

Mid-term evaluation report [International Waters Programme]

By Peter Hunnam and Cedric Schuster

*IWP-Pacific Technical Report (International
Waters Project) no. 3*



Global
Environment
Facility



United Nations
Development
Programme



Pacific Regional
Environment
Programme

SPREP IRC Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Hunnam, Peter

Mid-term evaluation report / [by] Peter Hunnam and Cedric Schuster. – Apia, Samoa : SPREP, 2004.

85 p. ; 29 cm.

IWP-Pacific Technical Report (International Waters Project) no. 3

ISBN: 982-04-0264-6

ISSN: 1818-5614

1. Evaluation – Utilization. 2. Performance standards. I. Schuster, Cedric. II. International Waters Programme. III. South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). IV. Title.

658.404

This report was produced by SPREP's International Waters Project that is implementing the Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States with funding from the Global Environment Facility.

The views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the publisher.

Cover design by SPREP's Publications Unit
Editing and layout: Sasae Walters

Printed by
Marfleet Printing Co. Ltd.
Apia, Samoa

SPREP
P O Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Ph: (685) 21929 Fax: (685) 20231
Email: sprep@sprep.org.ws
Website: www.sprep.org.ws/iwp

© SPREP 2004

The South Pacific Regional Environment Programme authorizes the reproduction of this material, whole or in part, provided appropriate acknowledgement is given.

International Waters Project

**Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme
of the Pacific Small Islands Developing States**

Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Peter Hunnam and Cedric Schuster

July 2003

CONTENTS

Acronyms and abbreviations	<u>43</u>
Executive Summary	<u>55</u>
Summary of MTE Recommendations	<u>88</u>
Introduction.....	<u>1242</u>
Evaluation – Project Concept and Design	<u>1242</u>
The Global Environment Facility International Waters Operational Programme	<u>1242</u>
Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region	<u>1444</u>
The Project Concept	<u>1545</u>
Project Design Process	<u>1646</u>
The Project Design	<u>1646</u>
Evaluation – Project Results	<u>2020</u>
Component 1. Results: Enhanced Trans-Boundary Mechanisms	<u>2020</u>
Project Management Arrangements	<u>2124</u>
Enhancing Trans-Boundary Management Mechanisms	<u>2424</u>
Component 2. Results Integrated Coastal Waters and Watershed Management	<u>2626</u>
National Analysis and Planning	<u>2727</u>
Technical Assistance and Guidance to ICWM Pilot Project Development	<u>2828</u>
National Pilot Project Development	<u>2929</u>
Component 4. Results Effective Project-Related Community and Donor Participation	<u>3030</u>
Communications	<u>3134</u>
Capacity Building	<u>3134</u>
Partnerships	<u>3232</u>
Evaluation – Project Administration.....	<u>3333</u>
Information Management	<u>3333</u>
Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation	<u>3333</u>
Financial Management	<u>3434</u>
ANNEXES	<u>3838</u>
ANNEX I Provisional Recommendations for IW Activities in Participating Countries	<u>3939</u>
ANNEX II Additional Comments on the Strategic Action Programme	<u>4444</u>
ANNEX III Project Document References to the Importance of Community Involvement	<u>4646</u>
ANNEX IV Additional Recommendations for Improving the Logical Framework	<u>4747</u>
ANNEX V Possible Types of Pilot Activities	<u>4848</u>
ANNEX VI Terms of Reference	<u>4949</u>
ANNEX VII Mid-Term Evaluation Itinerary Achieved	<u>5454</u>
ANNEX VIII Documents Reviewed during the MTE	<u>5555</u>
ANNEX IX Persons Consulted during the MTE	<u>5757</u>

Acronyms and abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMAK	Aia Maea Ainen Kiribati
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BSAP	Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
CAPAC	Community Assessment and Participation Advisory Committee
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community-based organisation
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
EA	Executing Agency
EPA	Environment Protection Agency
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
FSP	Foundation for the People of the South Pacific
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HoE	Heads of Environment
IA	Implementing Agency
ICARE	Integrated Community Approach for Resources and the Environment
ICWM	Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management
ICPL	International Centre for Protected Landscapes
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IW	International Waters
LA	Lead Agency
LMMA	Locally-Managed Marine Area
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MPR	Multi-Partite Review
MSWG	Marine Sector Working Group (CROP)
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NC	National Coordinator
NECC	National Environment Coordinating Committee
NEMS	National Environment Management Strategy
NEX	National Execution procedures (UNDP)
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NTF	National Task Force
OFM	Oceanic Fisheries Management
OP	Operational Programme (GEF)
PEC	Priority Environmental Concerns
PCU	Project Coordination Unit (SPREP IW)
PIC	Pacific Island Countries
PICCAP	Pacific Islands Climate Change Adaptation Project
PIRT	Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PT	Project Team
PTAG	Programme Technical Advisory Group
RTF	Regional Task Force
SAP	Strategic Action Programme (International Waters)
SAPHE	ADB Sanitation & Public Health Project, Kiribati
SICHE	Solomon Islands College of Higher Education
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SIDT	Solomon Islands Development Trust
SOPAC	South Pacific Applied Geo-Science Commission
SoE	State of Environment
SPBCP	South Pacific Biodiversity conservation Programme
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TDA	Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TRAC	A UNDP Project
UNCED	UN Conference on Environment & Development
UNDOALOS	UN Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UPNG	University of Papua New Guinea
USD	United States Dollar
USP	The University of the South Pacific
WB	World Bank
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Executive Summary

1. The International Waters Project aims to strengthen the management and conservation of marine, coastal and freshwater resources in the Pacific islands region. It is financed through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) International Waters Programme, implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in conjunction with the governments of the 14 independent Pacific island countries. The initiative was designed as a 5-year phase of pilot activities, started in 2000, and was extended after 3 years to a planned completion date in 2006.
2. An independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project was carried out in the period April-July 2003¹. The background and history of the Project's formulation, inception and progress over the first three years of implementation were reviewed through Project files, documents and interviews with Project executants and partner agencies in the participating countries. The process culminated in a presentation and discussion of the main recommendations with the Project's governing body, the Multi-Partite Review, following which the report was finalised.
3. The Evaluation Report reviews the Project concept and design, Project management arrangements, implementation activities and results obtained. Evaluation of each aspect of the Project is based on comparison between what was planned and what has been achieved to date, and an understanding of what has happened and why. A major purpose of the evaluation is to identify the needs and opportunities for improvement of efficiency, relevance and effectiveness in the second half of the Project, and recommendations are made throughout the Report for adjustments to the ways in which elements of the Project are being implemented.
4. The Executive Summary provides an outline of the evaluation report, highlighting the main conclusions from the first part of the Project, issues that are apparent and recommendations to address them.

Evaluation Overview

5. The Mid-Term Evaluation concludes that the International Waters Project is an important and highly relevant initiative for the Pacific islands region and in terms of potential global benefits. It is providing a major opportunity for each of the independent island countries and the region as a whole to make a difference to the ways in which their most important natural resources – their coastal waters and islands – are managed and governed.
6. The Project is a timely and well resourced initiative between the Global Environment Facility and the Pacific Small Island Developing States, facilitated by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and supported by the United Nations Development Programme. Its important aims include promotion and coordination of engagement of other donors and partner organisations to extend the programme in time and geographically.
7. The concept is strategically sound and appropriate. The idea is to enable a series of pilot projects to be undertaken in the 14 PICs, with national and regional support, coordination and sharing of results and lessons. The Project offers a strategic approach for small island countries to tackle common issues, with guidance from a Strategic Action Programme drawn up by the participants and from the GEF Operational Strategy for the International Waters Programme. The concept is to advocate and facilitate broad community, public and government engagement, enabling collaborative, integrating approaches to natural resource management that are comprehensive and multi-sectoral in scope. The design emphasises exploring effective solutions to some of the root causes of prevailing International Waters issues and places major focus on learning, demonstrating and sharing lessons.

Achievements

8. Implementation started in 2000 and has been underway for 3.5 years. A principal achievement in this first half of the Project has been the establishment of efficient arrangements for managing and supporting Project implementation. The GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP, and Executing

¹ The consultants who conducted the review and evaluation were Peter Hunnam and Cedric Schuster, with inputs from UNDP GEF Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, Dr Juha Uitto.

Agency, SPREP, form a constructive partnership for organising Project delivery. The SPREP Secretariat has established a new International Waters Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at its Apia headquarters and recruited a dynamic, dedicated team of professional and support staff to drive implementation. To service their operations, they have developed high quality systems for administration, financial management, communications and information management.

9. SPREP is the peak environment body for the region and provides an important liaison role between the governments of the participating countries. It is also the lead environment agency on the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific and the IW Project has formed close working relations with other CROP member programmes, particularly with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, SPC, and Forum Fisheries Agency, FFA, in relation to coastal, marine and fisheries matters. Through the CROP Marine Sector Working Group, the IW Project has contributed to the preparation of the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy.
10. IW Project administration and coordination arrangements have been established, to varying standards, with each of the 14 participating countries. National Coordinators (NCs) for International Waters have been employed in all of the countries and are developing into a valuable corps of executives for the Project across the region. In each of the countries a form of National Task Force has been established and, with varying effect, these groups play an important role, working with the NCs, planning and steering a process of reviewing priority environmental concerns, engaging stakeholders and formulating plans for in-country pilots.
11. The SPREP PCU has developed a significant capacity to service these in-country efforts. The unit's staff provide specialist advice, assistance and training, in the fields of community assessment and participation, resource economics, communications, administration and financial management. A series of substantial reviews of past experiences and lessons from comparable programmes was commissioned and published in the first part of the Project. The main mechanisms used subsequently by the PCU to guide implementation have been written guidelines and strategies, combined with individual and group training sessions aimed primarily at developing the skills of the NCs. Project resources have been used also to develop two substantial new courses under the Train:Sea:Coast programme, on fisheries management and economics for environmental management.

Key Issues and Lessons

12. A purpose of the evaluation is to record and disseminate lessons that may be useful to other programmes and agencies as well as to Project management. The majority of lessons derived from implementation to date concern the effectiveness and efficiency of processes that have been followed in planning, designing, setting-up and managing the first half of the Project.
13. Strategic Action Programme: The SAP is a useful tool for planning, guiding and monitoring International Waters projects. The Pacific SAP was prepared in the period 1995- 1997 and remains a valuable succinct analysis and plan for the pilot phase Project across the region. However, the SAP preparation process in the Pacific was not effective in achieving engagement and collaboration of key stakeholders and, subsequently, few participants in the Project at regional or national levels appear to make use of the SAP or its framework of analysis. The MTE concludes that there is a need for a comparable process of analysis, planning and stakeholder engagement in International Waters issues to be undertaken in each of the participating countries, linked to or identifiable as a component of the regional SAP. It would be valuable to use a framework of regional and national IW SAPs to collate and integrate the range of other relevant strategic and programme plans that are in existence.
14. Project Formulation: The MTE concludes that the formulation of the International Waters Project was not carried out thoroughly and that this has been a major hindrance to efficient and effective implementation. The Logical Framework was poorly developed, there were inconsistencies in the design, and the intended implementation strategy was not specified clearly. Delays in the approval process meant that the momentum and results achieved through the earlier SAP preparatory phase were lost, and the designed duration of 5 years became insufficient, justifying the two year extension that was approved prior to the MTE. The Project formulation process highlights the need for continuity, leadership, care and thoroughness in drafting a clear, succinct Project Document and rigorous Logical Framework. Sufficient time must be available for key stakeholder participation. For a "programme-style" IW Project, only the broad framework, main strategies and essential principles need to be specified in the design, without prescriptive details. This would help to emphasise that the purpose of the Project is to facilitate a devolved process of devising pilot

exercises, using formative evaluation, adaptive management and learning.

15. **Project Management Arrangements:** The IW Project in the Pacific is a complex and challenging initiative requiring engagement and participation of a wide range of agencies and stakeholders in each of the 14 countries and across the region. Appropriate, effective and efficient arrangements for managing this engagement are crucial, and the MTE concludes that there is scope for strengthening these arrangements in the second half of the Project. The Multi-Partite Review has an important role as the regional Project's governing body, providing overall direction and coordination. The Implementing and Executing Agencies need to facilitate and provide greater support to the MPR's functions. Management responsibility for a regionally-coordinated, nationally-driven project of this type must be clearly and properly devolved to a Lead Agency in each participating country, which should receive direct assistance from the Project to provide the required leadership, coordination and in-country supervision. National Coordinators employed with Project funds should remain primarily under the direction of the country Lead Agency. SPREP and its regional Project Coordination Unit need to develop their capacity to be comfortable and effective in an "off-line" role, providing support and guidance to national and local activities, and allowing the national agencies to lead.

Recommendations for Strengthening the IW Project

16. The Mid-Term Evaluation identifies needs and opportunities for improving the relevance, effectiveness or efficiency of the International Waters programme, and makes a series of recommendations for strengthening planning, design, delivery and administration. For ease of reference, the recommendations made throughout the Report are drawn together in the final section of the Executive Summary.
17. A number of key recommendations for strengthening implementation of the second half of the IW Project are summarised below. These concern National Strategies in each of the participating countries, the design and management of Pilot Activities, and development of the International Waters Programme in the region.
18. **National Strategies:** The MTE recommends that the participating countries should engage rigorously in the IW Project and use it creatively to strengthen critical elements of their national systems for managing IW-related issues. The strategy should be to tackle selectively the legal, institutional, economic, financial, planning and policy mechanisms which govern the use and conservation of coastal waters and watersheds. LAs and NTF members should refer to the IW SAP and apply it to their local circumstances, analyse the root causes of their focal area² issues, and devise and carry out a selection of pilot activities to explore possible solutions. These actions should be an extension of the LAs' and NTF members' existing environmental management and conservation agenda. The aim should be to build rapidly on the IW Project work carried out in each country to date, notably the analyses of stakeholders and priority environmental concerns, selection of focal areas and pilot locations or "host communities".
19. **Pilot Activities:** It is recommended that pilot activities should be kept relatively small and precise, recognising the need to obtain useful results in the 2-3 years remaining of the pilot phase, and avoiding the tendency to embark on a comprehensive local community development project that has hindered progress in the first phase. Some of the issues and solutions will involve local community-level activities but many concern primarily national or local government institutions, the private sector or the wider public community, and the country's policy and institutional framework. IW pilot activities should build onto existing initiatives, so that the Project is integrated with mainstream programmes, adding value, supporting partnerships and sharing in the lessons to be learned. It is important for LAs and NTF members to plan each pilot activity carefully, to be clear which key IW issue and root cause(s) are being tackled, the potential solution to be tested, the stakeholders to be involved, and the results or outputs that will be achieved. For each output a clear indicator of success should be determined in advance and used subsequently to guide implementation and monitor progress.
20. **Regional International Waters Programme:** The MTE recommends that the Pacific island countries should use the IW Project to systematically improve collaborative approaches to the management and conservation of their coastal waters and watersheds. Comparable circumstances prevail across the region and the Project is a significant opportunity for the island countries to pilot, develop, share and learn together about potential solutions to the national problems they have in

² Nominated focal areas are coastal fisheries, waste management, freshwater resources, and marine protected areas
 hunnam & schuster Page 7 July 2003

common. It will be especially important through the second half of the Project to strengthen regional activities for sharing experiences across national institutions and across the region. SPREP and its members and partners should use Project resources to explore, enhance and promote the range of trans-boundary mechanisms that are key to sustainable development and environmental protection in the region. These extend to regional collaboration arrangements, multi-national agreements, multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral initiatives, and other approaches to the integrated management of resources. The MTE recommends that SPREP and its members should make greater use of the close correspondence between the IW SAP and the SPREP Action Plan, and of the SPREP Meeting itself and a suggested Heads of Environment forum as significant potential trans-boundary mechanisms. It will also be valuable in the second part of the Project to review the existing assortment of regional agreements, Conventions, strategies, action plans and consultative forums, and to facilitate efforts to improve their relevance, effectiveness and linkages with respect to International Water resources management.

Summary of MTE Recommendations

The Strategic Action Programme

- [1] Greater use should be made of the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters as the basis for planning and evaluating activities in the second part of the Project and in future IW projects. The SAP is a valuable source of reference and provides a broad strategic framework within which to link multiple strategic plans at regional and national levels. The National Task Force (NTF) in each participating country should work with a plan equivalent to a national IW SAP, based on a thorough problem analysis which explores the root causes of the issues. The national SAP should integrate with other national environment and development plans, and be the planning and monitoring framework under which pilot project activities are carried out. The NTF and Multi-Partite Review should keep the national and regional IW SAPs under active review and development.

Regional Participation

- [2] SPREP and its CROP agency partners should work in concert with the 8 PI Territories, to plan and seek additional co-financing for their participation in both the development and the implementation of the SAP.

Project Concept and Design

- [3] The Project design should include more thorough and detailed consideration of “trans-boundary management mechanisms” and how they are to be enhanced by the Project. There should be at least a separate Output, or perhaps a separate Component, under which to specify the various efforts aimed at strengthening inter-governmental, inter-agency, inter-disciplinary and inter-sectoral collaborations.
- [4] Component 2 and Component 4 outputs should be planned to deliberately target the root causes of the International Waters issues identified in the SAP. These are issues of “governance” and “understanding”; the policy, institutional and economic settings which influence the use and conservation of coastal waters and watersheds. A wide range of stakeholders and the general public are involved, and the Project will need to broaden its activities beyond local community-level concerns.
- [5] The Logical Framework should be further developed, strengthened and used, as the principal, common guiding framework for project activity planning, supervision, reporting or monitoring. Additional recommendations for improving the Logical Framework as a tool are given in Annex III.

Project Management Arrangements:

- [6] Multi-Partite Review: The role of the MPR should extend to governing and coordinating the IW Strategic Action Programme as a whole, with the subsidiary task of supervising delivery of the IW Project. The MPR should annually review and develop the SAP, monitor progress with implementation, and organise links to other initiatives in the region that have implications for International Waters management. These functions should be facilitated by the PCU providing succinct, timely briefing sheets, highlighting critical issues and decision points, and in other ways enabling it to focus on the higher objectives of the IW SAP and Project plan. Noting and approving changes to implementation and administrative details should be kept strictly to a minor part of MPR agendas. MPR country members should ensure that they are well connected with and briefed by their Lead Agencies and National

Task Forces.

