



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS PROJECT
IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) FOR THE
INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES**

**FOURTH MULTIPARTITE REVIEW
11-12 August 2005
Apia, Samoa**

SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSION

1. Officials and International Waters National Coordinators from 13 countries participated in the fourth Multi-Partite Review (MPR-4) for the International Waters Project that is implementing the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States. The countries represented were the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Tonga and Vanuatu. In addition representatives from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) participated in the Review. A list of participants is annexed at Attachment A.

OPENING

2. The opening prayer was delivered by Reverend Nu'ausala Siutaia of the Apia Protestant Church. The Officer-in-Charge of SPREP, Ta'ito John Roache, delivered a welcome address (Attachment B).

3. The Keynote Address was delivered by the Chief Executive Officer of the Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (Attachment C).

4. Ms Joyce Yu, the Resident Representative of the UNDP (Apia) delivered Opening Remarks appended at Attachment D.

SELECTION OF CHAIR

5. The MPR unanimously selected Afiofa Faumuina Vole Sailimalo Pati K. Liu, the representative from Samoa, to Chair the meeting.

APOLOGIES

6. Apologies were received from representatives from Vanuatu, Tonga, Nauru and SPC who were unable to attend.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

7. The Meeting agreed to amend and adopt the meeting schedule as presented in IWP/MPR4/2005/Info. 2 in order for the MPR to be completed in one day.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

8. The agenda, as amended, was adopted (Attachment E).

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT/PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

ISSUES ARISING FROM MPR3

9. The Project Manager, Andrew Wright, referred the meeting to Working Paper IWP/MPR/2005/WP2a. He provided an update on action taken in response to requests from last year's MPR.

10. The Chairman raised the issue of engaging lead agency officials in the Project and the importance of providing opportunities for decision makers to integrate lessons from the IWP to their day-to-day activities.

11. The representative from Cook Islands, Mr Vaitouti Tupa, agreed that it appeared that the engagement of Lead Agencies in the Project was proving challenging in some countries. He noted that this was the first meeting for some representatives from some participating countries, and that high rotation of representation in the Project at this stage, with 15 months of the Project remaining, could prove challenging. He urged countries to more fully engage in the project, through senior lead agency officials. Supported by the representative from Tuvalu, Mr Kelesoma Saloa, he suggested that perhaps there is a need for an extra NCM plus MPR next year preceding the final MPR in September – to ensure that project impacts during its critical final 12 months are maximized.

12. Ms Joyce Yu, The Resident Representative from UNDP, Apia supported this suggestion. She suggested that a second MPR in 2006 should consider options for securing support for initiatives that may build on the lessons and findings of the IWP beyond 2006 as well as consider exit strategies. She advised that one of the central responsibilities for the new GEF Adviser based at the Apia Office was to assist with the development of new GEF proposals.

13. Assistant UNDP Resident Representative, Ms Easter Galuvao, added that some countries would be hosting country dialogue workshops in the foreseeable future and that these provided a good opportunity to discuss future option and transition strategies in relation to national IWP activities. The representative from Kiribati, Mr Rikiaua, agreed with this suggestion.

14. The Chair added that it is important for Lead Agencies to discuss how the initiatives of the IWP are to be mainstreamed to Government services and initiatives, as was being undertaken in Samoa with the integration of the Samoa IWP to a new unit responsible for water management being established within the Ministry of Natural Resources, and the Environment.

15. The representative from Papua New Guinea, Mr Gunther Joku, added that there are also project sustainability issues at the host communities that need to be considered.

16. The Project Manager considered that, with appropriate marketing, many communities that had hosted IWP activities could be attractive to others with an interest in supporting community-based resource management. He considered that the IWP investment in the initial community engagement processes was considerable – in most instances it had taken considerable time and resources. He thought that, as long as communities were willing to consider new implementation arrangements, this investment could lead to considerable savings for others, such as NGOs, who might progress the IWP initiatives beyond 2006.

17. He also advised that options for a Phase II for the coastal component of the IWP were limited. This was because the South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission (SOPAC) has secured an initial commitment from the GEF to fund a five year integrated coastal water management (IWM) project – tentatively valued at US\$8.5 million. This meant Pacific SIDS were unlikely to access GEF funding for a similar scale regional initiative addressing ICWM. However, he considered countries had other options available for securing GEF support for further work piloted by the IWP. These included the UNDP Small Grants Programme and the possibility of designing a Medium Size Project (<US\$1 million) for national execution.

