Templates for Mid-Term Evaluation Report**

**(Individual and Consensus)**

**Water Joint Programming Initiative**

**2018 Joint Call**

*Closing the water cycle gap - Sustainable management of water resources*

These Project Management Guidelines will be effective from the date of the National funding decisions and shall remain in force until the last final project report is approved in 2022.

**The Mid-Term Consensus Report will be made available to the Consortium as well as CSC and JPI Water GB.**

**MID-TERM INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**PROJECT TITLE AND ACRONYM**

Name of Coordinator: Dr Jasper De VRIES

Project code: WaterWorks2017-EnTruGo

Duration of project: 30 months

Start date:  **September 2019** End date: **March 2022**

**DETAILS OF THE EVALUATOR**

Name: Gaëtane SUZENET

Organisation: International Impact Partners

Date of review: 30 March 2021

### **Scientific and technological progress**

|  |
| --- |
| *Progress has mainly been made towards objective 1 ‘evaluating the status of trust in government institutions tasked with water management’ and on work package (WP) 1 tasks. WP 2 tasks have been launched.**WP1: Task 1.1 has been achieved. The Dutch and Swedish partners extensively reviewed the existing literature. The review was meant to gain knowledge on trust in government tasked with water management. A scientific paper summarising the results has been under preparation. Task 1.2 has been launched, and was not yet completed at the time of the reporting period. The consortium developed a common template for both the survey and the interviews. The survey was completed in all countries, except in South Africa. The results of the survey will be compared and published into a scientific paper and policy brief. First results indicated a relatively high trust in water governance bodies in Norway and the Netherlands. Interviews were completed in Sweden, and were under way or will be started beyond the reporting period in other countries.* *WP2: Task 2.1 on building on 3 European case studies has been launched. Contacts with specific groups to explore how to shape the participatory workshops and questions have been made in Sweden and data gathered in Norway. There is no progress reported for the Netherlands. South African case studies were to be decided beyond the reporting period.**Progress of the project has promoted a multi-disciplinary approach through the involvement of different citizens’, youth and industrial groups and national, regional water authorities.* |

### **Collaboration, coordination and mobility within the Consortium** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *The mid-term report demonstrates the efficiency of the coordination and organisation of the project fairly well. E.g. Protocols for specific tasks of the project (e.g. literature review) have been designed. Collaboration between the partners has also been active and effective, through both the organisation of 3 levels of coordination (consortium, post-docs in each country and ad hoc whenever an issue arises) and one to one collaboration on specific project tasks, e.g. the Dutch and Swedish partners collaborated on the survey design. Because of the COVID 19 situation, the consortium organised periodic progress meetings. 13 meetings (including the kick-off meeting) were organised over the period running from December 2018 to September 2020. Mobility has been limited due to COVID 19. It has however been compensated by both close and/or bilateral collaboration between partners and resources allocated to two countries, e.g. An intern, hosted by the Swedish partner, did a comparative study of water governance in Sweden and South Africa, in cooperation with the South African partner. The transnational aspect is a key feature of the project as the latter is carried out in 4 different countries and some tasks are carried out bilaterally and in close collaboration between at least 2 countries. It allows for comparison and benchmark of different governance environments.* |

### **Coordination with other international project funded by WaterWorks2017, or other instruments**

|  |
| --- |
| *The mid-report mentions the collaboration with another Water JPI project NATWIP as the latter covers the same case study areas (Norway, Sweden and South Africa). Collaboration has also been initiated at the national level, in Sweden with the project RE-LAND funded by FORMAS, and in South Africa with the project CoReCT. A similar approach has been developed in Norway. The mid-report does however not mention how these collaborations will enhance the approach and outcomes of the EnTruGo project.*  |

### **Coverage of the themes and sub-themes of the call**

|  |
| --- |
| *The EnTruGo project relates to the Theme 2 ‘Strengthening socio-economic approaches to water management’ and in particular to Sub-theme 2.4. ‘Promoting new governance management approaches’. To date, the project has built the knowledge on the general public’s trust in water governance and in government institutions entrusted with water management. This will form the basis for assessing the impact of democratic innovative approaches and identifying governance strategies to enhance trust in government’s capacities to implement water policies.*  |

1. **Stakeholder/industry engagement**

|  |
| --- |
| *Stakeholders’ participation has been initiated during this reporting period, mainly to design the survey and conduct interviews. The project partners considered it as a pre-requisite to enhance the methodological approach to study the interpersonal trust. It will be furthered and stepped up in WP2 with the case studies and WP3 with the workshops. Contacts have already been instigated. Stakeholders’ participation is inherent to the process implemented in the project and is a key requirement to improve water governance.**The industry has not yet been involved. It may be during the next reporting period, when fully carrying out WP2.* *No commercial exploitation of the results is planned as the results are linked to improve governance in water resources management. Results will be publicly made.*  |

### **Recommendations for improvements/amendments of the report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Modification** | **Rationale for change** |
| 29 | Collaboration with other projects | To better understand how the projects mentioned will influence/contribute to the project’s outcomes. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Recommendations/ problems and risks**

|  |
| --- |
| *Completion of WP1 Deliverables has been delayed because of administrative issues and a delay in the starting date of the project. Also, the literature review and survey design have proved to entail more work than expected. The mid-term report does however not give the reasons why.* *The COVID 19 situation has hampered to fully implement the stakeholders’ involvement process, and limited the collaboration with the relevant stakeholders.**As a result and to mitigate the impacts of the delays, the consortium has decided to have a more combined approach between WPs2 and 3.* |