- [7] Heads of Environment: Given the broad scope of the SAP, its focus on integrated approaches to IW management and its close alignment with the SPREP Action Plan, it is recommended that the MPR is re-formed as a convention of the Heads of Environment (HoE) of SPREP Member countries (or a smaller sub-committee), modelled on the region's "Heads of Forestry" and "Heads of Fisheries" meetings. It would be an appropriate activity for the IW Project to facilitate a trial of this model in this pilot phase of SAP implementation.
- [8] Implementing Agency, UNDP: UNDP should use its position as IA of GEF Programmes and experience in development assistance in the Pacific islands region, to work in close partnership with SPREP and provide a critical monitoring and mentoring function for effective technical delivery of GEF Projects, in addition to efficient administrative support.
- [9] Executing Agency, SPREP: SPREP should make greater use of the IW Project to determine and develop the organisation's role in relation to other regional institutions and international agencies, to further the regional environment agenda and implement its overall work programme. The SPREP Meeting should recognise the close alignment of its Action Plan with the IW SAP and should monitor and direct implementation of the nested or parallel programmes. It is recommended that the IW SAP and SPREP Action Plan are reviewed and revised together in 2003 (mid-term of the current Action Plan) and subsequently, during the formulation of the next (2005-2008) Action Plan. The aim should be to identify and align their common elements and incorporate the IW SAP into the SPREP programme. In parallel, the 7-year IW Project should be aligned fully with the annual SPREP Work Programme. This could be developed as an integrated rolling 3-Year Work Programme, making use of the multi-year plans and budgets of each project.
- [10] Common management and administration systems should be developed and used across the SPREP Secretariat, and IW Project resources and expertise should be able to be used in appropriate ways by the whole organisation. An important benefit is that this should contribute to the institutionalising of International Waters programming within SPREP, rather than it being just a short-term ad hoc project, albeit a large one.
- [11] SPREP's IW PCU should facilitate, guide and coordinate, rather than attempting to direct and control Project delivery. It should work primarily through the Lead Agency Director rather than directly to the IW Coordinator in participating countries, and in conjunction with other parts of the SPREP Secretariat in the region.
- [12] National Lead Agencies and IW Coordinators: The IW Project should be devolved properly to each country, with responsibility for the performance of the Project and any employees or consultants assigned to an appropriate Lead Agency. The LA should be willing and able to work cooperatively on the IW programme as a Member of SPREP and contribute a reasonable level of resources from its own budget to supplement those from the Project. The LAs should drive IW Project activities in country and use them strategically to strengthen critical elements of their national systems for managing IW-related issues.

Enhancing Trans-Boundary Mechanisms – Objective 1.

- [13] National Task Forces: NTFs should be encouraged and enabled to take on the broader role envisaged in the Project Document. It is suggested that a National SAP for IW issues should be formulated by this group, as a participatory problem analysis and strategic planning exercise between key national stakeholders, to form the basis for national pilot activities under the IW Project.
- [14] Regional Task Force: An RTF/ PTAG should be re-convened as a small, ad hoc group of individuals able to provide expert advice (individual or collective) on matters relevant to the IW programme, to the MPR, PCU, Lead Agencies, IA and EA.
- [15] CROP MSWG: MSWG members should make more use of the IW Project as an opportunity to engage in addressing the region's IW issues, with Project resources being used to undertake specific pilot activities. For example, Project resources could be used to facilitate strengthening of the MSWG itself as an integrating mechanism. Another important initiative for the MSWG would be to formulate clear, substantial links between the recently-released Ocean Policy, with, on the one hand, the relevant regional Conventions (Noumea/ SPREP Convention; Waigani Convention), and on the other, with the IW SAP and the many other Regional Strategies.
- [16] Other Regional Initiatives and Plans: The Project should undertake a review of current agreements, strategic plans and consultative forums in relation to the IW Strategic Action Programme, with a view to building linkages and collaboration, to achieving a degree of harmonisation between the diverse instruments and to contributing selectively to the

strengthening of the most useful mechanisms.

Strengthening Integrated Coastal Waters Management – Objective 2.

- [17] Lead Agencies and NTFs: For the second part of the Project, Lead Agency and NTF members should engage fully in the IW Project and be willing to use it to examine their country's International Waters issues and explore possible solutions. They are integral parts of the governance system which the pilot projects aim to analyse and strengthen. Agencies in each country should allow that their activities form part of the broader IW program and that, besides themselves, the PCU, UNDP, GEF, other partner organisations and the other participating countries are also keenly interested in how their pilot project is conducted and the results that are obtained. National governments should be allowed and enabled to own and drive the IW Project, and the PCU should be more accommodating and flexible in accepting decisions made by them. The government Lead Agency and NTF need to be responsible for the country's pilot project activities, their design, execution, monitoring and evaluation. Each country should assign responsibility for the IW SAP to the appropriate national umbrella body, which may convene a dedicated sub-group (i.e. an IW NTF). A process of national SAP preparation, monitoring and development should be used to re-engage NTF members in an overall IW programme. This process should build on existing PEC assessments as a continuing process in parallel with other Project implementation activities. It should include specific self-analyses of NTF members' responsibilities in relation to IW issues, with the aim of facilitating participatory development by NTF members of a full range of legal, institutional, economic, financial, planning and policy mechanisms applicable to the National IW SAP.
- [18] National Pilot Project Development: The IW Project should enable and encourage countries to explore and pilot solutions to a more diverse selection of the root causes of IW issues they identified in preparing their national SAPs. It would be more effective and efficient for the IW Project to support a varied package of pilot activities, each smaller and simpler than a full project. The pilot activities should explore innovative approaches and possible solutions to the root causes of a strategic selection of the prevailing priority issues facing the country's chosen IW focal area(s). While accepting that a portion of activities will involve local community-level activities, the Project should give greater encouragement to activities concerned with national or local government institutions, the private sector or the wider public community, and the policy and institutional framework for the management of coastal and watershed resources. Country pilot activities should build onto existing initiatives wherever possible. There is a considerable range of existing activities underway in many of the countries, directly relevant to coastal waters and watershed management, and it is a highly efficient strategy to collaborate with them, using IW Project resources to "add value" and share in the lessons to be learned, as the Project has started to do in some instances. NTFs and NCs should be positively encouraged to use their analyses of root causes, stakeholders and existing initiatives to identify such opportunities.

Extending and Replicating ICWM – Objective 4.

- [19] Communications: The IW Project should continue to pilot effective means of transferring knowledge, in particular to ensure that information is accessible and applicable to stakeholders and activities in participating countries. This should include devising and supporting innovative methods of using pilot and demonstration activities directly as learning exercises, integrating a capacity-building component with each pilot activity, based wherever possible on local resources, skills and experience.
- [20] Capacity-building: Project support for capacity building should be broadened to systematically address the needs of the Lead Agencies and NTF member agencies in relation to ICWM. The Project should collaborate with the GEF enabling activity on National Capacity Self Assessment being implemented in all the participating countries.
- [21] Partnerships: The PCU and SPREP should deliberately develop joint activities with other programmes and organisations to explore possible solutions to the range of root causes identified in the regional IW SAP and proposed national SAPs.

Project Administration

- [22] Strengthened Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation: Given the onerous reporting schedule, it is recommended that opportunities for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the system should be sought. Possibilities include combining the several different overall Project progress reports that are produced.
- [23] Logical Framework: The quality and efficiency of progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation should be improved by using a revised Logical Framework as the common

basis. Pilot project activities – at local, national or regional level – should be integrated with the overall Logical Framework. The pilot projects' substantial outputs are to contribute to the overall Project's substantial outputs.

- [24] Project Financing: Following the MTE, each LA in consultation with the NTFs and PCU should prepare a plan of the main Outputs to be produced and an indicative Output budget for the second 3.5 years of the Project. This Outputs and budget plan should be refined prior to the start of each new year, with additional detail for the forthcoming year. The PCU should prepare a comparable 3.5 year Outputs budget for the whole Project in conjunction with the development of a more detailed Logical Framework. UNDP and the PCU should arrange a reliable system for transferring funds to Lead Agencies in advance of them being needed. To ensure consistency and transparency in budget adjustments, changes should be approved by the MPR.

International Waters Project Mid-Term Evaluation

Introduction

21. The International Waters Project, formally titled Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific Small Islands Developing States, is a 5-year, \$12 million³ initiative concerned with management and conservation of marine, coastal and freshwater resources in the Pacific islands region. It is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) under its International Waters Programme, implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in conjunction with the governments of the 14 independent Pacific island countries – Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.
22. This report presents the findings and recommendations of a Mid-Term Evaluation of the IW Project conducted by independent consultants Peter Hunnam and Cedric Schuster, with inputs from Juha Uitto, Senior Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator at UNDP GEF. The evaluation was done in the period April-June 2003, nearly 3.5 years after the Project start-date of February 2000. The Project had been planned to run for 5 years, to January 2005. Shortly before the evaluation, a 2-year extension was granted to January 2007. The MTE was conducted in accordance with the detailed Terms of Reference in Annex VI, in consultation with the Implementing Agency, Executing Agency and many of the national agencies involved in the Project. The itinerary achieved and the documents and people consulted during the MTE are listed in Annexes VII, VIII and IX.
23. The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to review the Project's design, management arrangements, implementation and progress towards the objectives and planned results; to identify ways of improving performance of the programme; to promote accountable use of project resources; and to record and disseminate lessons that may be useful to other programmes and agencies. It is an important opportunity for the management of the Project to be adjusted, based on recommendations arising from the review and consultations.

Evaluation – Project Concept and Design

The Global Environment Facility International Waters Operational Programme

24. The GEF International Waters Operational Programme 9 – Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area – focuses on integrated, region-wide approaches to better land and water resource management practices. The goal is to help groups of countries utilise the full range of technical, economic, financial, regulatory, and institutional measures to operationalise sustainable development strategies for international waters and their drainage basins. The long-term objective is to achieve global environmental benefits through implementation of IW projects which integrate the use of sound land and water resource management strategies as a result of changes in sectoral policies and activities that promote sustainable development.
25. The OP document (paragraph 9.4) states that the short-term objectives of the program include:
- (a) undertake a series of international water projects, in several development regions, that address the cross cutting issues of land degradation and include a focus on Africa;
 - (b) assess the usefulness of the SAP concept for IW projects with multiple focal area benefits in: facilitating collaboration among IAs and countries; leveraging the involvement of regular IA programmes and donors; and serving as a logical framework for M&E;
 - (c) derive lessons learned in testing workable mechanisms to improve community, NGO, stakeholder, and inter-ministerial participation in planning, implementing, and evaluating projects, especially as they relate to the special needs of Small Island Developing States;
 - (d) develop projects in two or three areas of threatened marine waters in close cooperation

³ The total Project budget includes an additional USD 8.1 million from co-financing. The USD 21 million is split between components on Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (USD 10 million), and Oceanic Fisheries Management (USD 11 million). The latter has been managed as a separate project and is not covered by this evaluation.

with Operational Programmes in the climate change and biodiversity focal areas and with the coastal/marine priority of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

26. It is further stated that projects in this OP often involve determining what sectoral changes are needed to achieve the goals of sustainable development as well as what type of measures are needed to ensure that the ecological carrying capacity is not exceeded. Community involvement and stakeholder participation are seen as especially important. In addition, projects would often involve processes that link environmental considerations into the thinking of sectoral managers in order to ensure that policies and activities are modified to address sustainability and to protect aquatic and marine ecosystems. The projects require a long-term commitment on the part of all concerned to leverage the intended sectoral changes and to address the root causes of complex environmental problems. Expected outcomes of the OP include reduction of stress to the international water environment through participating countries making changes in their sectoral policies, making critical investments, developing necessary programmes, and collaborating jointly in implementing land and water resources protection measures.
27. The specific SIDS component of the OP stresses integrated freshwater basin - coastal area management as a key element. Typically, activities are targeted to the following major issues: coastal area management and biodiversity, sustainable management of regional fish stocks, tourism development, protection of water supplies, land and marine-based sources of pollution, and vulnerability to climate change.
28. It is stated (paragraph 9.20) that the GEF helps facilitate the analysis of environmental problems and the setting of specific priorities for modifications of sectoral policies and activities that might be needed on particular islands. The GEF also helps strengthen regional approaches to joint management and helps leverage needed investments.
29. The achievements of the IW Project by the Mid-Term Evaluation in relation to key elements from this GEF International Waters Operational Programme 9 are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Project Achievements against GEF OP9 Objectives

GEF OP9 Objectives	Evaluation of Project Achievements to date
Analysis of environmental problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the regional level, the SAP preparation carried out at project preparation identified the broad areas of environmental problems for the region. • The countries' analyses of priority environmental concerns address this issue directly in relation to the pilot demonstration projects.
Modifications of sectoral policies and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current strategy of the project is not directly addressing this issue. Pilot projects through their analyses of options and identification of solutions to the priority environmental concerns are intended to influence policy. • The national Lead Agencies and NTFs representing various sectors need to become aware of and involved in these opportunities.
Strengthening regional approaches to joint management and facilitating collaboration among countries (SAP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SAP provides an agreed framework for regional cooperation. However, it appears that the linkage between the SAP and the project should be strengthened. • SPREP as a regional intergovernmental organisation is well placed as the executing agency to promote such collaboration. • The cooperation, networking, and exchange of information and lessons amongst the NCs is highly conducive to strengthening regional approaches and mutual learning. Their training in facilitation skills contributes towards this objective. • The MPR process needs to be strengthened so that the project can catalyse regional action that involves multiple sectors. • An RTF mechanism could serve a valuable role in guiding and monitoring progress with implementation of the SAP through cooperative and multi-country initiatives.
Leveraging additional resources and involvement of other donors and regular programmes of the IAs (SAP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging additional resources and actions will require a perspective that goes well beyond the pilot communities. It will be important that the various sectoral departments in national and regional institutions identify themselves within the scope of the environmental problems and solutions, thus resulting in the development of actions in the

	<p>various sectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a major need for links, gaps and overlaps between the current strategic plans and programmes in operation across the region and in each country to be identified and harmonised • There is a need to identify and build upon complementarity between IWP and other initiatives around the pilot projects.
Community, NGO, stakeholder, and inter-ministerial participation in planning, implementation and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-ministerial participation formally incorporated into the project through the NTF (national) and MPR and SPREP (regional) structures/processes. These need to be strengthened and re-engaged in IWP planning, implementation and evaluation beyond a narrow focus on the pilot projects. • Stakeholder identification/analysis through the pilot projects can contribute to this goal. The process is still not completed. It needs to be ensured that the identification of stakeholders is complete and inclusive, and that all of the stakeholders within and outside of the pilot communities are engaged in the solutions to the environmental problems. • Communities are incorporated in the pilot project planning and implementation. Participatory M&E needs to be developed.
Use of logical framework, including for M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the revised Log Frame is a clear improvement upon the original included in the Project Document, there are still problems with various parts. The Log Frame should be further revised following the Mid-Term Evaluation. • An M&E plan should be developed utilising the revised Log Frame as its basis.

Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region

30. The Project is the first phase of implementing the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region (SAP). The SAP document itself was drawn up through a consultative planning process between the 13⁴ independent Pacific island countries (PICs), with SPREP, other members of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) and other agencies, in the period 1995 to 1997.
31. The SAP analysis recognised the crucial significance of the Pacific islands region's marine and freshwater ecosystems and their extensive cross-linkages to island life and to national and regional development. It identified unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, degradation of critical habitats and pollution from human activities on the islands as major threats to the region's aquatic ecosystems. Deficiencies in governance and understanding were highlighted as "ultimate root causes", and improvements in integrated management – of coastal waters and watersheds and of oceanic fisheries – were prescribed as solutions.
32. During implementation, the IW Project has made little use of the SAP and the analysis and plan have not been kept under review and up-to-date. It would be valuable for national stakeholders to engage in a process of national IW SAP preparation, monitoring and development. This could build on the countries' assessments of priority environmental concerns and be undertaken in parallel with other Project implementation activities. It should include specific self-analyses of NTF members' responsibilities in relation to IW issues, with the aim of facilitating participatory development by NTF members of a full range of legal, institutional, economic, financial, planning and policy mechanisms applicable to the national IW SAP.
33. It would be important for such regional and national planning for IW SAPs to be done cleverly and efficiently, by being used to draw together and integrate (rather than add to or duplicate) other strategic and programme plans relevant to natural resources, conservation and sustainable development. There is a plethora of such plans current in the PI region – for organisations, sectors, programmes and methods – and there is a need to align or merge them, showing their common elements, seeking collaboration and synergy and avoiding duplication and overlap.
34. Additional comments on the SAP for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region are contained in Annex II.

⁴ At the time, there were 13 independent Pacific island countries. Palau did not participate in the SAP preparation and was not eligible for GEF support until it became independent in 1995 and subsequently joined in the IW Project.

Recommendation

- [1] Greater use should be made of the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters as the basis for planning and evaluating activities in the second part of the Project and in future IW projects. The SAP is a valuable source of reference and provides a broad strategic framework within which to link multiple strategic plans at regional and national levels. In each participating country, the Lead Agency and National Task Force should work with a plan equivalent to a national IW SAP, based on a thorough problem analysis which explores the root causes of the issues. The national SAP should be integrated with other national environment and development plans and should provide the planning and monitoring framework under which pilot project activities are carried out. The NTF and Multi-Partite Review should keep the national and regional IW SAPs under active review and development.

Participating Countries

35. The 14 independent PICs are eligible participants in the GEF International Waters Programme and the Pacific regional Project. The 8 Pacific island Territories⁵ form an integral part of the Pacific islands region, with comparable geographic, ecological and cultural characteristics to the 14 independent PICs and common issues facing their freshwater, coastal and marine resources. However, they are not eligible and are not participating in the IW Project, even though its central purpose is to enhance regional cooperation and mutual support. Clearly, there would be great benefits to the region and globally, if all 22 Pacific island countries could collaborate in a complementary portfolio of pilot activities and in the shared learning from the IW programme.

Recommendation

- [2] SPREP and its CROP agency partners should work in concert with the 8 PI Territories, to plan and seek additional co-financing for their participation in both the development and the implementation of the SAP.⁶

The Project Concept

36. The IW Project is the first stage of implementing the Pacific SAP and was intended to be an initial series of “regionally consistent, country-driven” actions that would start to address the root causes of degradation of International Waters. The root causes to be addressed had been identified in the SAP analysis as deficiencies in “governance” and “understanding” – the ways in which International Waters resources are used and managed, by the variety of stakeholders at all levels of island society. The SAP and subsequent Project Document laid out the main elements of the Project concept:
- to encourage comprehensive, cross-sectoral, ecosystem-based approaches, integrating development and environment needs;
 - to strengthen national and regional coordinating mechanisms, improving national and regional capacity for management of trans-boundary water resources;
 - providing a framework for overall national and regional planning and assistance for the management of International Waters;
 - reflecting the different national styles and circumstances of each participating country... sufficiently flexible to accommodate these differences... tailored to disparate situations;
 - to review and... modify the policy, legal and institutional arrangements;
 - improving integration of environmental concerns into local, national and regional policy;
 - demonstrating best practices and appropriate methodologies;
 - improving information input and exchange at regional, national and community levels;
 - exploring options for creating financial and institutional sustainability;
 - to assist national adaptations as countries analyse and share the results of their work, enabling rapid national and regional learning and replication;
 - to plan and coordinate regional and national development assistance for International Waters
 - catalysing other contributions to SAP implementation, specifically the participation of other donors in supporting further investments.