18. The delegate for FSM asked whether applications for Medium Size Projects would be affected by involvement in the SOPAC regional project. Ms Galuvao advised that this would be the case only if the two projects addressed the same issue.

19. The representative from Palau, Mr Joe Aitaro, advised that the SOPAC proposal had initially caused officials some concern because another large community-based proposal was likely to cause confusion after the IWP had already done considerable work with communities.

20. The representative from Vanuatu, Ms Leah Nimoho, noted that the SOPAC proposal is quite technical whereas the IWP has adopted a more social approach to implementation.

21. Ms Yu noted that all countries participating in the IWP are members of both SOPAC and SPREP and that collaboration between the two Secretariats did not only depend on agency staff but also depended on good strategic oversight by respective members. She noted that the GEF Secretariat regards effective synergies between agencies as important elements that can make a significant contribution to successful project implementation.

22. The Chair advised that this issue has been raised in previous MPRs. He noted that while there is a need to ensure that regional organizations coordinate their work there are also issues at the national level with respect to inter-ministerial collaboration.

23. The Meeting noted the report relating to issues arising from the 2004 MPR.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

24. The Project Manager presented IWP/MPR4/2005/WP. 2b the draft Project Implementation Report.

25. On behalf of the Meeting the Chairman expressed appreciation for the detailed report and invited the Meeting to provide comments.

26. Although she noted that the reported had been circulated electronically in May, the representative from the Federated States of Micronesia, Ms Cindy Ehmes, asked that the report be circulated to officials for one week to allow time for comments to be submitted.

27. UNDP informed the meeting that PIF is a GEF requirement and that country feedback is very important, noting that the deadline for input to the report was the end of July.

28. In order to provide an opportunity to consult on the draft with officials in capitals, the Meeting agreed that any comments on the draft should be submitted to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) by close of business, Friday 19th August.

29. The Project Manager appealed to representatives for assistance in providing additional information in the report relating to i) co-financing for Project initiatives and ii) partnerships. The Chairman supported this request noting that host agencies make many contributions to the implementation of the Project that is rarely documented. He urged countries to assess the value of the

provision of corporate support, technical backstopping and other infrastructural and logistical support to assist the PCU to report more comprehensively on these items.

OCEANIC COMPONENT – PHASE I/II

30. The Project Manager presented Working Paper IWP/MPR4/2005/WP 2c relating to Project-related activities being executed at the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

31. The representative from Tuvalu considered that oceanographic information would be very useful if it was made available to member countries. He noted that information on the trends in fishing activity in response to changing oceanographic conditions could assist government in understanding changes of fishing activity within EEZs – and as a result impact on fishing license revenue. The Project Manager advised that this information is increasingly being made available to the public and that the oceanic component of the SPC website was a good resource for people interested in the dynamics of regional tuna fisheries.

32. The representative of Cook Islands moved that the report from SPC be noted with appreciation. This was accepted by the Meeting.

COASTAL COMPONENT – OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

33. The Project's Natural Resource Economist, Ms Paula Holland, presented IWP/MPR4/2005/WP. 2d. She advised that the paper is presented as a supplement to the draft Progress Implementation Report presented under agenda item 2b in that it focused principally on the regional-level activities of the Project. She noted that these concerned four broad areas relating to the Project's contribution to i) the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy and its associated Integrated Strategic Action Framework, ii) contributions to the draft Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and to preliminary discussions relating to a Regional Integrated Waste Management Strategy, iii) a collaborative project with the University of Adelaide to examine issues associated with governance and ICWM in three Melanesian countries and planned attempts to synthesize the outcomes of that into a regional assessment and iv) common lessons being generated by participating countries in areas such as monitoring and evaluation, participatory processes and baseline assessments.

34. The representative from Tuvalu noted that their baseline studies that looked at economic evaluation, institutional, reviews were not included in the report. PCU noted that the information had been undertaken outside the reporting period.

35. Tuvalu then requested clarification about the link with Integrated Waste Management Strategy and IWP work. He stated that he would like to see this Strategy assist individual countries in taking pressure off demand for IWP resources. PCU noted that decisions around ISWM would not be made until after the annual SPREP meeting. It was also noted that the Waste Unit was constrained by the lack of a solid waste officer.

36. The representative from Vanuatu asked when the report for Vanuatu under the collaborative project with the University of Adelaide would be available. Ms Holland responded that the report was anticipated this month and that the reports for Solomon Islands and Fiji were complete, that the possibility of further work had been discussed but that no new initiatives would be supported until the outstanding work for Vanuatu was complete.

37. The representative from Fiji reported that the Fiji IWP had made a contribution to the first national forum on the development of a solid waste management strategy for Fiji.

38. UNDP acknowledged the contribution by the IWP to the PIROP and the NSWT and enquired about possible contributions by the IWP to other relevant CROP agency working groups and programmes. It was noted that the Project's association with the MSWG, besides being the WG with a

mandate of most direct relevance to the Project's work, was also nominated in the original IW Project Document as the WG that the Project should report through.

39. In relation to the economic and institutional work Ms Holland responded that economic work would directly contribute to national policy where that had been the purpose of the work being initiated. She also advised that it was not yet clear to what extent the institutional work with Dr Lane would directly impact national policy and that it would depend in part on time and resources.

40. Ms Galuvao emphasised it was important to highlight the findings of the work that had been undertaken as part of mainstreaming IWP work to national policies and programmes.

41. The Meeting noted the report.

FINANCIAL REPORT

42. The Project Accountant, Mr Rama Va'a, presented a summary of the Project budget (IWP/MPR4/NCM6/2005/WP. 4). The presentation included total expenditure on the Project to date by item, agency and country, information on proposed budget revisions and the 2004 audit. At the conclusion of the presentation the Chairman invited comments from the floor.

43. The representative from Tonga asked if the proposed Revision 5 budget accommodated the earlier suggestion of the Meeting that a second MPR be convened in 2006. The Project Manager responded that the current proposed revision did not accommodate this suggestion. He advised there were two sources of funding to support a second MPR i) savings resulting from the non-participation of several officials that had been budgeted for support to this Meeting and ii) national project budgets.

44. The Project Manager added that, on average, there is approximately US\$120,000 remaining for each of the 13 operational national projects. If the average National Coordinator salary is deducted from this amount, and the distribution of remaining funds is done equitably, each country has approximately US\$90,000 to support operational activities in the last six quarter of the Project. Although the requirements for funds will vary from country to country, and on the basis no new high-cost initiatives would be started, there should be sufficient funds available to satisfactorily complete the Project in all participating countries.

45. The representative from UNDP noted that it is important for countries to report any financial support and partnerships that are applied to support the implementation of the IW projects. This will indicate to the GEF that in country financial and in kind support is real and will contribute to improve confidence relating to the sustainability of IWP initiatives. She reflected on the earlier comment relating to the need to report on in-kind support in the Progress Implementation Report.

46. The Meeting adopted the Financial Report on the basis that the recommendation relating to a second MPR in 2006 would be provided for.

REPORT OF THE 5th AND 6th NATIONAL COORDINATOR'S MEETING

47. The Chairman of NCM6 and the National Coordinator from Niue, Sione Leolahi, presented a report on NCM5, the radio workshop that was held in advance of the present set of Meetings and NCM6 (IWP/MPR4/2005/WP.4).

48. The official from Fiji acknowledged the work and effort by all National Coordinators since last year's MPR. The official from Cook Islands seconded this. He reported his observation of the discussions during NCM6 had been very encouraging. He urged the National Coordinators to continue this effort during the next 16 months. The Chairman added his appreciation for the work of the National Coordinators underscoring the responsibility that rests with National Coordinators for the successful conclusion of this Project.

49. The reports of the 5th and 6th National Coordinator's Meetings were noted.

LOG FRAME REVIEW

50. The Project Manager reported on the log frame for the IWP. He noted that the log frame has not been refined since the last MPR and that Output 4, relating to the oceanic component was now effectively complete. He invited comments from the Meeting in case any refinements were needed.

51. The Chair invited participants to review the log frame and provide comments on any suggested refinements in writing to the PCU.

DRAFT REPLICATION STRATEGY

52. The Natural Resource Economist presented IWP/MPR4/2005/WP. 6b relating to the draft Replication Strategy for information. She noted that this had also been discussed during NCM6. The current draft was the result of the work of the PCU and a consultant that was initiated during NCM5 in 2004. The draft drew on the lessons learned material that is being consolidated by the PCU. She noted that finalization of the draft would not be possible until the national reporting was completed in early 2006.