⁵ American Samoa, French Polynesia, Guam, New Caledonia, Northern Marianas, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Wallis & Futuna.

⁶ This should continue the initiative started by the Project Manager in 2000 with respect to the Pacific French Territories

37. The MTE concludes that generally the IW Project is a relevant, timely and well-resourced opportunity for the Pacific island countries to start to execute the ideas contained in the SAP. However, it notes also that the Project concept is complex, ambitious and challenging, requiring careful planning, innovation, collaboration and flexibility in execution. During implementation, there appears to have been inadequate distinction made between the Project and the broader programme.⁷ In particular the pilot nature of the work, testing possible solutions to the root causes of IW issues, seems to be lost sight of in some areas of implementation.
38. The Project Document emphasises in several places the importance of local communities being adequately involved in implementation. A number of these references are reproduced in Annex III. The MTE considers that this emphasis has contributed to Project implementation being overly concerned with establishing a series of country projects that are centred on local communities. Project execution has become pre-occupied with local community-level actions, as though deficiencies in this area are themselves the primary root cause of International Waters issues in the PICs. The MTE concludes that the Project has been misled in this regard and that in order to achieve its objectives, greater attention will be required during the remainder of the Project on national and local government institutions, the private sector, the wider public community and the policy and institutional frameworks within which coastal and watershed resources are used and managed.

Project Design Process

39. The design of the IW Project is laid out in the Project Document and Logical Framework, written initially in 1997. The intended process was to use a GEF Project development grant to plan the SAP, prepare a Project Brief and formulate a Project Document. This did not work out due to insufficient funds and time, and the Project Brief and Document were prepared in a subsequent exercise. The Project Document was reviewed and eventually approved, in 2000, through UNDP and the GEF Secretariat and Council. The MTE concludes that this process probably contributed to the Project design being weak in a number of regards: the process was too long and there was a lack of leadership and continuity; “too many cooks” were involved. There was a long hiatus between the hasty preparation of national submissions for compiling the SAP in 1997, and starting Project implementation in 2000. The 1997 national submissions were of little use 4-5 years later and the work had to be repeated; the SAP itself was largely forgotten and has not been revised or used much since it was written.
40. Preparation of an Inception Report during the first year of implementation (2000) by the newly-recruited Project Manager was good practice. It provided an opportunity to review the Project Document and rectify errors and ambiguities. The main changes made to the design included balancing of Input and Output Budgets; revising the Logical Framework, Activities Descriptions, the Work Plan and the Review and Reporting Schedule; and up-dating information on regional and national developments.
41. The MTE concludes that Project formulation should be a reasonably short, continuous process of research, consulting, planning and drafting, with continuity of leadership provided from SAP to Project planning to implementation. Sufficient time and process should be allowed for key stakeholders to adequately explore and express perspectives on priorities, problems to be tackled, causes and effects, possible solutions and alternative ways of implementing solutions.

The Project Design

42. The current design of the IW Project has four major components:

- Component 1. Trans-boundary management
- Component 2. Conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources
- Component 3. Oceanic fisheries management
- Component 4. Community and donor participation.

43. Component 3. on Oceanic fisheries management (OFM), has been treated throughout as a separate project. Execution was sub-contracted from SPREP to two other Pacific inter-governmental agencies, the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The MTE did not extend to assessing the progress and performance of this

⁷ The Project Document itself and subsequent IA and EA documentation tend to treat the “IW Project” and “GEF SAP” as synonymous.

component. The contribution that the OFM work has made to the other three components of the Project has not been evaluated.

44. The designed duration of the Project was 5 years. This was appropriate for what was clearly intended to be a first phase of pilot activities to test ways of addressing the root causes identified in the SAP. Unfortunately, the achievements of the earlier preparatory phase (1995-1997) – engagement of regional and national stakeholders; problem analyses; national concept plans for pilots – did not flow smoothly or usefully on to Project execution. They all had to be started afresh as part of Project implementation and pre-occupied most of the first 2 years (2000- 2001). This justified a two-year extension, with the end-date moved from January 2005 to January 2007, which was approved prior to the MTE.
45. The MTE found that the Project Document had not been thoroughly prepared; in parts it was incomplete, confused or inaccurate. For this type of broad, diverse programme, it would have been more suitable for the Project document to be simpler and more succinct, setting out only the broad framework, main strategies and essential principles, and avoiding detailed prescription. This would have helped project implementation to be a continual process of pilot exercises, formative evaluation, adaptive management and learning.
46. The design is summarised in the Logical Framework (November 2002 revision) in operation at the time of the MTE.

IW Project Logical Framework (November 2002 version, excluding Component 3.)

Goal	Integrated sustainable development and management of international waters
Project Purpose	To address the root causes of degradation of International Waters in the Pacific Islands region through a programme focused on improved OFM and ICWM
Objective 1.	Enhanced trans-boundary management mechanisms
Output 1.	Trans-boundary management mechanisms supporting SAP implementation
Planned Activities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish PCU at SPREP • Establish administrative arrangements to support project-related responsibilities of the implementing and executing agencies (UNDP, SPREP, FFA and SPC). • Establish administrative arrangements to support project-related responsibilities within participating countries. • Implement project-related consultative arrangements • Secure country commitment to participate in the project and in regional and related global fora. • Establish mechanisms to monitor and evaluate GEF/SAP implementation • Administer the GEF/SAP.
Objective 2.	Conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources
Output 2.	Strengthened processes supporting conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources
Planned Activities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance to design, implement and monitor 14 pilot projects in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freshwater protection 2. Sustainable coastal fisheries 3. Waste reduction, and 4. Marine protected areas • Support community-based participatory conservation and sustainable resource use practices • Strengthen national capacity for community-based conservation and sustainable resource use initiatives • Assess sub-regional waste recycling options.
Objective 4.	Effective project-related community and donor participation in conservation and sustainable management of coastal and watershed resources

Output 4:	Effective community and donor participation in conservation and sustainable management of coastal and watershed resources
Planned Activities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance to support project-related communications and information management • Improve communications in relation to community-based conservation and resource management • Strengthen information management in relation to community-based conservation and resource management • Strengthen linkages with other GEF/IW programs and related projects • Donor participation to support long-term financial sustainability for OFM and ICZM initiatives catalysed.

47. The Logical Framework approach and performance indicators are intended to be key tools for planning, monitoring and evaluating the Project. The Logical Framework in the Project Document (1997) was poorly developed and had to be revised in the Inception Report (2000) and again in November 2002 as part of the “Justification for a Programme Extension”. The current (2002) Log Frame is a significant improvement over the earlier versions. Nevertheless, the Log Frame requires further development in order to be an effective Project management tool. While the project goal, purpose and immediate objectives are at correct levels, there remain a number of problems at the middle and lower levels of the Log Frame, and in its utility for monitoring and evaluation.

Design Component 1.

48. Objective 1. is to Enhance Trans-Boundary Mechanisms. The Project is a significant opportunity for the Pacific islands region and individual countries to conceive and develop “an appropriate coordinated and collaborative... institutional framework” for International Waters management. However, the current design reads as though the PCU itself is virtually the only mechanism to be considered. Activities to “enhance trans-boundary mechanisms” are reduced to one half-item: “Secure country commitment to participate (in the Project and) in regional and related global fora.” The original Log Frame included “Increased capacity to create national benefits through enhanced trans-boundary management regime” as an output, but this was not elucidated and is not in the current version.

49. The MTE considers the Project design to be weakened by including Project Management and Support actions together with the substantive aims of Trans-Boundary Management under Component 1. The design actually gives two objectives to the one output, to “enhance trans-boundary management regimes and create effective project coordination support”.

Design Component 2.

50. Objective and Output 2. are to strengthen the processes supporting conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources. It is inappropriate that this objective is similar to or at a higher level than Objective 1; a trans-boundary mechanism is a type of management process. (Presumably, the difficulty was caused originally by inclusion of Component 3. Oceanic Fisheries Management, within the same Project plan).

51. The SAP proposed four “high priority activity areas for immediate intervention” under this Component, “conserving and sustainably managing (a) freshwater resources, (b) coastal fisheries, (c) effective marine protected areas, and (d) waste reduction initiatives.” It also suggested five types of targeted actions for the Project – management (and institutional strengthening), capacity-building, awareness and education, research and information for decision-making, and investment – all aimed at improving governance and understanding.

52. The Project design stipulates 3 or 4 demonstration projects in each of the four Focal areas. This is useful to the extent that it stresses the need to focus reasonably narrowly on particular sets of issues rather than the whole field of managing conservation and sustainable use of coastal waters and watersheds. However, the MTE concludes that it is appropriate that the design stipulation of the four focal areas has been applied flexibly. Several countries plan to work across two or more linked Focal areas and the numbers of activities in each is not being “enforced”. In addition, the inclusion of “marine protected areas” as an objective is inappropriate; an MPA is a tool or means

to the end of marine conservation.

53. The current Logical Frame specifies a greater emphasis on “community-based” activities under this component than the original version, and this is strengthened further in Component 4. (see below). The MTE concludes that the effectiveness of the Project can be increased by more attention being given to the broader range of coastal waters and watershed management issues and the root causes of deficiencies in governance and understanding identified in the SAP.

Design Component 4.

54. Objective and Output 4. state “Effective Project-Related Community and Donor Participation in Conservation and Sustainable Management of Coastal and Watershed Resources”. The purpose of this component is not conveyed clearly by the wording used. It should be concerned with the broad extension and expansion of the International Waters programme and approaches, beyond the activities that are piloted under Component 2. Outputs planned are the communication of lessons, encouraging replication and contributions from other institutions and donors to SAP implementation.
55. Again, significant emphasis is given in the planned activities to community-based conservation and resource management. The current Project plan gives the impression that the main strategy to be piloted and the major lessons that will be learned are concerned primarily with strengthening local community participation.

Recommendations concerning the Project Concept and Design

- [3] The Project design should include more thorough and detailed consideration of “trans-boundary management mechanisms” and how they are to be enhanced by the Project. There should be at least a separate Output, or perhaps a separate Component, under which to specify the various efforts that will be made in the second part of the Project to strengthen inter-governmental, inter-agency, inter-disciplinary and inter-sectoral collaborations.
- [4] Component 2 and Component 4 outputs and activities should be planned to deliberately target the root causes of the International Waters issues identified in the SAP. These are issues of “governance” and “understanding”; the policy, institutional and economic settings which influence the use and conservation of coastal waters and watersheds. A wide range of stakeholders and the general public are involved, and the Project will need to broaden its activities beyond local community-level concerns.
- [5] The Logical Framework should be further developed, strengthened and used more, as the principal, common guiding framework for project activity planning, supervision, reporting or monitoring. Additional recommendations for improving the Logical Framework as a tool are given in Annex III.

Evaluation – Project Results

56. This section reviews and evaluates what has been achieved by the Project to date. For each of the three Components considered, there is a summary of the activities that were planned, according to the current version of the Logical Framework (November 2002), and of the results that have been recorded. The results are evaluated and recommendations made for adjustments to Project management or activities.

Component 1. Results: Enhanced Trans-Boundary Mechanisms

57. Objective 1. is to enhance trans-boundary mechanisms. Some progress has been made towards the substantive outputs towards this objective that were envisaged in the Project Document but not detailed in the Logical Framework. The main planned outputs as specified in the Logical Framework are management arrangements for the Project. These have been brought into operation at regional and national levels.

Table 2: Summary of Output 1. Planned Activities and Achieved Results
(based on Log Frame of November 2002)

Output 1 Planned Activities	Output 1 Results at Mid-Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish PCU at SPREP • Establish administrative arrangements to support project-related responsibilities of the implementing and executing agencies (UNDP, SPREP, FFA and SPC) • Establish administrative arrangements to support project-related responsibilities within participating countries. • Implement project-related consultative arrangements • Secure country commitment to participate in the project and in regional and related global fora. • Establish mechanisms to monitor and evaluate IWP implementation • Administer the IWP 	<p>1.1 <u>Project Management Arrangements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Project management, financial and administrative arrangements made with UNDP, SPREP and countries (b) MoUs for IWP between SPREP and participating countries (c) National Coordinators (NC) and some assistants appointed, managed and supported (d) Multi-Partite Review established (e) IWP PCU established and operating at SPREP Secretariat (f) Project integrated with SPREP Work Program and Budget (g) Monitoring, reporting and evaluation in operation (h) M&E Plan drafted (i) Information management systems developed (j) Communications programme developed (k) Social assessment and community participation strategy, economic strategy and project implementation guidelines (l) NC meetings (m) NC personal development training needs identified (n) Training programme – facilitation skills (o) Engagement of NGOs for project actions – hasn't really happened yet – as much as we have promoted it! <p>1.2 <u>Trans-Boundary Mechanisms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) National lead agency for IWP nominated in each country (b) IWP National Task Forces (NTF) established and operating in each country (c) SPREP Action Plan (d) SPREP Meeting (annual) (e) CROP Marine Sector Working Group (f) Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy (g) Pacific Islands Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas (h) Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the PI Region (i) Pacific Regional Consultation Meeting on Water in Small Island Countries (j) South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management (k) Forum Fisheries Committee Meetings (l) SPC Heads of Fisheries meetings

Project Management Arrangements

58. The International Waters Project is executed by the regional, inter-governmental body, SPREP, in conjunction with the nominated government Lead Agency in each of the 14 participating countries. UNDP is the Implementing Agency for the GEF programme. The formal governing body for the Project is the Multi-Partite Review.
59. **Multi-Partite Review:** The 14 participating countries, with UNDP as Implementing Agency (IA) and SPREP as Executing Agency (EA), form the governing body for the IW Project, known as the Multi-Partite Review (MPR). However, the MPR has met only twice in 3½ years⁸, the second coinciding with the completion of the MTE. The MTE found that the IW Project has not been governed consistently or well since its inception. The MPR has not been able to fulfil its mandate effectively, to provide the overall direction and cooperative management required for the International Waters programme. In order to carry out these functions, the MPR needs to be given adequate support and opportunity.
60. It is good practice for MPR meetings to be held as economically as possible, such as in conjunction with the annual SPREP Meeting, given the cost of bringing together the large and dispersed membership. It would be useful to consider other possible mechanisms for increasing the efficiency and the value of the process. For example, the full membership could delegate a smaller permanent core group to liaise and make critical decisions by electronic means. A more fundamental suggestion is to establish the MPR under the auspices of a permanent standing regional Heads of Environment body, and link this in turn to the SPREP Members' Meeting.

Recommendations

- [6] The role of the MPR should extend to governing and coordinating the IW Strategic Action Programme as a whole, with the subsidiary task of supervising delivery of the IW Project. The MPR should annually review and develop the SAP, monitor progress with implementation, and organise links to other initiatives in the region that have implications for International Waters management. These functions should be facilitated by the PCU providing succinct, timely briefing sheets, highlighting critical issues and decision points, and in other ways enabling it to focus on the higher objectives of the IW SAP and Project plan. Noting and approving changes to implementation and administrative details should be kept strictly to a minor part of MPR agendas. MPR country members should ensure that they are well connected with and briefed by their Lead Agencies and National Task Forces.
- [7] Given the broad scope of the SAP, its focus on integrated approaches to IW management and its close alignment with the SPREP Action Plan, it is recommended that the MPR is re-formed as a convention of the Heads of Environment (HoE) of SPREP Member countries (or a smaller sub-committee), modelled on the region's "Heads of Forestry" and "Heads of Fisheries" meetings. It would be an appropriate activity for the IW Project to facilitate a trial of this model in this pilot phase of SAP implementation.
61. **Implementing Agency, UNDP:** UNDP Apia office is the conduit for GEF support and oversees the Project. It provides administrative and financial services to the Executing Agency SPREP, and is also a source of technical advice through Project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, with support in this role from UNDP-GEF offices in Kuala Lumpur and New York.
62. UNDP Apia office and SPREP's Project Coordination Unit have established a good working relationship, able to resolve issues that arise during Project implementation. Routine operations of disbursing funds and reporting on Project activity appear to proceed efficiently, apart from delays caused by the method of funds transfer - see Evaluation of Financial Administration.
63. The MTE found that although UNDP is keenly interested in the Pacific IW Project, it provides little guidance on technical management issues. UNDP Apia, Kuala Lumpur and New York offices do not appear to have provided substantial advice or instruction to the Executing Agency over the five years of Project design, inception and implementation to the mid-term. Some feedback is apparently given by these offices to the annual reports submitted by the Executing Agency; UNDP also convenes the MPR and commissions the major independent Project evaluations. Nevertheless, UNDP does not seem to draw on its experience in the region and globally to

⁸ An inaugural meeting of officials was held in 2001 in conjunction with the re-convening of a Regional Task Force; MPR-1 was in 2002; and MPR-2 took place in June 2003

exercise its potentially significant function of ensuring effective technical delivery, particularly with regard to the Project's higher level objectives as a major activity under the GEF International Waters Programme, nor with regard to its own regional programme.

Recommendation

- [8] UNDP should use its position as IA of GEF Programmes and experience in development assistance in the Pacific islands region, to work in close partnership with SPREP and provide a critical monitoring and mentoring function for effective technical delivery of GEF Projects, in addition to efficient administrative support.
64. **Executing Agency, SPREP:** SPREP is the region's inter-governmental body with the mandate to support its Members⁹ efforts to protect, manage and use the natural environment for sustainable development. The SPREP Secretariat has been given responsibility for the efficient and effective delivery of the IW Project, based on the Project Document and contractual agreements with UNDP and GEF.
65. The MTE found that SPREP has established efficient arrangements for administering implementation of the Project. The Secretariat has set up a Project Coordination Unit (PCU), with excellent facilities at its Apia headquarters. The PCU is run by a Project Manager and five staff in full-time dedicated positions and performing to high standards of professionalism and activity. The systems that the PCU has set up for its office, communications, information management, reporting and publishing activities are models of good practice that other parts of SPREP would do well to emulate.
66. Within the Secretariat, the PCU initiated the good practice of presenting and reporting on IW Project activities at monthly meetings, with a view to developing collaboration between SPREP divisions and programme areas. At the same time, the IW Project has been developed rather separately from the rest of the Secretariat, establishing its own systems for managing records, travel, budget and expenditure records, communications and information. It would be more conducive to harmonious working relations and strong organisational development for the Project to contribute to the development of common systems and processes across the organisation.
67. The PCU is responsible for organising and supporting delivery of the Project and is well equipped to do so. PCU staff have expertise in marine resources management, finance and administrative support, communications and information management, economics, community assessment and participation. The PCU has focused much of its effort on working with the Project's IW National Coordinators appointed by the countries. The level of routine technical support being provided to the NCs is higher than was anticipated in the Project design, and this is diverting the expertise of the PCU team away from the broader support function that was intended. The PCU has limited expertise in project cycle management and planning, and for the second part of the Project it may be necessary to strengthen capacity in this area, and at the same time economise by out-sourcing its current specialist expertise through specific contracts.
68. The MTE found that the tendency of the PCU has been to try to direct and supervise Project activities rather than facilitate, support and coordinate. This is understandable given the size and complexity of the Project and the pressure to produce results. Nevertheless, the PCU has not adopted an appropriate management style for this type of initiative to meet its objectives effectively. The IW Project needs to be "regionally-coordinated, nationally-driven", but responsibilities and resources for Project activities have not been handed over or shared adequately with partner organisations, programmes or projects, regionally or, in particular, nationally. As a consequence, there is little apparent partnership in operation, particularly in the critical relationship between the PCU and national Lead Agencies.
69. SPREP is the region's peak inter-governmental environment body. The Meeting of its Members (currently annual) is an important regional forum and, in International Waters terms, a significant trans-boundary mechanism. The IW Project provides a major opportunity for SPREP to facilitate its Members' engagement with International Waters issues, i.e. cooperative management of the region's marine, coastal and freshwater resources. The work programme of the SPREP

⁹ The 26 Members of SPREP are American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France, French Polynesia, Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Northern Marianas, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Pitcairn, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States of America, Vanuatu, Wallis and Futuna.

Secretariat is drawn up to serve the requirements of its Members and is expressed in the SPREP Action Plan, revised every four years¹⁰, and the annual Work Programme and Budget.

70. SPREP's current programme has four Key Result Areas, each with prescribed objectives and a series of proposed outputs. The majority of the Secretariat's funding is earmarked for individual projects which aim to deliver specific outputs. The organisation has to align the secured projects with its programme structure in order to monitor and achieve progress towards its planned objectives. Difficulties can arise when the Action Plan and project plans are drawn up without reference to one another, or for some other reason have objectives and outputs that do not marry easily. Many projects including the current IW Project are developed to serve other specific Strategic Plans or programmes (for another organisation or a specific focal area or sectoral interest group) and there is inadequate attention to the alignment or merging of these broader plans. The IW SAP is similar in scope and objectives to the SPREP Action Plan, but to date, connection has been limited. The current Action Plan and annual Work Programme do not adequately incorporate the actions that are to be undertaken by the IW Project, and this contributes to opportunities being missed. The IW Project is the first set of actions to implement the IW SAP; both the SAP and Project plan were drawn up in 1997, and the Project plan was revised in 2000 and 2002. The current SPREP Action Plan was developed in 2001 and is scheduled for review this year (2003).

Recommendations

- [9] SPREP should make greater use of the IW Project to determine and develop the organisation's role in relation to other regional institutions and international agencies, to further the regional environment agenda and implement its overall work programme. The SPREP Meeting should recognise the close alignment of its Action Plan with the IW SAP and should monitor and direct implementation of the nested or parallel programmes. It is recommended that the IW SAP and SPREP Action Plan are reviewed and revised together in 2003 (mid-term of the current Action Plan) and subsequently, during the formulation of the next (2005-2008) Action Plan. The aim should be to identify and align their common elements and incorporate the IW SAP into the SPREP programme. In parallel, the 5(7) year IW Project should be aligned fully with the annual SPREP Work Programme. This could be developed as an integrated rolling 3-Year Work Programme, making use of the multi-year plans and budgets of each project.
- [10] Common management and administration systems should be developed and used across the SPREP Secretariat, and IW Project resources and expertise should be able to be used in appropriate ways by the whole organisation. An important benefit is that this should contribute to the institutionalising of International Waters programming within SPREP, rather than it being just a short-term ad hoc project, albeit a large one.
- [11] SPREP's IW PCU should facilitate, guide and coordinate, rather than attempting to direct and control Project delivery. It should work primarily through the Lead Agency Director rather than directly to the IW Coordinator in participating countries, and in conjunction with other parts of the SPREP Secretariat in the region.
71. **National Lead Agencies and IW Coordinators:** The 14 independent PICs are eligible participants in the IW Project and each has nominated the national environment office or its equivalent¹¹ as the Lead Agency (LA) to execute IW activities nationally and contribute to regional IW initiatives. Arrangements have been made for LAs to house and support Project activities, with funds provided for a dedicated IW National Coordinator and office.
72. Given that all the national governments are Members of SPREP and governors of the Secretariat, and have participated in numerous previous SPREP projects, it has taken a surprising amount of effort and time to establish efficient and appropriate arrangements for Project management between SPREP and the governments of the participating countries, and this has contributed to considerable delays in Project implementation. Specific Memoranda of Understanding to guide IW Project delivery have been drawn up between the two parties, as required by the Project Document, though their value and necessity are doubtful. Similarly, mechanisms for the transfer of Project funds have had to be organised, in some cases of an *ad hoc* nature. Additional delays have occurred in the appointment of NCs, taking over two years before all 14 were on board.

¹⁰ The current SPREP Action Plan is for 2001 to 2004.

¹¹ In FSM, Yap State Government's Department of Resources and Development is the nominated Lead for International Waters.

73. At the time of the MTE, 13 NCs and 10 Assistants were on contract. The Project execution strategy followed by the PCU has centred on these positions, despite concerns that some of the appointees have limited experience in work of this sort. The PCU has provided considerable briefing, guidance and training to each of the NCs and tends to have regarded them as an extension of the Apia-based team through whom Project delivery is being driven. This places the NCs in a difficult position. They are employed by the Lead Agency, which means that most are members of small national government environment units, formally responsible to and working day-to-day alongside the unit Director or senior manager. At the same time they receive detailed instructions and extensive guidelines from the PCU in Apia on what to do and how .
74. The MTE concludes that the management approach of issuing instructions and guidelines and attempting to impose standards through the NCs is inappropriate and unlikely to be effective in this type of regional project partnership. The IW Project needs to be owned and driven by the Lead Agency in each country. The NC assists the LA Director or is delegated her/himself to work on the Project in conjunction and cooperation with other relevant offices in the country. The PCU's role is to support, service, facilitate and guide these national arrangements and activities.
75. Perhaps in part as a consequence of the narrow attention and support to NCs, the national Lead Agencies do not appear to be well-engaged in the International Waters initiative. Many appear to regard their role as confined to housing a National Coordinator and, in due course, administering a relatively limited IW Pilot Project. It is a concern that some see IW as "another SPREP project", rather than their own. Even though the primary objective of the IW Project is to pilot ways of strengthening ICWM in the country, which could be considered as encompassing much of the Lead Agency's national mandate, the connection is not being drawn. The MTE concludes that the LAs and their governments are not making sufficient use of the IW Project to review and strengthen their own programmes.

Recommendation

[12] The IW Project should be devolved properly to each country, with responsibility for the performance of the Project and any employees or consultants assigned to an appropriate Lead Agency. The LA should be willing and able to work cooperatively on the IW programme as a Member of SPREP and contribute a reasonable level of resources from its own budget to supplement those from the Project. The LAs should drive IW Project activities in country and use them strategically to strengthen critical elements of their national systems for managing IW-related issues.

Enhancing Trans-Boundary Management Mechanisms

76. The substantive part of Objective 1 is to develop trans-boundary mechanisms for the effective management of coastal waters and freshwater resources. The main outputs envisaged relate to improved arrangements for collaboration and cooperation between agencies and sectors, both nationally and regionally. Both SPREP and the Multi-Partite Review, which are mentioned above in connection with execution of the IW Project, also have key roles to play in meeting this key objective.
77. **National Task Forces:** The Project has been used to re-convene an IW National Task Force¹² in each participating country, providing a forum in which integrated resource management approaches can be devised and piloted – across sectors and between Ministries, departments, institutions, NGOs, private companies and civic society. The NTFs form a potentially significant "trans-boundary mechanism" for this programme. Their role, as envisaged in the Project Document, is "to coordinate and administer activities to implement the project; to secure cooperation, information and resources...; to facilitate national policy and institutional changes...; to mainstream, within policy, legal and institutional frameworks, the successful approaches to resource management...".
78. Some NTFs exemplify Good Practice by being established under the auspices of an existing broad-based national standing committee, such as a National Sustainable Development Council or Environment Committee. This establishes legitimacy and helps to build clear links between programmes, strategies and projects. However, to date most of the NTFs appear to have regarded their role as a narrow one focused largely downwards, namely to decide on a Focal Area and to

¹² IW NTFs were first formed in 1997 to generate national submissions to the regional process of SAP and Project formulation.

supervise development of an IW pilot project, which they have understood should be a single, relatively simple, small-scale village project. Few NTF members seem to regard their role as facilitating institutional change, devising innovative solutions, improving collaboration and mainstreaming.

Recommendation

[13] NTFs should be encouraged and enabled to take on the broader role envisaged in the Project Document. It is suggested that a National SAP for IW issues should be formulated by this group, as a participatory problem analysis and strategic planning exercise between key national stakeholders, to form the basis for national pilot activities under the IW Project.

79. **Regional Task Force:** The Project Document recommended re-convening and strengthening a Regional Task Force (RTF) to provide technical and managerial guidance to Project implementation. An inaugural meeting was held in March 2001, with 50 participants representing participating countries, donor, development and conservation organisations, partner agencies, SPREP Secretariat, observers and resource persons. Revised Terms of Reference for a Programme Technical Advisory Group (PTAG) of 10 members, to meet annually, were prepared and adopted by the meeting. However, no meetings have been called in the subsequent two years, apparently in consideration of the cost.
80. The role of the RTF/ PTAG envisaged by the Project design was significant, with a principal consideration being high level engagement of other regional institutions and programmes in the IW programme. The RTF was intended also to steer Project delivery, review national submissions and select demonstration projects. A specialized sub-group, the Community Assessment and Participation Advisory Committee (CAPAC), was to be formed to assist with community-based activities.
81. To an extent, the CROP agencies' Marine Sector Working Group has provided a substitute regional forum. Nevertheless, the IW Project has remained essentially a SPREP project, not an outward-looking programme shared with other organisations and integrated with other initiatives, and not receiving any independent high level scrutiny or support through its first 3½ years. The MTE accepts that a representative style of RTF would not be a cost-effective mechanism for regional collaboration, and that this role is more appropriately served by the MPR. Nevertheless, a suitable standing group of experienced individuals, acting in a "monitoring-mentoring" role and using low-cost mechanisms such as e-communications, would be a valuable resource for the Project and for SPREP and its partner agencies.

Recommendation

[14] An RTF/ PTAG should be re-convened as a small, ad hoc group of individuals able to provide expert advice and comment (individual or collective) on matters relevant to the IW programme, to the MPR, PCU, Lead Agencies, IA and EA.

82. **Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific:** The 9 Pacific regional organisations, which include SPREP, share overlapping memberships and mandates to support the economic and social development and sustainable use of natural resources of the Pacific island countries and region. These organisations have formed the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) to act collectively and achieve efficient and effective support for their members. The CROP has established a number of Working Groups, including the Marine Sector Working Group¹³ (MSWG), as a mechanism for collaboration and sharing leadership of regional initiatives. The MSWG is a standing partnership between the CROP agencies and a significant example of a trans-boundary mechanism for addressing International Waters issues across the Pacific islands region. To date, SPREP has kept the MSWG informed of progress with the IW Project, and has contributed to the preparation of a Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy document by the group.

Recommendation

[15] More use should be made of the IW Project as an opportunity for MSWG members to engage in addressing the region's IW issues, with Project resources being used to undertake specific pilot activities. For example, Project resources could be used to facilitate strengthening of the MSWG itself as an integrating mechanism. Another important initiative for the MSWG would be to formulate clear, substantial links between the recently-released Ocean Policy, with, on the one hand, the relevant regional Conventions (Noumea/ SPREP Convention; Waigani Convention), and on the other, with the IW SAP and the many other Regional Strategies.

¹³ CROP Marine Sector Working Group members include SPREP, SOPAC, Forum Secretariat, USP, SPC, FFA
hunnam & schuster Page 25 July 2003

83. **Other Regional Initiatives and Plans:** A number of other initiatives are also aimed at improving coordination and collaboration between the PICs and between the many organisations which play a role in the management and conservation of natural resources. The IW Project has established contact with these initiatives as opportunities have arisen. Examples include:

- Pacific Islands Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas
- Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation
- Pacific Regional Consultation Meeting on Water in Small Island Countries
- Global International Waters Assessment
- South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management
- the forthcoming Ocean Forum.

84. The use of Strategic Plans has also increased considerably over recent years, by organisations, including SPREP, and for specific initiatives. Current Strategies relevant to ICWM include:

- SPREP Action Plan
- Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the PI Region
- Regional Action Plan for Wetlands
- Regional Marine Mammals Action Strategy
- Regional Marine Turtles Action Strategy
- Regional Invasive Species Action Plan
- Regional Waste Management Strategy.

85. There are in addition a number of multi-national agreements in force between Pacific island countries, providing a higher level framework for governing the region's natural resources. Of particular relevance to International Waters governance are:

- The Apia Convention 1976 – the Convention on Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific
- The SPREP Convention 1986 – Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region
- The Waigani Convention – Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Waste and to Control the Trans-boundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Waste within the South Pacific Region.

Recommendation

[16] The Project should undertake a review of current agreements, strategic plans and consultative forums in relation to the IW Strategic Action Programme, with a view to building linkages and collaboration, to achieving a degree of harmonisation between the diverse instruments and to contributing selectively to the strengthening of the most useful mechanisms.

Component 2. Results Integrated Coastal Waters and Watershed Management

86. Component 2 is the core of the IW Project, concerned with conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources. The Project design is to provide support for the establishment of "pilot or demonstration projects", one in any comment on the 'one'? in each of the 14 participating countries. Each pilot project is intended to explore ways of addressing the root causes of degradation affecting one or more of the four Focal Areas identified in the IW SAP analysis.

87. The major part of IW Project activity to date has been directed towards this end. For each country, the strategy adopted has been to engage key stakeholders in a review of national priority environmental concerns, selection of a focal area and a location for a pilot project. At the time of the MTE, all 14 countries had more-or-less?? followed this process and just about got to the stage of confirming a pilot location.

Table 3: Summary of Output 2. Planned Activities and Achieved Results
(based on Log Frame of November 2002)

Output 2 Planned Activities	Output 2 Results at Mid-Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance to design, implement and monitor 14 pilot projects relating to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freshwater protection 2. Sustainable coastal fisheries 3. Waste reduction 4. Marine protected areas. • Support community-based participatory conservation and sustainable resource use practices. • Strengthen national capacity for community-based conservation and sustainable resource use initiatives • Assess sub-regional waste recycling options 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Reviews of lessons and best practices from previous community-based initiatives (b) PCU National institutional assessments (c) PCU Guidelines for design and development of pilot projects (d) PCU Strategies for pilot project activities – economics, community participation, communications (e) National Primary Environmental Concerns (PEC) and stakeholders analyses prepared in each country, some in conjunction with other planning exercises (e.g. for N.BSAP or WSSD) (f) Focal Areas selection for pilot activities (g) Pilot project concepts (h) Reviews of existing environment legislation related to the focal issue (i) Feasibility study to assess regional waste recycling and disposal options

Table 4: Selection of Focal Areas and Pilot locations

Country	Selected Focal Area(s)	Pilot Location(s)
1. Cook Islands	Freshwater + Fisheries	
2. Fed. States of Micronesia	MPA + Fisheries	Yap
3. Fiji	Freshwater+waste+coastal fisheries	
4. Kiribati	Waste + Freshwater	Bonriki
5. Marshall Islands	Waste	Jenroc
6. Nauru	Waste + Freshwater	Bauda District
7. Niue	Fisheries	
8. Palau	Waste	
9. Papua New Guinea	Waste + Freshwater + Fisheries	Central District
10. Samoa	Freshwater	Apolima, Lepa
11. Solomon Islands	Fisheries	
12. Tonga	Waste + Freshwater	Nukuhetulu
13. Tuvalu	Waste + Freshwater	
14. Vanuatu	Freshwater + Fisheries	

88. The MTE Mission included brief visits to 10 of the 14 countries and short discussions about the IW Project with the NCs or Lead Agencies from 2 others, in addition to examining file records at the PCU. From this rapid review of progress and any outstanding issues, provisional conclusions were drawn, and on this basis, a series of preliminary recommendations are made for adjusting the ways in which the IW Project is being implemented in 12 of the 14 countries (refer to Annex I). The country-specific recommendations are intended to supplement the following generic evaluation comments.

National Analysis and Planning

89. The delays between the initial national consultations and planning for the IW SAP in 1997 and the start of the IW Project in 2000 meant a considerable loss of continuity and momentum. The Project had to facilitate afresh the process of engaging stakeholders, identifying priority issues for coastal waters and watershed management, analysing their root causes and devising a strategically useful first phase of pilot project activities.

90. In the first year, the PCU held briefings in each of the 14 countries and compiled national assessments of stakeholders and current activities relating to IW issues. Each of the countries was encouraged to build on the initial assessments, engage key stakeholders and analyse national priority environmental concerns. Several countries adopted the Good Practice of undertaking consultations, analysis and planning for the IW Project in conjunction with other planning exercises, such as in Niue with preparing for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and in Palau and others with formulating a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). This approach tends to facilitate broader strategic thinking and planning. In other cases, the assessment appears to have been done with the relatively narrow aim of deciding on one of the proposed focal areas and on a project site, rather than undertaking a broad analysis of the situation facing the country's coastal and freshwater resources and the range of contributory factors, root causes and possible management solutions.

Recommendation

- [17] For the second part of the Project, Lead Agency and NTF members should engage fully in the IW Project and be willing to use it to examine their country's International Waters issues and explore possible solutions. They are integral parts of the governance system which the pilot projects aim to analyse and strengthen. Agencies in each country should allow that their activities form part of the broader IW program and that, besides themselves, the PCU, UNDP, GEF, other partner organisations and the other participating countries are also keenly interested in how their pilot project is conducted and the results that are obtained. National governments should be allowed and enabled to own and drive the IW Project, and the PCU should be more accommodating and flexible in accepting decisions made by them. The government Lead Agency and NTF need to be responsible for the country's pilot project activities, their design, execution, monitoring and evaluation. Each country should assign responsibility for the IW SAP to the appropriate national umbrella body, which may convene a dedicated sub-group (i.e. an IW NTF). A process of national SAP preparation, monitoring and development should be used to re-engage NTF members in an overall IW programme. This process should build on existing PEC assessments as a continuing process in parallel with other Project implementation activities. It should include specific self-analyses of NTF members' responsibilities in relation to IW issues, with the aim of facilitating participatory development by NTF members of a full range of legal, institutional, economic, financial, planning and policy mechanisms applicable to the National IW SAP.