53. The Meeting noted the draft with appreciation. The Chairman urged all participants to review the draft and work to provide additional material that can be used to finalise the draft as early as possible in 2006. He noted that there were few apparent precedents for this type of initiative so that the Strategy offered the potential to be an extremely valuable outcome of the IWP. He also noted that the Strategy would be of significant benefit to participating countries as they consider options to continue IWP initiatives beyond 2006.

HIGHLIGHTS FOR LESSONS LEARNED

54. The Project Manager observed that, given the preceding presentations on the draft Replication Strategy and draft Progress Implementation Report, where lessons learned had received considerable attention, there was little to add under this agenda item. He supported the appeal from the Chairman relating to the need to document lessons learned. He observed that documentation of lessons should cover all stages of the Project – from administration and logistical issues at the commencement of the Project through to monitoring and the final evaluation.

55. The Chair suggested that lessons learned reports should be considered as living documents on which countries should be continuously building.

56. The representative of the Cook Islands, Mr Tupa, agreed that the responsibility was now with National Coordinators to document the learnings of the Project. He encouraged National Coordinators to make a concerted effort in this regard. He also considered that the experience of the National Coordinators could be of significant assistance to the PCU in preparing a refinement of the current draft, prior to its finalization next year. He urged National Coordinators to review the draft and provide comments back to the PCU.

57. The National Coordinator from Fiji, Ms Sandeep Singh noted that the PCU would be synthesizing lessons learned. She asked that lessons not be diluted so that lessons remain as country-specific. The Project Manager stated that a consolidated lessons learned publication could annex individual country reports. He also recommended that in-country reports thoroughly document lessons so that the reports can be published as stand alone documents – an excellent outcome for the Project would be a lessons learned document published for each participating country.

TERMINAL EVALUATION

58. The Project Manager referred the Meeting to WIP/MPR4/NCM6/2005/WP.6c. He observed the importance of this evaluation, the draft Terms Of Reference for which were based on guidelines provided to Implementing Agencies by the GEF Secretariat. He recommended participating countries endorse the terms of reference, scope, evaluator attributes, and proposed schedule for the terminal evaluation as soon as possible so that sufficient time was available to locate the best possible people for the assignment.

59. The Project Manager reported that a budget of approximately US\$120,000 had been reserved for the Evaluation and that he envisaged the reviewers would have to start work in early April 2006 in order to complete a thorough evaluation covering all 14 participating countries. This meant that the team for the terminal evaluation would probably be larger than had been the case for the mid term evaluation in 2003. He also noted that at least one of the members of the review team should have considerable participatory natural resource management experience – preferably in the Pacific Islands region.

60. The Project Manager suggested that an advanced draft of the Terminal Evaluation Report should be considered at the next MPR. He had recommended to SPREP Management that the next MPR be held in the week immediately prior to the 17th Annual SPREP Meeting that is tentatively scheduled to take place in New Caledonia. He recalled that, at the suggestion of the representative from the Cook Islands, it was possible that two MPRs may be convened next year. He suggested that if a second MPR was to be held it might be useful to convene it after the SPREP Meeting in the 4th Quarter of 2006 to consider practical means to implement the Replication Strategy in the light of the findings of the Terminal Evaluation.

61. The Project Manager concluded by appealing to the National Coordinators to ensure that they keep all relevant stakeholders in their countries fully informed of their projects and the progress they were making as the terminal evaluators will want to talk as many in-country stakeholders as possible. Those stakeholders need to be fully informed about the project so that they can give a fair account of the project's achievements, shortcomings and lessons.

62. The Chair invited the Meeting to provide feedback on the draft terms of reference, scope and schedule for the Terminal Evaluation by 1 September 2005.

OTHER BUSINESS

63. The representative from Fiji expressed appreciation and best wishes, on behalf of the Fiji Government, to Andrew Wright who was leaving the Project to take up a post with the new Tuna Commission. The representative of the Cook Islands also extended his best wishes, on behalf of MPR, acknowledging the valuable contribution of the exiting Project Manager to the IWP across the region. He observed that the Project has come a long way since its inception and there has been considerable progress. On behalf of the MPR, he wished the Project Manager good luck with his new assignment.

64. The Project Manager acknowledged the work of the National Coordinators, countries and the PCU in contributing to project's progress. He thanked the Meeting and all associated with the Project for their support during his time with SPREP. He asked officials to continue to support their national projects especially while the project was awaiting a replacement Project Manager. The Project Manager stressed importance of monitoring and recording the successes of national projects and he appealed to lead agency officials to pay particular attention to the work of National Coordinators, and support them where possible, throughout the next 12 months.

NEXT MEETING

65. The Chairman advised that the PCU, in consultation with participating countries, would advise of the dates and venue for the next meeting early in 2006.

SUMMARY RECORD

66. This summary record was adopted by the MPR.

CLOSE OF MEETING

67. UNDP expressed thanks to the Chair for his leadership in the Meeting. She stated that the Meeting had been very productive and instructive and thanked all NCs and officials for their work in the Project. She extended thanks to the PCU and other SPREP staff for arranging and supporting the Meeting. Ms Galuvao encouraged NCs to keep up their good work. She reiterated the support of the UNDP to countries. Finally she reiterated the thanks of the Meeting to the departing Project Manager.

68. The Chair reminded the Meeting to document lessons learned and get these to the PCU as quickly as possible. He reminded the Meeting to advise the PCU of any in-kind support provided by countries to the Project. He requested input from participants on the Terminal Evaluation as quickly as possible to prepare for tenders. He reminded the Meeting of the short time left in the Project and encouraged countries to complete their work as well as possible.

69. The Chair thanked SPREP for Meeting support and reiterated thanks to the departing Project Manager. He thanked the UNDP for its support and guidance.

70. The Chair declared the Meeting closed.

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS PROJECT
IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES**

**FOURTH MULTIPARTITE REVIEW
Apia, Samoa
11-12 August 2005**

**Sixth National Coordinator's Meeting
8-10 August 2005**

**Information Paper 4
Participants List**



COOK ISLANDS

Mr. Tauraki Raea
National Coordinator
Cook Islands Environment Service
Cook Islands Government
PO Box 371
Rarotonga
Phone: +682 21256
Fax: +682 22256
Email: iwpcooks@environment.org.ck
iwpcooks@oyster.net.ck

Mr. Vaitoti Tupa
MPR-4 Representative
Director
Cook Islands Environment Service
Cook Islands Government
PO Box 371
Rarotonga
Phone: +682 21256
Fax: +682 22256
Email: vaitoti@environment.org.ck

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Mr. Jesse Gajdusek
Deputy Director
Department of Resources & Development
PO Box 251
Colonia
96943 Yap
Federated States of Micronesia
Phone: +691 3502182
Fax: +691 3502571
Email: iwpyap@hotmail.com
fsmiwp@mail.fm

Mrs. Cynthia Ehmes
MPR-4 Representative
Sustainable Development Planner
Department of Economic Affairs
PO Box PS-12
Palikir
FSM 96941 Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Phone: +679 304180 / 3202646
Fax: +691 3205854
Email: climate@mail.fm
fsmdea@mail.fm

FIJI

Ms. Sandeep Singh
National Coordinator
Ministry of Local Govt. Housing, Squatter Settlement
& Environment
PO Box 2131
Government Buildings
SUVA
Phone: +679 3311699 / 3316580
Fax: +679 3312879
Email: iwpfj@connect.com.fj

Mr. Tevita Dawai
MPR-4 Representative
A/Senior Economic Planning Officer
Office of National Planning
Sectoral/Regional Unit
Ministry of Finance & National Planning
8th Flr. Ro Lalabalavu House
P.O Box 2351,
Govt. Building
Suva
Phone: + 679 3313411 (ext. 2322)
Fax: +679 3304809
Email: tdawai@govnet.gov.fj

KIRIBATI

Mrs. Ritia T. Bakineti
National Coordinator
Environment Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agricultural
Development
PO Box 234
Bikenibeu, Tarawa
Phone: +686 28425 / 28211 / 28000
Fax: +686 28261
Email: ritia_b@tskl.net.ki

Mr. Rikiau Takeke
MPR-4 REPRESENTATIVE
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Environment, Lands &
Agricultural Devpt.
PO Box 234
Bairiki, TARAWA
Phone: +686 28507
Fax: +686 28334
Email: rtakeke@melad.gov.ki

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Mr. Lowell Alik
National Coordinator
Office of Environmental Planning & Policy
Coordination
Office of the President
PO Box 925
96960 MAJURO
Phone: +692 6257944
Fax: +692 625 7918
Email: oeppc@ntamar.net

Hon. Jisham Kaisha
MPR-4 Representative

NIUE

Mr. Sione Leolahi
National Coordinator
Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries
(DAFF)
PO Box 74
Alofi
Phone: +683 4032
Fax: +683 4079
Email: sionel@mail.gov.nu