Technical Assistance and Guidance to ICWM Pilot Project Development

91. The PCU team has provided considerable support and guidance to implementation of activities in each country. This has been primarily through the NCs, using electronic communications to a large extent, team members' visits to countries, a number of specialist consultancies and a series of regional meetings for the NCs.
92. To supplement these direct means of assistance, the PCU has compiled written guidelines and strategies for countries to follow, allowing for "local adaptation". The guidelines and strategies are substantial sources of advice on how to organise each stage of the processes associated with project implementation. They draw together a range of prior experiences and analysis and contain much valuable information. The aim of the PCU has been to progressively develop the guidelines over the life of the Project, as a mechanism for capturing lessons. The principal sets developed so far are as follows:
- (a) Guidelines for In-Country Arrangements: Selection of Focal Issues, Host Community and Project Strategic Planning and Design. draft Version 2.00 March 2003. 59 pages.
 - (b) Social Assessment and Community Participation Strategy. draft Version 2.0 April 2003. 70 pages.
 - (c) Economic Strategy. Version 1.01 March 2003. 44 pages.
 - (d) Communication Strategy. March 2002
93. The MTE found that the guidelines and strategies have been relatively ineffective in stimulating Project actions in countries. They are lengthy and complex draft documents with apparently little input from local practitioners in the PICs, and appear to be difficult for Project participants to use. They give the impression that the PCU is stipulating a prescribed approach to ICWM and Project implementation. Participants are questioning the appropriateness of the guidance and proposed strategies to the situations in their countries and the issues they wish to address. A number of national participants have expressed resentment over being instructed by the PCU on what to do and how in their own country, with little regard for their existing competencies or for activities

relevant to ICWM already underway locally. The MTE concludes that it would be more appropriate to outline initially a simpler general framework within which countries are to develop their pilot projects, and then to allow each country to explore relevant approaches that build on its existing ICWM initiatives and exchange ideas with other similar programmes under way in the region, coordinated by various government agencies and NGOs.

94. It is noticeable that the guidelines and strategies compiled to date do not provide advice on how to address root causes of issues concerning ICWM specifically. It would be valuable for the PCU to prepare guidelines and training materials on possible types of pilot activities to tackle the root causes of coastal fisheries, freshwater resources, coastal waste or MPA management problems, i.e. the four proposed focal areas for national pilot projects. These guidelines should be based on the analyses carried out in preparing the IW Strategic Action Programme and the proposed national SAPs.
95. A related major undertaking by the PCU in the first years of Project implementation was to draw together a substantial body of information on the technical delivery of this type of project. A series of 6 comprehensive reviews was commissioned and published, covering past projects, experiences and lessons relating to the main focal areas and strategies being considered by the IW Project (see Annex VIII list of documents). The PCU intends to publish also the reviews undertaken in 1997 as part of the SAP preparation process. The preparation of these documents is good practice by the PCU, providing an important tool for the process of devising, piloting and demonstrating solutions, and of learning and sharing lessons. The reviews are of a high academic standard, extensively peer reviewed and edited and printed as quality professional publications. To date little use appears to have been made of the reviews in the participating countries, and the next step should be to make the materials in the reviews more accessible and useful to national and local participants in the IW Project. As recommended under Objective 4, it is important to devise and trial innovative ways of communicating this type of 'technical' information.

National Pilot Project Development

96. Implementation of the IW Project at country level has been slow and the MTE concluded that contributory factors include the poor relations that have developed between a number of the participating country offices and the PCU at SPREP, and the emphasis placed on undertaking a conventional project centred on a local community.
97. The country offices perceive the PCU to be "micro-managing" Project activities, by giving direct instructions to the National Coordinators on what to do and how to operate, requiring thorough justification and documentation of day-to-day decisions and insisting on adherence to detailed guidelines. There have been disagreements over the quality of the process followed and over the decisions made by countries, even on the preliminary steps of selecting a focal area and community to "host the pilot project". Some countries have balked at the PCU's detailed and lengthy guidelines, and their emphasis on a single local community-level pilot project.
98. The PCU staff believe that they are obliged by the Project Document and employment contract to introduce certain standards of Project execution and performance and to achieve reasonable levels of compliance. They point out that they are asking for participatory and transparent processes of planning and decision-making, which are called for by the design. They stress that the guidelines and strategies given to the countries were developed in consultation with the NCs and are intended to be just guidelines, interpreted flexibly to suit local circumstances. They justify the setting of standards on the grounds that each project is a pilot expected to test and provide feedback on the efficacy of a particular approach or technique.
99. The MTE concludes that the situation poses a challenge for the second half of the IW Project. It is not good practice nor realistic (given the limited resources available) for the PCU to attempt to impose standards on national agencies or to micro-manage the country projects. The specification in the Project Document for "regionally consistent, country-driven targeted actions" is completely appropriate for the IW Project in the Pacific islands region. It will be necessary to re-build an adequate relationship between the PCU, Lead Agency and NTF in each country, to forge a constructive partnership that will be able to organise actions that are reasonably effective.
100. The other significant factor is the stipulation that the major part of the single pilot project in each country should be focused on a local community. The MTE concludes that it will be important in the second part of the Project to broaden this approach in two ways: first, rather than persist with a single, discrete pilot project in each country, it would be more realistic and effective to

devise and carry out a strategic series of simpler pilot activities. Each should be selected carefully to tackle root causes of ICWM issues mapped out in a national problem analysis (N.SAP) exercise. To illustrate this point, Annex V lists a range of possible types of pilot activities concerning one of the focal areas, which it would be valuable to implement in one or more of the participating countries.

101. Second, the MTE concludes that none of the root causes of International Waters issues will be addressed adequately by just working at the local community level, without engaging the broader stakeholders and settings. "To be successful and sustainable, each demonstration project will review and, to the extent possible, modify the policy, legal and institutional arrangements necessary for the ongoing support of appropriate methodologies and best practices" (Project Document). The PCU should actively counter the impression they have given that pilot projects should be primarily at local community level, as stated for example in the Social Assessment and Community Participation Strategy: with "bottom-up involvement of the community throughout the entire pilot project process... to be primarily community driven, owned, administered and managed." Some significant pilot solutions may not require substantial local community participation; in many situations, more emphasis on addressing problems that are generated beyond the local community is required.

Recommendations

[18] The IW Project should enable and encourage countries to explore and pilot solutions to a more diverse selection of the root causes of IW issues they identified in preparing their national SAPs. It would be more effective and efficient for the IW Project to support a varied package of pilot activities, each smaller and simpler than a full project. The pilot activities should explore innovative approaches and possible solutions to the root causes of a strategic selection of the prevailing priority issues facing the country's chosen IW focal area(s). While accepting that a portion of activities will involve local community-level activities, the Project should give greater encouragement to activities concerned with national or local government institutions, the private sector or the wider public community, and the policy and institutional framework for the management of coastal and watershed resources. Country pilot activities should build onto existing initiatives wherever possible. There is a considerable range of existing activities underway in many of the countries, directly relevant to coastal waters and watershed management, and it is a highly efficient strategy to collaborate with them, using IW Project resources to "add value" and share in the lessons to be learned, as the Project has started to do in some instances. NTFs and NCs should be positively encouraged to use their analyses of root causes, stakeholders and existing initiatives to identify such opportunities.

Component 4. Results Effective Project-Related Community and Donor Participation

102. Objective 4. is concerned with extension and replication of the solutions to ICWM issues that are explored through Component 2 pilot activities. Results to date relate to preparatory work and setting up mechanisms for broader promotion, communication and capacity-building efforts.

Table 5: Summary of Output 4. Planned Activities and Achieved Results
(based on Log Frame of November 2002)

Objective 4 / Output 4 Effective project-related community and donor participation in conservation and sustainable management of coastal and watershed resources	
Output 4 Planned Activities	Output 4 Results at Mid-Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance to support project-related communications and information management. • Improve communications in relation to community-based conservation and resource management. • Strengthen information management in relation to community-based conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Preliminary review of NGO activity in community-based initiatives (b) IWP Communications – Strategy, information management systems, web-site, publications (c) National IW communication strategies developed and implemented (d) IW contacts database (e) Fellowships/ Studentship scheme (f) Materials developed for 2 Train:Sea:Coast courses (g) Linkage with IW:LEARN scheme (h) Donor and other stakeholder consultations

and resource management.

- Strengthen linkages with other GEF/IW programs and related projects.
- Donor participation to support long-term financial sustainability for OFM and ICZM initiatives catalysed.

Communications

103. The IW Project has made a considerable investment in developing effective means of communicating information between the Project and the range of participants and wider audiences. A comprehensive Communication Strategy is being progressively planned and implemented, centred on the IW PCU at SPREP and the IW offices in each participating country. The broad aim is to provide an enabling environment for participants and partner organisations to work effectively, with ready access to and sharing of relevant information as it is generated. The major means of communication being employed include the local area computer network at SPREP, the Project's Web site, Internet messaging and e-mail, and the SPREP library. The PCU has also produced a variety of Project promotional materials, including calendars, posters, t-shirts, greeting cards.

104. Issues encountered to date relate to the slow electronic transmission rates in some participating countries, the low proportion of country-derived content being captured on the system, and the low levels of use being made of the facility by in-country participants. High reliance is placed at present on written text, much of it complex, lengthy or academic in style. It is important to trial other media and methods of making information available and usable by target audiences.

Capacity Building

105. Building capacity to better manage IW issues is one of the Project's principal strategies, underlying many of the actions that are undertaken. The main direct beneficiaries to date have been those employed on the Project, notably the National Coordinators. The PCU aims to systematically assess and address the training and development needs of each individual. Much of the support to the NCs, from the PCU and associated consultants, is a form of in-service training, and the NCs' regional meetings have also been used for specific briefings and skills development sessions.

106. The Project has organised a number of specific capacity-building initiatives over the first 3 years:

- Training in facilitation skills is being provided to the NC plus 2 other associates from each country, at a series of sub-regional "Train-the-Trainer" workshops in 2003.
- PCU staff and other SPREP staff participated in a workshop on the use of "Social Marketing" strategies for conservation and resource management initiatives in developing countries, and developed a Pacific Island Social Marketing model.
- An IW Pacific Regional Scholarship Scheme was announced in March 2003, for post graduate studies related to IW, at one of the region's main universities, USP, UPNG, or U.Guam. The budget for the scheme is USD 273,000, amounting to USD 19,500 from each participating country.
- The professional staff at the PCU have undertaken to develop two complete Train:Sea:Coast courses. This is an international training programme coordinated by the UN Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea (UN/DOALOS). Staff of the PCU, USP, Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) and UN/DOALOS collaborated in the design of a first course on ocean resources management, entitled *Responsible Fisheries in the Pacific Islands Region: Implementation of Post-UNCED International Instruments*. The course was delivered for the first time in June-July 2002 at USP, Suva, to senior fisheries officers from the region, and was formally validated in August 2002. The second Course proposed for the programme, on "community-based resource economics" is being designed currently as a collaboration between PCU, USP and the Australian National University.

107. To date, the PCU appears to have made limited use of existing local knowledge and skills as the foundation for capacity-building in-country. The MTE recognises that there can be difficulties in such a strategy, but concludes that these are outweighed by the potential gains, in local confidence, ownership and culturally-appropriate results.

Partnerships

108. The PCU has formed partnerships with a number of other organisations and found this a useful strategy for accessing broader resources and strengthening Project delivery. It is good practice for example for the specialist technical expertise of PCU staff to be combined with the educational and training resources of the USP to develop and delivery new course modules relevant to IW management. Similarly, the members of the CROP MSWG have collaborated usefully to formulate a common Ocean Policy for the Pacific Islands Region.

109. Nevertheless, the MTE concludes that there are many other opportunities for collaboration which the PCU and SPREP should consider for the second part of the Project. The PCU appears to have been reluctant to use Project funds to support activities by other organisations, even though there would be mutual benefits. It may be necessary to allocate funds for such purposes explicitly in the second-half budget. There is also a perception that the IW Project and its management is insufficiently flexible to marry with another programme, even though the IW Project Document stresses that such arrangements are essential to tackle IW issues successfully.

110. In particular there are important opportunities for the IW Project to collaborate with other capacity-building initiatives, recognising that virtually all assistance projects have common objectives in this regard. The wider range of possible collaborations include joint risk assessment of marine invasive species with the IMO Globallast Project; development of a module on ICWM issues for USP's community-based conservation course with the IUCN International Centre for Protected Landscapes (ICPL); support for a waste management strategy by the Micronesian Leaders Forum; developing a joint programme with the EU-SPC coastal fisheries management project; funding the development of the Activities Inventory initiated by the Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation (PIRT); water resource assessments by SOPAC; documentation of lessons arising from the LMMA network's experiences; and so on. Many of these collaborations could be engaged in relatively simply and economically by the IW Project.

Recommendations

[19] The IW Project should continue to pilot effective means of transferring knowledge, in particular to ensure that information is accessible and applicable to stakeholders and activities in participating countries. This should include devising and supporting innovative methods of using pilot and demonstration activities directly as learning exercises, integrating a capacity-building component with each pilot activity, based wherever possible on local resources, skills and experience.

[20] Project support for capacity building should be broadened to systematically address the needs of the Lead Agencies and NTF member agencies in relation to ICWM. The Project should collaborate with the GEF enabling activity on National Capacity Self Assessment being implemented in all the participating countries.

[21] The PCU and SPREP should deliberately develop joint activities with other programmes and organisations to explore possible solutions to the range of root causes identified in the regional IW SAP and proposed national SAPs.

Evaluation – Project Administration

111. Project management has established good administrative and technical support systems for Project and personnel administration, funds transfer, procurement and financial management, information management, reporting, monitoring and evaluation. These systems facilitate the operations of the offices involved in Project execution, at SPREP and the national Lead Agencies.

Information Management

112. Effective knowledge management systems are important outputs for the first phase IW Project, relevant to all three Objectives – trans-boundary mechanisms, in-country pilot activities, and extension of the initiative through replication and leverage. The Project generates considerable amounts of information, including data from routine recording, monitoring, progressive evaluation of Project actions and tracking of lessons derived from implementation, augmented by compilation and publication of surveys, studies and plans, training resources and briefing materials, reviews of other programmes' experiences, and analyses of organisations engaged in similar work.

113. The PCU has established good systems for capturing this range of information. At the centre is a well-structured and well-used Project records system, storing mainly electronic files with a smaller proportion of paper records. The system has been copied as a model to each of the country's IW offices. Some data are extracted and can be manipulated in specific electronic databases, notably on Project finances and on contacts and other projects relevant to IW issues in the region. These databases have also been copied to each country's IW office computer. In addition, the Project's main reports and publications are being progressively posted on the Project's web site. The Project's system components are linked to the records, library and web site of its home organisation, SPREP.

114. The Project's information management and communications systems show many examples of good practice, including the records system, published reviews of past experiences, databases on other projects and organisations, the web site, use of e-communications, the communications strategy itself, and the profile established for International Waters in the Pacific.

115. The recording of "lessons" progressively as the Project proceeds is also an important task which the PCU is starting to develop. The Project has linked with the IW:LEARN network and found this a useful peer exchange forum, and the IW Project Manager participated in the 2nd GEF International Waters Project Managers' Conference, in September 2002. In order to get lessons to be learned, it would be valuable to devise innovative and "fun" ways to capture and apply lessons, rather than the current rather "academic" approach. As noted also under Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation, the lack of a rigorous Project or Logical Framework is hindering the systematic recording of lessons from Project activities.

Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation

116. Routine monitoring and reporting of activities and results and periodic evaluation of performance are important aspects of project management. Generally, monitoring, reporting and evaluation for the IW Project are being carried out to high standards and in accordance with the design schedule. Key elements of the system include:

- Systematic data recording and reporting by all staff involved in management or administration
- Quarterly and annual progress reporting and monitoring
- Quarterly fund disbursements and expenditure reporting and monitoring
- Annual audit
- Multi-Partite Review
- Independent mid-term and final evaluations.

117. The PCU compiles the majority of the reports and does so with great efficiency. There is some wastage of effort in compiling reports to different formats for various recipients, notably the three annual progress reports, to UNDP and GEF, to SPREP and, at a different time of year, to the MPR. The Project Manager and PCU show good practice in "adaptive management" by using the

reported information to modify future Project management practice and activities. It is not clear to what extent the offices involved in supervising the Project use the reports systematically to monitor progress and provide feedback to the Project executives.

Table 6: Current Routine of Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

Report	Period	From : To
e-Update on activities	week	NCs, PCU
Field mission	mission completion	PCU
Project activity (workshop etc)	activity completion	NCs, PCU
Project financial audit	Annual	NCs, PCU, SPREP, UNDP
Project financial report	quarter, annual	NCs, PCU, SPREP, UNDP
Project funding request	Quarter	NCs, PCU, SPREP, UNDP
Narrative progress report	Quarter	NCs, PCU, SPREP, UNDP
Narrative progress report	Annual	PCU, UNDP, SPREP, Meeting
Narrative progress report	quarterly	PCU, partner agencies
Project Implementation Report	Annual	PCU, SPREP, UNDP
Implementation Status Report	Annual	PCU, MPR
Equipment inventory	Annual	PCU, UNDP
Consultancy contracts issued	Annual	PCU, UNDP
Consultancy report	assignment completion	consultant, PCU
SPREP staff briefing	Monthly	PCU, SPREP
Independent Evaluation report	mid-term	consultants, PCU, MPR, SPREP, NCs

118. The effectiveness and efficiency of reporting, monitoring and evaluation, including the MTE, are reduced significantly by the absence of a rigorous Project plan, notably a Logical Framework. As noted elsewhere, this basic management tool requires further development in order to be of value as the framework against which to report progress, and monitor and evaluate results. A detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been drafted for the IW Project (April 2003). The MTE concludes that this is a confused and confusing document which should not be brought into use. An improved Log Frame should provide the Project with an adequate framework for planning and programming activities and for reporting, monitoring and evaluation: the Log Frame's Indicators list what exactly is to be monitored, and the means of verification specify how data on each Indicator is going to be obtained, observed or measured.

Recommendations

[22] Given the onerous reporting schedule, it is recommended that opportunities for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the system should be sought. Possibilities include combining the several different overall Project progress reports that are produced.

[23] The quality and efficiency of progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation should be improved by using a revised Logical Framework as the common basis. Pilot project activities – at local, national or regional level – should be integrated with the overall Logical Framework. The pilot projects' substantial outputs are to contribute to the overall Project's substantial outputs.

Financial Management

119. **Budget:** The IW Project had a budget of USD 12 million from GEF with an additional USD 8.118 million of co-financing indicated, for a total of USD 21 million. Out of this, the Ocean Fisheries Management component (OFM – Obj.3) implemented by FFA and SPC had a budget of USD 3.5 million (10.9 with co-financing). The Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management component (ICWM – Obj. 1,2,4), managed by SPREP, had a budget of USD 8.5 million (10 with co-financing).

120. The original Project Document contained substantial discrepancies between its input and output budgets. The 2000 Inception Report was used by the PCU and UNDP Apia to revise and reconcile the two budgets, and to make a number of changes to amounts allocated to particular budget lines. The budget revisions were noted subsequently by the inaugural RTF meeting in 2001.