Mrs. Gaylene Tasmania
MPR-4 Representative
Phone: +683 4032
Fax: +683 4079
Email: fisheries@mail.gov.nu

PALAU

Mr. Joseph Aitaro
National Coordinator
Office of Environmental Response & Coordination
PO Box 7086
Koror, PW 96940
Republic of, Palau
Phone: +680 4886950 / 4886952
Fax: +680 4888638
Email: iwppalau@msn.com
jaitaro@palau-oerc.net

*No representative

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr. Narua Lovai
National Coordinator
International Waters Project - PNG
PO Box 265
Waigani, NCD
Papua New Guinea
Phone: +675 325 2043
Fax: +675 3251082
Email: iwp_png2@datec.net.pg

Mr. Gunther Joku
MPR-4 Representative
Department of Environment & Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCD
Papua New Guinea
Phone: +675 3232619
Fax: +675 3250182
Email: env.council@daltron.com.pg

SAMOA

Mr. Maturo Paniani
National Coordinator
Chief International Waters Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment &
Meteorology (MNREM)
PO Box L1849
Apia
Phone: +685 22729 / 21054
Fax: +685 25856
Email: maturo_p@yahoo.com

Afioga Faumuina Vole Sailimalo Pati K. Liu
MPR-4 Representative
Assistant Director
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
(MNRE)
PO Box L1849
Apia
Phone: +685 25856 / 25670
Fax: +685 23176
Email: envdlse@lesamoa.net

SOLOMON ISLANDS

*No representative

Mr. Patrick Mesia
MPR-4 Representative
Community Facilitator
International Waters Project
PO Box 1424, Honiara
Phone: +677 21521/ 28735
Fax: +677 28735
Email: intwaters@solomon.com.sb

TONGA

Mr. Sione Fakaosi
National Coordinator
Department of Environment
PO Box 917
Nuku'alofa
Phone: +676 27769 / 27767
Fax: +676 25051
Email: nciwpton@kalianet.to /
sionef@environment.gov.to

*No representative

TUVALU

Mr. Kelesoma Saloa
National
Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy &
Environment
Private Mail Bag
Funafuti
Phone: +688 20064
Fax: +688 20178 / +688 20826
Email: tuviwp@tuvalu.tv
ksaloa@yahoo.com / enviro@tuvalu.tv

*No representative

VANUATU

Ms. Leah Nimoho
National Coordinator
Environment Unit
Private Mail Bag 9063
Port Vila
Phone: +678 25302 / 22227
Fax: +678 23565 / 22227
Email: iwp-vanuatu@vanuatu.com.vu

*No representative

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
(UNDP) Apia Office
Private Mail Bag
APIA
Samoa**

Phone: +685 23670 / +685 23671
Fax: +685 23555
Website: <http://www.undp.org.ws>

Ms. Joyce Yu
Resident Representative
UNDP Apia

Email: registry@undp.org

Ms. Easter Galuvao
Assistant Resident Representative

Email: easter.galuvao@undp.org

Ms. Veronica Levi
Programme Associate - Environment

Email: veronica.levi@undp.org

**SPREP Secretariat
P.O. Box 240
Apia**

Phone: +685 21929 / 24689
Fax: +685 20231/ 24689
Website: www.sprep.org.ws

Mr. Asterio Takesy
Director

Email: AsterioT@sprep.org

Mr. Taito John Roache
Corporate Services Manager

Email: JohnR@sprep.org

Ms. Kate Brown
Action Strategy Coordinator

Email: KateB@sprep.org

Mr. Vainuupo Jungblut
Assistant Ramsar Officer

Email: VainuupoJ@sprep.org

Mr. Clark Peteru
Environmental Legal Adviser

Email: ClarkP@sprep.org

Mr. Andrew Wright
Project Manager
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: DrewW@sprep.org

Ms. Paula Holland
Natural Resource Economist (NRE)
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: PaulaH@sprep.org

Ms. Roslyn Sue Le Mesurier
Community Assessment & Participation Specialist
(CAPS)
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: SueL@sprep.org

Mr. Steve Menzies
Community Communications Specialist (CCS)
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: SteveM@sprep.org

Mr. Rama Va'a
Project Accountant
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: RamaV@sprep.org

Ms. Rosanna Galuvao M. -Ah Ching
Project Assistant
International Waters Project (IWP)

Email: RosannaG@sprep.org

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS PROJECT
IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) FOR
THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND
DEVELOPING STATES**

FOURTH MULTIPARTITE REVIEW

**[Apia, Samoa]
11-12 August 2005**

**Draft Welcome Remarks
Taito John Roache
Officer-in-Charge
SPREP**

Salutations.....