Table 7: Total Funding for the OFM and ICWM Components of the IW Project

Source	USD m	OFM	ICWM	Totals
A. GEF Funding		3.5	8.5	12.0
B. Co-Financing				
UNDP (TRAC)			0.060	0.060
UNDP ICARE Project			0.877*	0.877*
SPC		1.331		1.331
FFA		6.107		6.107
SPREP			0.619	0.619
Total Co-financing		7.438	0.679	8.118
Total Funding (A+B)		10.938	10.056	20.994

Note: * not added to total

121. At the end of 2002, the budget was revised further to allow a 2-year Project extension, and taking into account the expenditure incurred over the first 3 years. These changes were endorsed by the MPR meeting in 2002.
122. The summary table below shows the 3 main budget revisions and the expenditure against the main budget lines to the end of 2002.

Table 8: IW Project (ICWM component) GEF Budget Allocations & Expenditure, 2000-2002

Budget Lines	USD	Budget Revisions			Expenditure 2000-2002	
		Original	Inception	Extension		% of Inception
PCU staff		1,435,000	1,130,000	1,643,263	517,779	32%
National project personnel		1,790,000	1,537,500	1,637,260	204,908	13%
PCU travel		200,000	303,000	410,402	175,371	43%
Local travel		50,000	-	-	-	-
Mission costs		175,000	150,000	118,012	19,568	17%
<u>Project Personnel Total</u>		<u>3,650,000</u>	<u>3,120,500</u>	<u>3,808,937</u>	<u>917,626</u>	<u>24%</u>
Contracts (country pilot activities)		3,690,000	3,748,000	3,088,576	555,011	18%
Training		1,530,000	800,000	812,518	116,066	14%
Eqpt/ Miscellaneous		590,000	656,500	497,960	239,944	48%
TOTALS		9,460,000	8,325,000	8,207,991	1,828,647	22%

Note: figures reproduced from PCU consolidated budget March 2003

123. **Co-financing:** The co-financing funds identified for the ICWM project from UNDP ICARE and TRAC have not been available as funds for project activities. Following the MTE, UNDP should confirm if either amount will become available and, if not, the budget should be amended formally. The SPREP contribution to the Project's ICWM component is identified in the organisation's and the project's accounts. SPREP is providing just under USD 30,000 annually of in-kind support services, including inputs from senior management, administration and support staff, and office premises, furnishings and utilities. These inputs amounted to roughly half (55% in 2002 for example) of the actual costs incurred by SPREP, and the Project pays the balance to the Secretariat. The MTE considers it inappropriate for SPREP to be subsidising the Project's implementation in this way, in view of (a) the key purpose of the IW Project being to enhance and support regional management mechanisms, (b) the organisation having limited core funding and (c) the fact that SPREP's membership is broader than the 14 independent PICs participating in the IW Project.
124. **Expenditure:** At the end of 2002, the third year of implementation, total expenditure was USD 1.83 million, just 22% overall of the Inception budget, compared to planned expenditure to that date of around 60%. The pattern of expenditure reflects the initial emphasis on establishing Project management and delivery arrangements, and the subsequent slow progress with getting pilot projects underway in the participating countries: the lowest rates of expenditure have been on

training (14% of the Inception budget) and pilot activities (18%), whereas a high proportion of the allocation to PCU staff and PCU travel has been spent (46% and 58% respectively).

125. The slow expenditure on in-country activities is summarised in the table below, which shows total direct disbursements to each participating country and other general country-level expenditure over the first three years of Project implementation.

Table 9: Disbursements to participating countries, January 2000 to December 2002

Participating Country <i>USD ,000</i>	Y1 2000	Y2 2001	Y3 2002	Total
Cook Islands	0	0	24,420	24,420
FSM	0	0	48,787	48,787
Fiji	0	7,029	42,162	49,191
Kiribati	0	0	62,531	62,531
Marshall Islands	0	1,000	27,556	28,556
Nauru	0	0	59,829	59,829
Niue	0	12,726	81,469	94,195
Palau	0	0	35,027	35,027
Papua New Guinea	0	0	37,387	37,387
Samoa	0	1,000	36,158	37,158
Solomon Islands	0	0	40,349	40,349
Tonga	0	2,245	43,019	45,264
Tuvalu	0	0	34,610	34,610
Vanuatu	0	0	32,448	32,448
country-level, general	0	154,393	32,450	186,843
TOTALS	0	178,393	638,202	816,595

126. The balance of funds for expenditure over the remaining 4 years (2003 to 2006) totals USD 6.38 million. The proposed allocation to the main budget lines is summarised in the table below.

Table 10: Balance of Funds and Proposed Budget Allocations, Years 4-7

Main Budget Lines <i>USD ,000</i>	Total Budget (7 Years)	Expenditure (Years 1-3)	Balance (Years 4-7)
PCU Staff, Consultants & Travel	1,900	662	1,238
PCU Admin Staff	154	31	123
Monitoring & Evaluation	118	20	98
Communications	126	22	104
Regional Task Force	248	51	197
National Task Forces	378	43	335
National Coordinators & Consultants	1,637	205	1,432
Country Pilot Activities	3,089	555	2,534
Donor Conference	60	0	60
Equipment	369	181	188
Miscellaneous	129	59	70
TOTALS	8,208	1,829	6,379

127. **Financial administration procedures:** The PCU has established efficient financial administration processes, and is administering the Project budget rigorously. A full-time project accountant works closely with the Project Manager and SPREP finance department. The audit of accounts up to January 2002 did not report any problems associated with the utilization of funds. The audited reports up to March 2003 found the accounts to be well managed apart from a discrepancy of \$47,754.76, due apparently to a genuine difference in figures caused by additional items (unexpended leave) being included in the SPREP report but not UNDP's.

128. Financial administration for the Project is carried out in accordance with the UNDP National Execution (NEX) procedures. These stipulate, inter alia, that in regionally-delivered projects such as this one, all participating countries are required to submit quarterly progress and financial reports and annual audited reports to the executing agency, which in turn will prepare consolidated reports for UNDP.
129. Disbursements from UNDP to SPREP are made quarterly, on receipt of the financial report for the previous quarter. SPREP works in the same way with each of the countries, requiring previous disbursements to be accounted for before making further transfers. This practice transfers the cash flow problem down the line to the office least able to afford it. Additional delays are caused by the UNDP practice of transferring funds to SPREP by means of bank cheques drawn on a New York account rather than by telegraphic transfer. It can take several weeks to get cheque clearance.
130. These two sources of delays have not caused serious problems during the first half of the Project. However, expenditure in-country should increase significantly in the second half, and more efficient procedures should be devised. Each Lead Agency prepares an annual budget estimate in consultation with the PCU, and it would be advantageous for a higher proportion of these funds to be advanced in order to facilitate local expenditure and activity.
131. In some of the countries, difficulties were encountered with funds transfers from PCU to country IW office and National Coordinator, and innovative arrangements have had to be made to ensure security and efficiency.
132. There have also been a number of mis-understandings over what may be purchased with the Project funds and what justification is required. It would be valuable for simple and clear guidelines to be provided by the IA, EA and LAs, based on relevant regulations and policies, at the outset of implementation.

Recommendations

- [24] Following the MTE, each LA in consultation with the NTFs and PCU should prepare a plan of the main Outputs to be produced and an indicative Output budget for the second 3.5 years of the Project. This Outputs and budget plan should be refined prior to the start of each new year, with additional detail for the forthcoming year. The PCU should prepare a comparable 3.5 year Outputs budget for the whole Project in conjunction with the development of a more detailed Logical Framework. UNDP and the PCU should arrange a reliable system for transferring funds to Lead Agencies in advance of them being needed. To ensure consistency and transparency in budget adjustments, changes should be approved by the MPR.

ANNEXES

- I Provisional Recommendations for IW Activities in Countries**
- II Additional Comments on the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region**
- III Project Document References to the Importance of Community Involvement**
- IV Recommendations for Improving the Logical Framework as a Tool for Project Management**
- V Possible Types of Pilot Activities concerning one IW SAP Focal Area**
- VI Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation**
- VII Mid-Term Evaluation Itinerary Achieved**
- VIII Documents Reviewed during the MTE**
- IX People Consulted during the MTE**

ANNEX I Provisional Recommendations for IW Activities in Participating Countries

Introduction

The MT Evaluators made short visits to 10 of the 14 countries participating in the IW Project, and were able to speak to some of the key stakeholders in each country. During the MTE opportunities arose to meet with the remaining National Coordinators out of country. Based on these consultations, recommendations for development and strengthening of the IW Project implementation in 12 of the 14 countries are summarised in the following section. The recommendations are provisional or tentative, in view of the rapid and limited nature of the review and discussions in each country.

MTE Mission	Participating Countries	Provisional recommendations below
Opportunistic consultation only	1. Cook Islands	-
	2. Nauru	✓
	3. Niue	-
	4. Tuvalu	✓
Country visits	5. F.S. Micronesia	✓
	6. Fiji	✓
	7. Kiribati	✓
	8. Marshall Islands	✓
	9. Palau	✓
	10. Papua New Guinea	✓
	11. Samoa	✓
	12. Solomon Islands	✓
	13. Tonga	✓
	14. Vanuatu	✓

FSM - YAP	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reconvene and maintain IWP monitoring and learning functions, under the National Sustainable Development Council re-focus around SAP review/ FSM.SAP compilation establish role/ link with Micronesian Leaders Forum initiative on waste consider additional GEF IWP applications
Project Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-form with broader constituency of all key IW stakeholders in the State; include other relevance State agencies, tourism, education, the three primary resources Divisions of the R&D Department (Fisheries, Land Resources, Agriculture), research, NGOs/ CBOs and private sector; deliberately engage Women's group re-focus around SAP review/ Yap SAP compilation
Lead Agency Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm LA and develop role form PT of individuals (including women) from communities, State agencies, CBOs and private sector (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> properly appoint and establish Coordinator and office compile broad national FSM.SAP analysis; use PEC link to other current strategic plans and programmes compile broad Yap.SAP analysis; focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue, at the several pilot sites
Focal Issue Pilot Site(s) Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> integrated coastal management; marine protected areas; coastal fisheries 4-5 sites around Yap main island local conservation area management planning pilot management plan implementation actions – catchment management, village waste management, fishery closures supportive State measures
KIRIBATI	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-convene under auspices of National Environment Committee re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ Kiribati.SAP compilation establish role/ link with Micronesian Leaders Forum initiative on waste management ensure broad engagement of stakeholders (in the Focal issue) from government, community groups, private sector

Lead Agency	• confirm and develop role of Lead Agency
Project Team	• form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator	• focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	• compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	• identify SAPHE project outputs and investments
Pilot Site(s)/ Situation(s)	• waste management (all categories) – groundwater management • Bonriki and surrounds • South Tarawa
Possible Pilot Activities	• South Tarawa waste management strategy formulation? • household r.r.r. waste management pilot programme • pilot national initiative to control waste importation • pilot initiatives to dispose of difficult categories of waste • water quality monitoring programme (community plus e.g. Health)

FIJI	MTE Comment
National Task Force	• link to National Sustainable Development Council if formed • re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ Fiji.SAP compilation
Lead Agency	• support coordination and communication functions
Project Team	• form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator	• focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	• compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	• waste management – all categories; coastal habitat degradation; freshwater and coastal water pollution
Pilot Site(s)/ Situation(s)	• a “typical District” of rural coastal villages • linkage to Suva-Lami-Nausori waste management project
Possible Pilot Activities	• District waste analysis • District management plan formulation • review of current waste management policies and institutions • household waste management pilot programme • pilot initiatives to dispose of difficult categories of waste • water quality monitoring programme (community plus e.g. Health)

MARSHALL ISLANDS	MTE Comment
National Task Force	• link with RMI waste management round table initiative • re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ RMI.SAP compilation • establish role/ link with Micronesian Leaders Forum initiative on waste management • ensure broad engagement of stakeholders from government, community groups, private sector
Lead Agency	• develop coordination and strategic planning capacity
Project Team	• form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator	• focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	• compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue
Focal Issue	• waste management (all categories) – groundwater management
Pilot Site(s)/ Situation(s)	• Jenrok suburb and Majuro
Possible Pilot Activities	• Majuro waste management strategy formulation from N.SAP • review of current waste management policies and institutions • household waste management pilot programme • pilot initiative to control waste importation • pilot initiatives to dispose of difficult categories of waste • water quality monitoring programme (community plus e.g. Health)

NAURU	MTE Comment
National Task Force	• strengthening multi-sectoral linkages amongst departments and between projects using existing NECC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ SAP compilation • Input into national positions to regional and international for a influencing international waters
Lead Agency Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants • compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue Pilot Site(s) Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste management • Bauda District • District waste analysis • District management plan formulation • review of current waste management policies and institutions • household waste management pilot programme • pilot initiatives to dispose of difficult categories of waste • water quality monitoring programme (community plus e.g. Health)

PALAU	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintain current broad membership • re-vitalise around SAP review/ Palau.SAP compilation • use as senior national governing body • establish role/ link with Micronesia Leaders Forum initiative on waste management
Lead Agency Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-engage around Palau.SAP compilation • form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthen communication and coordination functions, as executive officer for NTF • compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste management, especially non-sewage waste, coastal habitat degradation and coastal water pollution
Pilot Area(s) Site(s)/ Situation(s) Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one 'rural' (Babeldaub) State (with significant coastal waste problems); one urban (Koror) hamlet • pilot household waste management campaign • pilot disposal methods for separated waste categories • pilot mangrove restoration and conservation campaign • pilot State waste management regulation

PNG	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthen multi-sectoral linkages with departments and projects • include civil society organisations on the NTF • Re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP compilation • Assess existing capacity in-country to support the pilot project and SAP implementation • Input into national positions to regional and international for a influencing international waters
Lead Agency Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to collaboration with other projects currently being implemented or coordinated by the agency such as NCSA • form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities • explore linkages with other projects within the district, province or national level that can collaborate and/or assist in the project implementation projects
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants • compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, • link to other current strategic plans and programmes • focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue Pilot Location Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coastal fisheries • Central Province • NGO and NFA collaboration to design community participation approach • Explore institutional frameworks as explored by other organisations to support community activities • Review of existing coastal fisheries management programmes and lessons learnt in PNG • Economic incentives to support community, district, provincial and possibly

national level to promote sustainable coastal fisheries management

SAMOA	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ Samoa SAP compilation Collaborate with NCSA to assess existing capacity in-country to support the pilot project and SAP implementation Input into national positions to regional and international for a influencing international waters
Lead Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support coordination and communication functions improve linkages with other project related to activities of IWP
Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PT to have strong linkages in providing technical advise and resources support to implementation
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants compile broad national SAP analysis Develop long term multi-sectoral implementation plan for SAP with linkages to other current strategic plans and programmes explore appropriate NEMS policies to integrate international waters, or need to separate IW policy institutionalise SAP for Ministry rather than just for pilot project focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> watershed management
Pilot Site(s)/ Situation(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apolima village: only village on the island Lepa: village catchment area
Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment on impacts of land tenure systems in protecting watershed areas around the country Reforestation and protection of watershed areas Identify options for compensating land owners being relocated in rural area settings from watershed areas Standardising the Ministries community participation and assessment approach Community management and monitoring of watershed areas strengthening multi-sectoral linkages amongst departments and between projects
SOLOMON ISLANDS	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SI.SAP compilation Develop long term multi-sectoral implementation plan for SAP Institutionalise NTF as part of government rather than just for the project Collaborate with NCSA to assess existing capacity in-country to support SAP implementation and pilot project Input national positions to regional and international fora influencing international waters
Lead Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilise experiences and lessons from 2 SPBCP sites and other programmes such as NCSA and Climate change for community participation and assessment work More representation on the NTF
Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, link to other current strategic plans and programmes focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coastal fisheries with possibility of integrated coastal management when site is selected
Pilot Site(s) Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> strengthening multi-sectoral linkages amongst departments and between projects review of provincial and national policy frameworks to support community-based actions
TONGA	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ Tonga SAP compilation Improve linkages between IWP and other projects to share resources and improve delivery Assess existing capacity in-country to support the pilot project and SAP implementation Input into national positions to regional and international fora influencing

Lead Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> international waters support coordination and communication functions
Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve linkages with other projects related to activities of IWP PT identified
IWP Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, link to other current strategic plans and programmes focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop long term multi-sectoral implementation plan for SAP
Pilot Site(s)/ Situation(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> waste management: all categories rural community on outskirts of Nuku'alofa with limited land and impacted by village and lagoon waste
Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assess relevant technology for village sewage systems pilot lagoon wide awareness programme for waste disposal explore economic incentives for affordable solid and liquid waste management options community-based waste monitoring programme

TUVALU	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore opportunity for Falekaupule representatives having leadership role in the project Strengthen multi-sectoral linkages amongst departments and between projects Re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ compilation Input national positions to regional and international fora influencing International Waters
Lead Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> need for the Falekaupule to accept the project as a partnership, rather than a government project
Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, link to other current strategic plans and programmes focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> waste management: solid and sewage waste management
Pilot Site(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify possible economic incentives to support identified actions needed to reduce solid and liquid waste island-wide awareness campaign on waste management traditional leaders having central role in project implementation identify appropriate technology for waste management
VANUATU	MTE Comment
National Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with NCSA and NBSAP to assess existing capacity in-country to support the pilot project and SAP implementation Re-focus, re-engage and build capacity around SAP review/ compilation Assess existing capacity in-country to support the pilot project and SAP implementation Input into national positions to regional and international for a influencing international waters
Lead Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> form PT of those (who will be) actively engaged in implementing and supporting pilot activities
IWP Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on coordinating and supporting project team and pilot activity executants
Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> compile broad national SAP analysis; use PEC, link to other current strategic plans and programmes focus in detail on the various contributory causes of the Focal issue and possible solutions
Focal Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> freshwater and coastal fisheries: preference is to undertake a broad ICWM project
Pilot Site(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to be decided
Possible Pilot Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> economic incentives or disincentives to conserve resources awareness programme to improve understanding and catalyse actions improve governance through amendments to relevant policy frameworks strengthening multi-sectoral linkages amongst departments and between projects

ANNEX II Additional Comments on the Strategic Action Programme

Preparation of the Strategic Action Programme

1. The Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region (SAP) was drawn up in the period 1995 to 1997, through a consultative planning process between the 13 independent Pacific island countries (PICs), with SPREP and other members of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP), UNDP, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Bank (WB) the GEF and AusAID.
2. A GEF Project Development Fund Block 'B' grant to UNDP and SPREP supported the planning exercise. A Regional Task Force (RTF) was established to oversee preparation of the SAP. Its members were from 5 PICs (Fiji, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Tonga, and Vanuatu), SPREP, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the three GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, WB), two Non-Government Organisations (NGO) active in the region (the World Conservation Union, IUCN, and The Nature Conservancy, TNC), and one private sector representative (Fiji Dive Operators Association). The RTF considered expert regional reviews and gave guidelines for national consultations and planning. National Task Forces were formed in each of the island countries, as a variable group of government agencies and non-government organisations, with an appointed Coordinator (NTFC). The NTFCs had a short period to work through a process of consultation, analysis and planning, and prepare national reports on priority issues and concept proposals for national pilot projects. These were endorsed by each country's SPREP and GEF operational focal points and forwarded to the RTF Coordinator working at SPREP. The SAP was prepared on the basis of the national submissions and regional reviews, taking into account the GEF Operational Strategy and International Waters Programme Guidance. Following review by participating countries, PIC Missions to the UN and members of CROP, and endorsement by the RTF and NTFCs, the SAP was approved by the Heads of Government of the South Pacific Forum in September 1997.
3. Preparation of the SAP for the Pacific islands region made use of information and analyses that had been compiled for previous national and regional strategic planning exercises¹⁴. These were corroborated by a number of specially commissioned expert reviews¹⁵. Reference was also made to the international legal framework of binding agreements between nations which govern sustainable development of the region's resources¹⁶. The SAP planning process was not preceded by a special, comprehensive Trans-Boundary (Diagnostic) Analysis (TDA) such as has been used in the preparation of other International Waters Projects. Apparently it was agreed at the time that there had been ample "joint fact-finding activity" and demonstration of the willingness and commitment of the PICs to work together.

MTE Comments on the Strategic Action Programme

4. The SAP document provides a useful summary analysis of the main environmental concerns and threats that are shared by the Pacific island states, and the underlying causes of those threats. It was prepared efficiently, drawing on the various materials that had been prepared for earlier planning exercises. It provides a framework for strategies to manage the sustainable development and environmental protection of the region's International Waters.
5. The exercise of compiling a TDA for the Pacific islands region would have provided a valuable reference database and statement of baseline conditions. The previous planning studies and country submissions that were used in compiling the SAP did not provide comprehensive facts on the prevailing condition of International Waters resources in the region. The "sectoral" reviews commissioned were a useful first step, and in the subsequent Project inception phase, the comprehensive reviews commissioned by Project management also provide an example of good practice. Materials such as these, generated through the Project, provide a developing library of data, which needs to be formatted and presented for maximum utility and accessibility.

¹⁴ The SAP and Project Document refer to the following reference materials: each PIC's State of the Environment (SoE) Report and National Environmental Management Strategy (NEMS), the SPREP Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the South Pacific Region 1997-2000, the Draft Regional Strategy for Development Priorities of the Forum Island Countries, the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the South Pacific Region 1994-1998, the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, the Report to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) on Activities to Implement the Barbados Programme of Action in the Pacific Region (1996) and the 1992 Report to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in "The Pacific Way".

¹⁵ The following Reviews were compiled in 1997: Critical Marine Habitats and Species... by Chris Bleakley; Fisheries Management Issues and Regimes... by Garry Preston; Non-Living Resources and Threats... by Russell Howorth; Strategies for Preventing and Mitigating Land-based Sources of Pollution to TransBoundary Water Resources... by Nancy Convard and Andrew Tomlinson.

¹⁶ Specific mention is made of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Whaling Convention, World Heritage Convention, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, Wetlands Convention, the Migratory Species Convention and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

6. There was a clear intention during the preparation of the SAP and the subsequent Project document to relate and give effect to the international legal framework which aims to govern the sustainable development of the PICs. Unlike the GEF focal areas of Biodiversity (CBD) and Climate Change (UNFCCC), the IWP does not serve a single multi-national legal agreement. There are however relevant regional Conventions, notably the SPREP (Noumea), Apia and Waigani Conventions.
7. Apart from the significant exception of the shared tuna resource, the “International Waters” or “trans-boundary” issues given priority in the SAP for the Pacific islands region are national issues that are common to most of the island countries, rather than being international issues, i.e. where activities in one island country have a direct impact on its neighbours. The solutions proposed by the SAP are measures that also need to be introduced nationally, rather than regionally. The main rationale provided by the SAP for a Pacific islands regional International Waters programme on coastal waters and watershed management is that comparable circumstances prevail across the region and common solutions to the common problems can be piloted and developed more efficiently by the island countries sharing and learning together.
8. There are international issues shared by PICs which the SAP does not highlight. These include the transportation of hazardous wastes across international borders, the transportation of potentially invasive exotic organisms (both land and marine) and the necessity for joint action by PICs to ensure conservation of shared wildlife such as migratory whales and bird species.
9. Insufficient time and resources appear to have been given to the national analyses, consultations and strategic planning. The Pacific SAP preparation and Project design exercise were not effective in engaging the key stakeholders in each country and across the region in problem analysis and exploring possible solutions. In most of the PICs, the task of preparing submissions for the SAP seems to have been concerned largely with securing ensuing project funding. Subsequently, few of the IW Project’s Lead Agencies, National Task Forces, Coordinators or staff of the regional organisations appear to have made use of the SAP and its framework of analysis.
10. For future IW Programmes, the MTE recommends a first stage of preparing a national IW SAP in each country, to engage key stakeholders in identifying priority issues, exploring thoroughly the detailed root causes and designing pilot activities that they will implement in their respective “sectors”. An initial national focus is justified especially where the countries’ issues are common rather than shared. A second step should be to integrate the national SAPs to form a regional SAP.
11. For the current Pacific IW Project, the MTE recommends that a process of national SAP preparation, monitoring and development should be used to re-engage NTF members, building on the countries’ assessments of priority environmental concerns, and continuing in parallel with other Project implementation activities. It should include specific self-analyses of NTF members’ responsibilities in relation to IW issues, with the aim of facilitating participatory development by NTF members of a full range of legal, institutional, economic, financial, planning and policy mechanisms applicable to the National IW SAP.
12. The regional and national IW SAPs should be integrated or nested with other strategic and programme plans in operation. There is a plethora of strategic plans current in the PI region – for organisations, sectors, programmes and methods – and there is a need to align or merge them, showing their common elements and avoiding duplication and overlap.

ANNEX III Project Document References to the Importance of Community Involvement

"The significant control that local communities exercise with regard to natural resource issues, makes especially important the substantial, planned community assessment, involvement, education and stakeholder participation in the project. The substantial attention to community level involvement will accrue to the benefit of local communities across the region and help ensure successful replicability of demonstration activities.

"Community based participation (will be) particularly important to this project since governments in the region have limited capacity to police and enforce top down environmental rules and regulations and given a strong history of local control or customary tenure in relation to resource use and practices. The success of this project will rely on a level of local participation and consultation far beyond any implemented to date.

"Selection criteria would include... Adequate community participation and support.

"A special emphasis to be placed on community participation during the life of the project. This is due to the wide range of traditional authority systems that exist, the communal ownership and traditional systems of management that account for 80% of the land (often including the adjacent marine area) as well as the strong role of individual communities in resource decision-making. Community participation, including the private sector, will be an integral component of each demonstration project.

"Activity 2.3: Develop criteria (including GEF criteria for the OP 2) for the selection of three sites to be established within a regional system of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). Each will foster a participatory, community-based approach to these protected area initiatives.

"Recent experience clearly supports using a community-based approach to protected area initiatives that recognizes and actively involves local resource users and owners.

"Many MPAs exist on paper only and often lack local support largely due to an absence of local community involvement in the identification, establishment and management of these areas.

"Ensure the active participation of all stakeholders in the development of methodologies, especially local communities and women.

"Community involvement will be emphasized throughout the life of the (coastal fisheries) demonstration projects.

"Three community centered demonstration projects with the objective of creating models of low cost/no cost community-based waste reduction activities

"Community-based activities will particularly emphasize integration of traditional practices, cultural values, and public participation for pollution prevention, waste reduction, and improved sanitation.

"Special emphasis will be placed on community-based participation and assessment in order to ensure that all lessons learned are effectively replicated for regional and ultimately global benefit. As noted under Objective 1, the PCU will include a full time professional with overall responsibility for community assessment and participation and will work closely with community groups, NGOs and education resources already in place within SPREP and other regional organizations.

"Objective 2 identifies the clear links between local communities and the success of demonstration projects in protecting freshwater and biological resources, the conservation and sustainable management of coastal fisheries as well as improved waste management.

ANNEX IV Additional Recommendations for Improving the Logical Framework

1. The vertical hierarchy is constrained by having only one Output under each Component Objective. The problem derives from the original Log Frame which specified no Components, only Outputs. This is a marked limitation for such a broad and extensive “programme-style” project, under which several layers of objectives need to be framed. As it is now written the outputs in essence repeat the immediate objectives, with lists of activities underneath. In order to give more guidance to project implementation and to enable effective monitoring and evaluation, a number of outputs should be formulated under each component objective. These outputs should be significant middle-level results that are fully achievable by the project and for which the project can be held accountable.
2. Pilot project activities – at local, national or regional level – should be integrated with the overall Logical Framework. In the current version, the planned output is merely “Technical assistance to design, implement and monitor 14 pilot projects”. This is not a substantial result contributing to strengthened management of coastal waters or trans-boundary mechanisms. The pilot activities are to contribute substantial results relating to specific improvements in the management of waste, coastal fisheries, etc. A useful indicator of success would be, for example, a reduction in a waste impact, not “pilot project implemented”.
3. In the current Log Frame, many of the factors listed in the indicator column would qualify as outputs or lower-level activities. Examples of current indicators that could be re-formulated as outputs include:
 - (a) Strategy for promoting stakeholder participation in community-based pilot projects designed and implemented
 - (b) Regional and national communication strategies developed and implemented.
4. Consequently, many of the factors listed under the column of sources of verification would become objectively verifiable indicators. These could include, for example:
 - (a) Formal Memoranda of Understanding executed by participating countries
 - (b) Transition (exit) strategy developed
 - (c) Community participation work plan at project sites (established).
5. The sources of verification should refer only to a few concrete products, such as:
 - (a) Purchase orders
 - (b) Disbursement records
 - (c) Monitoring and evaluation reports
 - (d) Analysis of lessons learned from pilot projects and related projects
 - (e) Reports on communications activities.
6. Statements like “Adequate support staffing provided”, “Level of government participation in regional fora” or “Increased extent to which explicit regional positions are formed for use in various global fora” are not sources of verification. If they were formulated in an unambiguous and measurable way, they could be used as indicators. “Work Plan endorsed by MPR or equivalent forum” could either be an indicator (if the emphasis is on the endorsement process) or a source of verification (if the work plan is used to verify progress).

ANNEX V Possible Types of Pilot Activities

1. It is envisaged that a range of potential pilot activities such as those listed below would be identified through a comprehensive participatory problem analysis/ project mapping exercise, focused in this example on coastal waste management, repeated in several of the participating PI countries.
2. It would be valuable to the IW programme for each of these types of pilot activities to be implemented in one or more countries and the results shared regionally.
3. The “pilot project” in any one country might comprise several of these pilot exercises.
4. There are opportunities in most of the countries for the selected pilot activities to be “added to” existing, complementary programmes.

Possible Pilot Activities in the Focal Area of Coastal Waste Management

Analysis

- Pilot exercise in District waste analysis and monitoring
- Pilot environmental quality/ waste impacts monitoring programme
- Review of current waste management institutions, regulations, policies, standards
- Assessment of relevant technology for village sewage systems
- Identification of appropriate technology for waste management
- Study of potential economic mechanisms to support development of affordable solid and liquid waste management

Planning

- Pilot exercise in planning a District waste management strategy
- Pilot exercise in planning a whole island waste management strategy
- Pilot management planning exercise for village waste

Awareness

- Pilot lagoon-wide awareness programme for waste disposal
- Island-wide awareness campaign on waste management

Collaboration

- Pilot exercise in engaging traditional leaders and government in implementation
- Pilot exercise in strengthening collaboration between agencies/ institutions
- Pilot multi-country collaboration in tackling intractable waste issue

Management actions

- Pilot programme in household waste reduction, re-use, recycling
- Pilot national initiative to control waste importation
- Pilot disposal methods for separated waste categories
- Pilot initiatives to dispose of difficult categories of waste
- Pilot artificial wetland as water quality improvement device
- Pilot mangrove restoration and conservation campaign
- Pilot State regulation to control dumping in mangroves

ANNEX VI Terms of Reference

Mid-term Evaluation of UNDP-GEF Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States RAS/98/G32

I. Introduction:

The Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States (the GEF/SAP) was originally a 5-year initiative of 14 independent Pacific Island States¹⁷. It is implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The Project Document was signed by UNDP and SPREP in February 2000. Actual execution did not commence until July 2000 when the Programme was activated at SPREP. Delayed implementation resulted in approval to extend the timeframe for the GEF/SAP to seven years with a new scheduled completion date of December 2006.

The GEF/SAP is designed to support actions to address the root causes of degradation of the international waters of the Pacific Islands region. The actions are to be carried under the auspices of two complementary, linked consultative programs: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (ICWM) and Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM). This Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is confined to the ICWM component of the GEF/SAP.

The ICWM Component of the Project programme was designed to “address root causes of the degradation of international waters in coastal regions”. It will do this through “improved integrated coastal and watershed management”. This is to be achieved through action at the community level to address priority environmental concerns within participating countries relating to:

- Marine and freshwater quality;
- Habitat and community modification and degradation; and
- Unsustainable use of living marine resources.

To address these concerns the ICWM component of the GEF/SAP will focus on the underlying economic and social factors affecting resource use. It will support the establishment of one pilot or demonstration project in each participating country. Drawing on natural resource economics and social science (particularly community participation and anthropological issues), the coastal component will work with communities in the pilot project areas to identify why actions are occurring that harm environmental quality. It will then partner local stakeholders in an effort to address the root cause of the environmental concerns. Community participation at all stages in the project cycle is a central element of the pilots.

Together with relevant scientific information, the ICWM Component seeks to develop an integrated approach to solving environmental problems. The GEF/SA's community focus requires a strong communications element. Communications will feature significantly in publicizing to other development/environmental agencies the outcomes of each pilot project and the lessons learnt in the component overall. Each pilot project will seek to strengthen capacity and provide lessons for best practice and appropriate methodologies for sustainable resource management and conservation.

The GEF/SA seeks to establish partnerships with other development assistance agencies who are active in the region. The objective in this respect is to plan and coordinate regional and national development assistance for international waters to address imminent threats and their root causes more effectively. The GEF/SAP is designed to provide a framework for overall national and regional planning and assistance for the management of international waters and provide a catalyst for leveraging the participation of other donors in Programme-related activities at the regional or national level.

A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at SPREP administers the Programme.

II. Objective and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of Evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

¹⁷ The 14 Pacific Island States that qualify for GEF support are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

MTEs are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve a project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTE provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

As per the general introduction, the overall objective of the MTE is to review progress towards the project's objectives and outputs, identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs, and provide recommendations on modifications to increase the likelihood of success (if necessary).

In pursuit of the overall objectives, the following key issues will be addressed during the MTE of the Pacific GEF/SAP:

- Assess progress towards attaining the Programme's regional and global environmental objectives as described in GEF operational focal areas 8 and 9;
- Assess progress towards achievement of GEF/SAP outcomes;
- Describe the 's adaptive management processes – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, and have the changes been appropriate?
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for GEF/SAP implementation and the level of coordination between relevant players;
- Review any partnership arrangements with other donors and comment on their strengths and weaknesses;
- Assess the level of public involvement in the GEF/SAP and recommend on whether public involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project;
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP and SPREP in support of the PCU and national institutions;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which GEF/SAP impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- Assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes and benefits after completion of GEF funding;
- Describe key factors that require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of GEF/SAP outcomes;
- Assess whether the Logical Framework approach and performance indicators have been used as effective GEF/SAP management tools;
- Review the implementation of the GEF/SAP's monitoring and evaluation plans;
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
 - country ownership/ drivenness;
 - regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
 - stakeholder participation;
 - adaptive management processes;
 - efforts to secure sustainability; and
 - the role of M&E in project implementation.
- In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

The Report of the MTE will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions.

The Report will be targeted at meeting the Evaluation needs of all key stakeholders (GEF, UNDP, SPREP and stakeholders in Participating Countries).

Knowledge Management

As a result of its regional scope, network of project sites, technical and substantives outputs, and the involvement of many participants, the GEF/SAP has, or has potential, to generate a significant quantity of data, information, lessons, contacts, processes – i.e. knowledge. The GEF/SAP is therefore an important opportunity to analyse and assess “knowledge management” in practice, to learn from the Programme's efforts and to document best practice and lessons for other similar projects. In this respect, the MTE will consider the following issues:

- Review the GEF/SAP's major outputs;
- Analyse the systems developed and/or used by the GEF/SAP to manage and transfer knowledge;
- Consider the role of IW:LEARN. How has it been used by the GEF/SAP to date? Has it provided useful assistance? What role could it play in the future?
- Assess whether the GEF/SAP has an appropriate strategy or process for knowledge transfer, and describe the results of this strategy or process to date;
- Assess whether key lessons, experiences and best practices are being captured. If so, assess whether they are then being applied (i) to the Programme's ongoing management (ii) to improve the implementation of Programme sites by participating nations or other projects;

- Assess the links between the Programme's knowledge management strategy or process, monitoring and evaluation framework, and the application of adaptive management;
- Review the links between knowledge management strategies or processes and the Programme's communication, dissemination and public awareness strategies;
- Recommend improvements to the Programme's knowledge management strategies or processes, including modalities to promote Programme success stories (within the region and also within UNDP and the GEF); and
- Document how to apply the knowledge management lessons from the Programme to other projects.

III. Evaluation

Three main Programme elements to be evaluated include:

A. Programme Management and Administration:

1. Collect, document and assess GEF/SAP elements and processes including:
 - Programme-related administration procedures,
 - Milestones;
 - Key decisions and outputs;
 - Major Programme implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful, and
 - Processes to support national components of the Programme.
2. Clarify Programme disbursements. Specifically:
 - Provide an overview of actual spending vs. budget expectations
 - Provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "directly" in-country against total funds spent
 - Provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "indirectly" in-country (i.e. external consultants and regional training) against total funds spent, and
 - Critically analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.

B. Technical implementation

1. Document the Programme activities in support of the implementation of community-based pilot projects.
 - Strategic planning, preparatory work and implementation strategies,
 - Consultative processes,
 - Technical support,
 - Capacity building initiatives,
 - Programme outputs,
 - Assumptions and risks,
 - Programme-related complementary activities, and
 - Administrative arrangements.

Three components will be evaluated in order to determine performance: Programme Delivery, Programme Implementation and Programme Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness.

Programme Delivery

The MTE will assess to what extent the GEF/SAP has achieved its immediate objectives? It will also identify what outputs have been produced and how they have enabled the GEF/SAP to achieve its objectives?