Rev. Nu'uausala Siutaia from the Apia Protestant Church,
Hon. Tuisugaletaua Sofara Aveau, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment
Ms Joyce Yu, UNDP Resident Representative,
Representatives of the Pacific island countries participating in the Global Environment
Facility's International Waters Project,
UNDP and SPREP staff,

Thank you Reverend Nu'uausala for the thoughtful and appropriate prayers which, I am sure will help guide this Meeting over the next two days. We appreciate very much the effort you have put into preparing your prayer for this morning.

On behalf of the Director of SPREP, Mr. Asterio Takesy, it is my privilege to welcome you all, locals and visitors alike, here to the SPREP Office at Vailima.

Although we were fortunate to have Mr. Takesy here for the Tuesday information evening, that happened during only a 2-day layover in Apia for him. He left again yesterday to attend a meeting of regional organisations in Suva.

Mr. Takesy expressed disappointment at missing this meeting and he has asked me to convey a couple of things to you.

Firstly, the IWP is the largest project that SPREP hosts – and this has been the case for the last 5 years. The Organization places very high priority on its efficient implementation.

This is because, unlike many regional projects that the Secretariat coordinates, the IWP touches on areas that stretches across the entire work programme of the Secretariat. As a result, the lessons that it generates have the potential to have a very significant impact on the way SPREP does its business in the future.

The IWP is supporting national and regional level activities in waste management and sanitation in eight SPREP Member countries.

This underscores the fact that SPREP Members now consider the threats posed by poor waste management and sanitation as perhaps the major threat to the environment in the region. In

fact, in some of our Members there are situations in high population areas where waste is literally a national crisis.

Working collaboratively with our own waste management and pollution group within the Pacific Futures Programme here at SPREP, and other regional agencies such as the South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission, the IWP has been generating some very useful information relating to the behavior of people and institutions with respect to the mounting problems caused by waste – piloting new approaches to how we might effectively manage this threat.

Some very interesting information is starting to flow from the IWP's projects in Tuvalu, Tonga, Fiji, and Marshall's that can be useful for all countries in the region as they implement strategies to improve the management of waste.

Likewise with the IWP's efforts to pilot new ways to protect our valuable freshwater resources – which for some of our low island and atoll Members during El Nino periods can be a very scarce commodity indeed - is also generating valuable lessons.

Not only is poor waste management and sanitation impacting on the quality of our freshwater resources – but simple wastage of water is surprisingly widespread.

Through the efforts of SOPAC, and arrangements such as the World Water Forum, we are starting to realize just how blessed most of our countries are in relation to the water we have access to.

But population growth of around 3% annually means that future access to quality freshwater supplies is by no means assured. We need to act now to institutionalize effective water resources management – from the community to the national level. In Cook Islands and here in Samoa, this is exactly what the IWP is trying to support.

The Project also works closely with many elements of our Island Ecosystems Programme – particularly in the area of sustainable management and conservation of coastal resources.

In Yap, Solomon Islands, Niue and Vanuatu the project has been working hard to establish coastal resource management arrangements that are essentially implemented and monitored by the communities themselves.

Again, it is encouraging that a lot of this work is being undertaken in partnership with others – such as the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and NGOs such as the Foundation of the People's of the South Pacific, and the WorldFish.

Central to this effort has been an accurate understanding of the social, economic and ecological baseline information. Before we apply any project resources to try and bring about change, it is essential to understand the baseline situation. Too often in the past this has not been done. The Project is demonstrating just how important it is to pay more attention to this.

The second key point that Mr. Takesy asked me to emphasize with you however is the fact that the IWP has a little over a year to run.

Although some work has already started integrating the learnings of the IWP to the Islands Ecosystems Programme, for example, SPREP is keenly waiting for the final findings of the Project. Mr. Takesy asked me to assure you that SPREP Management and staff will provide whatever support is necessary to ensure that this happens in a timely and efficient way.

However, at the same time, the final outcomes prepared by the PCU are going to be critically linked to what the National Coordinators will produce next year. The PCU will be constrained in terms of the information that it has available to it unless the national experiences with the Project are thoroughly documented.