The section will address the following priority areas:

1. Progress of the GEF/SAP as a whole in achieving anticipated outcomes:
 - Efficiency of GEF/SAP activities,
 - Progress in the achievement of immediate objectives (level of indicator achievements when available),
 - Quality of GEF/SAP activities
2. Partnerships
 - Assessment of regional collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations,
 - Assessment of national-level involvement and perceptions
 - Assessment of local partnerships, and
 - Involvement of other stakeholders

Programme Implementation

The MTE will review the implementation structure of the GEF/SAP. This includes:

Programme oversight:

- UNDP
- SPREP
- Multipartite Review (MPR) process
- The National Task Force.

Programme execution:

- SPREP as the Executing Agency (under the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality)
- The PCU
- National functions.

Programme implementation:

- UNDP as the Implementing Agency

The MTE will:

- Review the GEF/SAP's management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost-effectiveness.
- Compare the GEF/SAP's overview (GEF/UNDP), execution (SPREP) and implementation (PCU, National Lead Agencies, National Coordinators, etc) elements of the Programme with similar regional natural resource management programmes in the Pacific and elsewhere. Provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of the structure and recommend alternatives (if required) for future consideration.

Monitoring and evaluation:

- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the GEF/SAP?
- Is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- Is this framework suitable for replication/ continuation for any future Programme support?

Risk Management:

- Identify problems/ constraints which may impact, or are impacting, on the successful delivery of the GEF/SAP
- Were they, or are they being, appropriately dealt with?
- Are they likely to be repeated in future phases?

Programme Finances

How well and cost-effective have the financial arrangements of the GEF/SAP worked? This section will focus on the following three priority areas:

1. Budget procedures
 - Did the Project Document provide enough guidance on how to allocate the budget?
 - Review of audits and any issues raised in audits; and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations;
 - Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions, taking into account the increased duration of the GEF/SAP.
2. Disbursement
 - Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of actual spending,
3. Effectiveness of coordinating mechanisms
 - Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between national agencies, SPREP (including internal coordination), UNDP and the GEF.

Among other coordination issues, assess the:

- Evaluate the financial effectiveness of the PCU as a regional approach in support of in-country community-based conservation and sustainable resource management initiatives in the Pacific;
- Does the GEF/SAP approach represent an effective means of achieving community-based conservation and sustainable resource use objectives? How can the approach be improved?

IV. Methodology

The MTE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, selected site visits, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including (but not restricted to): UNDP (Apia), GEF, SPREP, participating Governments, National NGOs, communities, resource users and local governments.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant GEF/SAP documentation;

- Apia-based consultations with UNDP, SPREP, PCU, Samoan national Programme-related stakeholders, other Samoan-based agencies;
- Selected Programme site visits to as many participating countries as feasible within budgetary and timeframe constraints, and
- Participation in the Regional Task Force/Multipartite Review scheduled for 23-27 June 2003 in Tonga.

In addition, UNDP will attempt to arrange for direct input of a New York-based UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation expert. If this were to occur it would be scheduled for the the period leading up to the preparation of the draft Report in the last two weeks of May in Samoa.

V. Products

The main product of the Evaluation will be a Mid-term Evaluation Report based on agreed format (Annex 1)

Mid-term Evaluation Report:

The final Mid-term Evaluation report of no more than 40 pages (excluding an executive summary and annexes) will include: i) findings and conclusions in relation to the issues to be addressed identified under sections II and III of this TOR; ii) assessment of gaps and/or additional measures needed that might justify future GEF investment in the Pacific Islands region, and iii) guidance for future investments (mechanisms, scale, themes, location, etc).

The draft and final Mid-term Evaluation reports will be written in the format outlined in Annex 1. The draft will be submitted to UNDP and SPREP in time for it to be distributed to country officials who will participate in the Regional Task Force/Multipartite Review scheduled for 23-27 June 2003 in Tonga. To provide for this, the draft will be available on or before May 31st 2003.. Based on feedback received from stakeholders, including those participating in the Regional Task Force/Multipartite Review Meeting in Tonga, a final report will be prepared by 11th July 2003.

The reviewers will provide UNDP and SPREP with an electronic copy of both the draft and the final reports at the time of their submission.

VI. Tentative Schedule

April 1	Reviewers commence the Evaluation
April 14-18	Reviewers assemble in Apia, Apia consultations and project research
April 21-	Regional consultations
May 31	Draft Report
June 23-27	Report presentation, RTF/MPR, Tonga
July 11	Final Report submitted to UNDP and SPREP

V. Report Submission

The draft and final reports will be submitted simultaneously to:

Ms Joyce Yu, Resident Representative (to the attention of Mr. Tom Twining-Ward)
UNDP, Private Mail Bag, Apia, Samoa

Annex 1: Outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report

A Mid-term Evaluation Report (no more than 40 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes) structured to address the ToR provided at Sections II and III of the Call for Expressions of Interest as follows:

- i. Acronyms and Terms
- ii. Executive Summary (no more than 4 pages) should briefly explain how the evaluation was conducted and provide the summary of contents of the report and its findings.
- iii. Project Concept and Design Summary
This section should begin with the context of the problem that the project is addressing. It should describe how effectively the project concept and design can deal with the situation
- iv. Project Results
Progress towards attaining the project's regional and global environmental objectives and achievement of project outcomes. It should also try to answer the question: What has happened and why? The performance indicators in the logframe matrix are crucial to completing this section.
- v. Project Management
This section covers the assessment of the project's adaptive management, partnerships, involvement of stakeholders, public participation, roles and responsibilities, monitoring plans, administrative and financial issues, assistance from UNDP and SPREP etc
- vi. Recommendations - Specific recommendations are essential. To whom are the recommendations addressed and what exactly should that party do? Recommendations might include sets of options and alternatives.
- vii. Lessons Learned - a list of lessons that may be useful to other projects.
- viii. List of Annexes (Terms of Reference, Itinerary, Persons Interviewed).

ANNEX VII Mid-Term Evaluation Itinerary Achieved

2003

February		Expressions of interest by consultants
March		Selection of consultants and making arrangements for the MTE
April	1-15	Preparatory work by consultants from home bases
April	15-22	Initial briefing by SPREP and Samoa country visit
April 22 – May 9		Country visits to Tonga, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Yap State (FSM), Palau, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea
May	9-19	Analysis and discussions by consultants from home bases
May	20-31	Discussions, Report compilation and draft Report delivery in Samoa
June	1-20	Draft Report review by participating countries and agencies Draft Report development by consultants
June	21-25	Draft Report review and development at the National Coordinators Meeting in Tonga
June	26-27	Draft Report presentation and discussion at the Multi-Partite Review in Tonga
July	1-11	Final Report completion and delivery

ANNEX VIII Documents Reviewed during the MTE

2001	Q2 Q3 Q4	SP IWP Quarterly Narrative Reports	SPREP PCU
2002	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4		
2003	Q1		
2001		SP IWP Annual Progress Reports	SPREP PCU
2002			
2003			
2000	September	SP IWP Brief-1/ Summary Strategic Action Plan	
2001		First Country Assessment Reports	SPREP PCU
2001		ToR for 5 Reviews	SPREP PCU
2001	January	SP IWP Inception Report	SPREP PCU
2001	March	SP IWP First Regional Task Force Meeting Report	SPREP PCU
2001	March	SP IWP First Regional Task Force Meeting Working Papers	SPREP PCU
2001	April	SP IWP Frequently Asked Questions	SPREP PCU
2001	May	International Waters Database Development: Assessment of Information Needs	J. Atherton
2001	October	Executive Summaries of SP IWP Technical Reports	SPREP PCU
2002	April	SP IWP Communications Strategy	SPREP PCU
2002	April	SP IWP Communications Strategy Draft	SPREP PCU
2002	April	SP IWP Administrative Procedures for National Coordinators and Participating Countries	SPREP PCU
2002	April	Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the SP IWP Volume 1: A Synopsis of Information Relating to Marine Protected Areas	M. Huber and K. McGregor
2002	April	Volume 2: A Synopsis of Information Relating to the Quality of Freshwater and Watershed Management Issues in the Pacific Islands Region	T. Falkland
2002	April	Volume 3: A Synopsis of Information Relating to Waste Management, Pollution Prevention and Improved Sanitation with a Focus on Communities in the Pacific Islands Region	L. Crennan and G. Berry
2002	April	Volume 4: Synopsis of Information Relating to Sustainable Coastal Fisheries	P. Dalzell and D. Schug
2002	April	Volume 5: Economic Considerations in Community-based Project Planning and Implementation	P. Lal and M. Keen
2002	April	Volume 6: A Review of Lessons Learned and Best Practice in Integrated Coastal Watershed Conservation and Management Initiatives in the Pacific Islands Region	J. Whyte
2002	April	Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators for GEF International Waters Projects Draft	GEF
2002	April-May	SP IWP First National Coordinators Meeting Report	SPREP PCU
2002	May	SP IWP Guidelines for the Initial Phase of the IWP: In-Country Arrangements, Review of Priority Concerns and Selection of Pilot Projects. V1.04	SPREP PCU
2002	June	SP IWP Background Paper: Community Problem Analysis Phase and Approach for Niue Pilot Project Concept Development and Selection	SPREP PCU
2002	July	SP IWP First Multi-Partite Review Working Papers	SPREP PCU
2002	July	SP IWP First Multipartite Review Meeting Report	SPREP PCU
2002	July	SP IWP First Multipartite Review Meeting working Papers	SPREP PCU
2002	July-September	IWP News Volume 1, Issue 1	SPREP PCU
2002	December	SP IWP Justification for a Programme Extension	SPREP PCU
2003	January	SP IWP Auditors Reports 2001 and 2002	SPREP PCU
2003	January	PNG Priority Environmental Concerns Report	DEC
2003	January	Draft Solomon Islands Priority Environmental Concerns Report	DEC

2003	February	SP IWP Mid-Term Evaluation Call for Expressions of Interest	UNDP
2003	February	Course Development Mission Report	IWP/ANU/USP
2003	March	Guidelines for the Initial Phase of the International Waters Programme. V1.05	SPREP PCU
2003	March	Press Release: SP IWP Pacific regional scholarship scheme	SPREP PCU
2003	March	SP IWP Draft Economics Strategy	SPREP PCU
2003	March	SP IWP Draft Community Assessment and Participation strategy	SPREP PCU
2003	March	SP IWP Draft Second National Coordinators Meeting Report	SPREP PCU
2003	March	SP IWP Consolidated Budget	SPREP PCU
2003	March	Draft Vanuatu Priority Environmental Concerns Report	Vanuatu Environment Unit
2003	March	Integrated Coastal Watershed Management, Sustainable Coastal Fisheries and The International Waters Programme, paper presented to the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management	SPREP PCU
2003	March	Solomon Islands Experience in Community and Related Coastal Fisheries Management, paper presented to the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management	IWP Solomon Islands
2003	March	The Niue Experience in the Involvement of Communities, paper presented to the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management	IWP Niue
2003	March	(Draft) Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Version 1.01	SPREP PCU
2003	April	GEF Focal Areas	www.gefonline.org
2003	April	GEF Operational Programs	www.gefonline.org
2003	April	GEF Operational Program 8.	www.gefonline.org
2003	April	GEF Operational Program 9.	www.gefonline.org
2003	April	Palau - Priority Environmental Concerns Report	Office of Environmental Response and Coordination
2003	May	Vanuatu NTF meeting reports	Vanuatu Environment Unit
2003	May	Yap Project Task Force Meeting.5 Minutes	Yap PTF
2003	May	Solomon Islands NTF meeting reports (1-6)	DEC
2003	May	Draft Master Plan for Solid Waste Management in Pacific Island Countries	

ANNEX IX Persons Consulted during the MTE

Samoa		
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment	Tuu'u Ieti Taulealo	Director
	Faumuina Sailimalo Pati Liu	Assistant Director
Samoa UNGO	Su'a Faraimo Ti'iti'i	Principal IW Officer
	Ray Voight	Executive Director
	Karen Talan	
WB-IUCN MPA Project Conservation International	Sue Miller	Project Manager
	Francois Martel	
Tonga		
Department of Environment	Uilou Samani	Director
	Sione Fakaosi	IW National Coordinator
Department of Fisheries	Pelenatita Kara	Assistant IW Coordinator
	Manase Felemi	Secretary
Ministry of Health	Ofa Fakahau	Fisheries Officer
	Malakai Ake	Deputy Director
	Ofiu Isamau	Health Officer
Tonga Trust	Denis Wolff	Director
	David Wylie	
	Tevita Vea'ila	Environmental Projects
Langafonua-'a Fafine-Tonga	Ruby Adelin Fuiva Kavaliku	General Secretary
	Hauoli Vi	Program Officer
Nukuhetulu Village	Sioape Tuiono	District Officer
Fiji		
Ministry of Local Government Housing, Squatter Settlement & Environment	Bhaskaran Nair	Permanent Secretary
Department of Environment	Epeli Nasome	Director; NTF Chairman
	Sandeep Kaur Singh	IW National Coordinator
The University of the South Pacific	Satya Nandlal	NTF member
	Bill Aalbersberg	
	Cameron Hay	
Fiji Institute of Technology	Winifereti Nainoca	
PCDF	Floyd Robinson	
National Planning Department	Tevita Dawai	
WWF, World Wide Fund for Nature	Dermot O'Gorman	Representative
	Kesaia Tabunakawai	Program Director
	Etika Rupeni	Fiji Country Director
	Seri Hite	Solomon Islands Country Director
Vanuatu		
Environment Unit	Ernest Bani	Head
	Russell Nari	Deputy Director
	Leah Nimoho	IW National Coordinator
	Primrose Malosu	IWP Admin Assistant
	Donna Kalfatak	NBSAP Coordinator
USP Emaulus Campus	Yoli Tom Tavala	
Fisheries Department	Kalo Pakoa	Senior Biologist, Fisheries
Broadcasting & TV Corporation	Hillaire Bule	Journalist
Department of Geology, Mines & Water Resources	Erickson Sammy	Acting Director
Quarantine Services	Benuel Tari	Director
Vanuatu Cultural Centre	Ralph Reganvanu	Director
Department of Forestry & Conservation Unit	Ruben Bakeo	Policy & Program Officer
Department of Forestry	Tate Hannington	Acting Director
Department of Lands	Michael Mangawai	Director
Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific, FSP	Abel Tabisue	Consultant
Solomon Islands		
Department of Environment & Conservation	Moses Biliki	Director
	Kenneth Bulehite	IW National Coordinator
Fisheries Department	Eddie Orihaka	Director

Solomon Islands Development Trust	Abraham Beansia	Director
WWF, World Wide Fund for Nature	Silverio Wale	Liaison Officer
School of Natural Resources, SICHE	Alex Makini	Head
Tuvalu		
Office of the Prime Minister Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy & Environment	Uale Taleni Kelesoma Saloa	IW National Coordinator
Nauru		
Department of Industry & Economic Development	Tyrone Deiye	Director
Rehabilitation Ministry	Greta Harris Serenaid Dowabobo Roxan Pene Agadio Creedance Halstead	IW National Coordinator Assistant National Coordinator Environment Officer
PNG		
Department of Environment & Conservation	John Genolagani	Acting Secretary
National Research Institute	Narua Lovai	IW National Coordinator
National Fisheries Authority	John Sowe Molean Chapau	Director
Kiribati		
Ministry of Environment & Social Development	Karabati Taoaba	Permanent Secretary
Environment & Conservation Division	Terieta Mwemwenikeaki Tererei Abete-Reema	Assistant Secretary Acting Director
	Komeri Onorio Jo Braithwaite Tianeti Ioane Nakibae Teuatabo Noketi Karoua Paul Tekanene Mauea Wilson Taroe Beniera Katimira Nabatiku Naomi Atauea Danfung Binoka Ueraoi Taniera Taoniti Irata	IW National Coordinator Consultant Agricultural Officer PICCAP Coordinator Acting Pollution Control Officer Public Utilities Board AMAK - NGO RAK - NGO Teitoingaina - NGO MNRD CDSP CDSP FSPK
Marshall Islands		
Marshall Islands Visitors Authority	Mark Stege	General Manager
Environment Protection Agency	John Bungitak Tarry Lani Deborah Barker Nicole Baker Wilbur Heine	General Manager IW National Coordinator Biodiversity Officer Australia Volunteers Abroad Manager
Energy Division, Ministry of Resources and Development	Terry Keju,	
Marine Resources	Clary Makroro	Historic Preservation Officer
Interior Affairs	Arlington Robert	Assistant Manager
Majuro Water Sewer Company		
Federated States of Micronesia		
Department of Economic Affairs	Okean Ehmes	Project Manager, NBSAP
Kosrae EPA	Simpson Abraham	Director
FSM Economic Affairs Department	Sebastian Anefal	Secretary
Yap State Resources and Development Department	Joseph Giliko	Director
Workforce Enrichment Division	Jesse Tamel	Deputy Director
Commerce and Industries Division	Larry Raigetel	Chief
Marine Resources Management Division	Mike Gaan Andy Tafileichig	Chief Chief
Small Business Centre	Charles Yalaarow James Limar	IW Project Coordinator

Tooruw village	Martin Pisun Edmund Pisun	
Wacholab village	Al Ganang	Village View Resort
Palau		
Office of Environmental Response and Coordination	Youlsau Bells	National Environment Planner
Environmental Quality Protection Board	Joe Aitaro Ethan Daniels Terangue Tiger Gillham	IW National Coordinator National Science Coordinator Executive Officer
Palau Conservation Society	Judy Otto Ilebrang Olkeriil	Executive Director Rock Islands Support Officer
Bureau of Marine Resources Capital Improvement Projects	Alma Ridep-Morris Ric Mengham	MPA Program Manager Manager, Dept. of Design & Engineering
Foreign Affairs	Gustav Aitaro	International Trade & Technical Assistance
Cook Islands		
Environment Service	Vaitoti Tupa Tauraki Raea	Director IW National Coordinator
Niue		
Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Sauni Tongatule	Director
	Sione Leolah Tagiloa Cooper	IW National Coordinator
Agencies		
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme	Asterio Takesy	Director
	Vitolio Lui I'o Taukeu-Lindsay Pisa'ina Leilua-Lei Sam Andrew Wright Paula Holland Natasha Stacey	Deputy Director Programme Coordinator IW Project Manager IW Resource Economics IW Community Assessment & Participation
	Samson Samasoni Rosanna Gulavao Rama Va'a Matt McIntyre Alex Brunt Alofa Salima Tuuau Liz Dovey Mary Power Joyce Yu	IW Communications IW Administrator IW Accountant Programme Coordinator Finance Finance Invasive Species Programme Coastal & Marine Programme Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme	Tom Twining-Ward Tim Clairs Juha Uitto Ana Fa'aso	Environment Advisor Global Environment Facility Unit ex-IW Project Accountant
Forum Fisheries Agency The Nature Conservancy	Len Rodwell Gerald Miles Peter Thomas	Manager – Economics Marketing Senior Adviser Regional Director
IW Project Short-term Consultants	Tim O'Meara Kath Means	