This is not only critical in terms of finalizing reporting next year, but it will also provide the key information to be used by the Terminal Evaluation. And it will also be fundamental to the preparation of any follow-up project proposal that countries might be considering for submission to the GEF, for example, under their medium size grant programme.

So I leave you with that plea. The effort and resources applied to this Project over the last 5 years or so justify a great deal of attention to documenting the outcomes and impacts of the Project.

SPREP and the PCU will provide whatever backstopping is possible to support the work of National Coordinators between now and the start of the second quarter next year to ensure documentation of national level activities is thorough.

With that, it is now my pleasure to welcome the Hon. Tuisugaletau Sofara Aveau, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment here in Samoa to deliver his Keynote Address.

4th IWP MPR - Talking Points

- This is the 4th MPR and perhaps the most critical one too as we prepare for the final wrap up of the project at the end of 2006
- The MPR is one of the major monitoring and evaluation tools available in the context of UNDP/GEF programmes and projects. Generally the yearly MPR's have the following overall functions: (1) to review the previous year's performance of the project against its set targets and objectives; (2) to review, discuss, and approve the Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Review (PIR); (3) to consider, and advise on, the following year's proposed work plan and budget; and (4) to consider the extent to which project objectives are being met and advise, as necessary, on means to improve project performance. Basically it is an opportunity for you from the participating countries and other stakeholders to monitor progress and performance and recommend on future activities.
- This year's MPR should start to report on results achieved, which includes lessons learnt and best practices for possible replications. MPR to focus on strategic outcomes and high level achievements
- Reiterate that GEF is now more focused on impacts, thus the need to properly document impacts as a result of the project in particular lessons learnt that could be shared globally, regionally and nationally.
- A number of resource and information materials are have been produced by the project. These are important not only to share information but also to raise awareness. However, more critical is how the application of these information into use by stakeholders and the eventual translation of these information into national and regional policies.
- Need to re-examine national and regional priorities that could be realistically achieved within the remaining 16 months of the project
This is one of the key tasks for your meeting. It is time to focus on realistic targets that the IWP can achieve in the remaining months. These are both the national and regional targets. The IWP is a regional project, it is therefore essential to reflect clearly on the regional aspects and achievements of the IWP in addition to the national achievements.
- Need to explore opportunities for follow up work beyond the IWP timeframe. You are encouraged to start looking at the future beyond the IWP and explore opportunities for follow up initiatives. In addition to the support that the IWP and PCU are providing, UNDP is keen to assist countries by providing possible information on project development and funding opportunities. Reference to the GEF SGP.
- Urge Governments to seriously look into strategies on how the IWP work could be integrated into national programmes to ensure sustainability and replication of best practices that have come out of the IWP.
- Urge participating countries to build partnerships and collaborations with other national and regional initiatives relevant to IWP.
- Acknowledge work by governments, national coordinators, PCU and SPREP and the achievements by the project to date.
- Challenge the PCU and the participating countries to continue to the hard work and to prioritise the use of the resources to ensure maximum benefits by the end of the project

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS PROJECT
IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) FOR THE
INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING
STATES**

FOURTH MULTIPARTITE REVIEW

**[Apia, Samoa]
11-12 August 2005**

Draft Agenda

- a) Opening Prayer (Rev. Nu'uausala Siutaia)
- b) Welcome Remarks (Taito John Roache)
- c) Keynote Address (Afioga Lufatasaga Tu'u'u Dr. Ieti Taulealo)
- d) Opening Remarks (Ms. Joyce Yu)
- e) Selection of Chair
- f) Apologies
- g) Procedural Issues
- h) Introduction of participants
- i) Adoption of Agenda
 - 1. Participating Country Opening Statements
 - 2. Annual Project Progress Report
 - a. Issues Arising from MPR3
 - b. Project Implementation Report
 - c. Oceanic Component – Phase I/II (FFA or SPC)
 - d. Coastal Component ((SPREP/PCU)
 - e. National Pilot Site Components
 - 3. Financial Report
 - 4. Report from the 5th and 6th National Coordinator's Meetings
 - 5. Logframe Review
 - 6. Draft Replication Strategy
 - 7. Highlights for Lessons Learned
 - 8. Terminal Evaluation
 - 9. Other Business
- j) Next Meeting
- k) Summary Record
- l) Close of Meeting

