

IWP/MPR4/2005/WP. 2b

**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**

Agenda Item 2

Working Paper 2b
Draft Annual Project Report

Blue – PCU,

Orange – SPC contribution.

ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT (APR) FOR UNDP/GEF PROJECTS			
[JULY 31, 2005]			
OFFICIAL TITLE:	International Waters Project (IWP) implementing the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) of the Pacific Small Island Developing States		
COUNTRY(IES):	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.		
UNDP PROJECT NUMBER:	RAS/98/G32	GEF PROJECT NUMBER:	990
DATE OF REPORT:	<u>July 2005</u>	DATE OF LAST APR:	<u>July 2004</u>

I. BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFIERS- Please enter all date (DD/MM/YEAR)	
FOCAL AREA	IW
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	9
DATE OF ENTRY IN WP	15/07/1998
PRODOC SIGNATURE DATE	17/02/2000
DURATION (MONTHS)	84
DATE OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT ¹	June 2001
CLOSING DATE	Original: 17/02/2005
	Revised 1: 31/12/2006
	Revised 2:

**1.1 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION. (To be filled by Regional Coordinating Unit)
As it appears in PIMS. Please adjust if required.**

The long-term objective of this project is to conserve and sustainably manage the coastal and ocean resources in the Pacific Region. Targeted actions will be carried out in complementary linked consultative contexts: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (ICWM) and Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM). ICWM actions will focus on freshwater supplies including groundwater, Marine Protected Area (MPA) enhancement and development, sustainable coastal fisheries, integrated coastal management including tourism development, and activities to demonstrate waste reduction strategies will be stressed. The OFM component will target the Western Pacific Warm Pool ecosystem, whose boundaries correspond almost precisely to the Western Pacific tuna fishery. Interventions will include three other pressing concerns related to SIDS, namely biodiversity, vulnerability to climate change and land degradation. Management capacity at the individual country and regional level will be strengthened and global benefits would accrue. The project will provide working examples of economies of scale in environmental management.

Has it been adjusted? :

YES:
NO: The Project Description itself has not been adjusted but the conclusion of elements of the OFM component of the Project has resulted in some minor changes to implementation arrangements during 2004. In December 2004, the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), which jointly executed the OFM Component of the Project with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), completed the activities it was responsible for under the Project. SPC is scheduled to conclude the activities it is responsible for in June 2005. Throughout 2004, the EAs worked to design a second Phase for the OFM Component – an activity completed with a PDF-B Grant. Although yet to be formally endorsed by the GEF Council, it

¹ To be filled in Headquarters

is expected that, by the time this APR is submitted, the Phase II Project will be approved and implementation commenced. FFA and SPC are assuming joint responsibility for execution.

2: IMPACTS AND RESULTS RELATED TO THE NEW GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

A set of questions specific for GEF IW projects has been designed. . Please fill out Section 2 on impacts and results after question 11 of the standard APR questionnaire.

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE

SRF Goal (*):	Environmentally sustainable development to reduce human poverty
SRF Sub Goal (*)	
Strategic Area of Support (*)	

(*) The UNDP Country Office will fill out these fields

3.1 OBJECTIVE.

To address the root cause of degradation of international waters in the Pacific islands region through a project focused on improved oceanic fisheries management and integrated coastal and watershed management.

Indicator 1 (2000)	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
Country participation in development of and endorsement for OFM and ICWM work plans.	100%	100%	100%	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	S	S

Indicator 2 (2000)	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
Country participation on committees and work	100%	100%	100%	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	S	S

² Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

groups associated with OFM and ICWM activities.								
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator 3 (2003)	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
Pacific island country participation on committees and work groups associated with OFM and ICWM activities.	100%	100%	100%	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council).	S	S

Indicator 4 (2003)	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
Collaborative arrangements with other stakeholders, for example other South Pacific regional organizations and NGOs, to address root causes for degradation for	<30%	<75%	90%	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council), MoU's and other partnership arrangements.	Meeting records (MPR and CROP agency governing council), MoU's and other partnership arrangements.	S	S

international waters.									
Indicator 5 (2003)	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating		
OFM and ICWM-related root cause analysis and Project response strategies.	Zero consideration to root cause analysis in natural resource management response strategies (Project and other).	100% of Project activities driven by root cause analysis. Minor occurrence of root cause analysis in other related projects.	Project demonstrated application of root cause assessment in all activities. Other projects routinely considering root cause issues in response strategies.	Technical and meeting reports.	Technical and meeting reports.	S	S		

Overall rating	S
-----------------------	----------

<i>Project Comment on rating</i>	During 2004 it became increasingly evident that national level personnel and institutional capacity dictated Project achievements. Where environment management agencies are actively engaged in Project implementation and Project staff at the national level receives broad based in-country support, Project achievements are broadly satisfactory. Where this support is lacking Project achievements are limited. This occurs in countries with poorly resourced lead agencies that are expected to service a large number of competing demands. In addition, the recommendation from the Mid-Term Evaluation relating to increased autonomy for participating countries in respect of project implementation has proven to be generally poor advice. In situations where the Project Coordination Unit consciously stood back to provide an opportunity for increased national “driveness”, Project achievements (and management of personnel and financial resources and partnerships has suffered. This does not apply to all participating countries.
<i>CO Comment</i>	
<i>RC Comment</i>	
<i>PTA Comment</i>	

3.2 OUTCOMES.³ -

Outcome 1 Establish effective project implementation support							
	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating ⁴
<u>Indicator 1:</u> Project Coordination Unit operational within EA offices;	Zero	Fully operational	Fully operational	Narrative and financial reports, work plans.	Narrative and financial reports, work plans.	HS	HS
<u>Indicator 2:</u> Administrative arrangements to support in-country project-related activities designed and established	Zero	Fully operational	Fully operational	Narrative and financial reports, work plans.	Narrative and financial reports, work plans.	HS	HS
<u>Indicator 3:</u> Technical advisory/backstopping services established	Zero	Fully operational	Fully operational	Staff contracts, narrative and financial reports, work plans. Some disruption was experienced in 2003/2004 due the resignation of the Community Communication Specialist in December 2003. A replacement commenced duties in April 2004.	Staff contracts, narrative and financial reports, work plans.	HS	HS

³ Please use the same format to report on additional outcomes in case the project has more than three.

⁴ Ratings: HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating

<p><u>Indicator 4:</u> Monitoring and evaluation of Project implementation established</p>	<p>Zero</p>	<p>Fully operational</p>	<p>Fully operational</p>	<p>Narrative and financial reporting, MPR records and M&E plans. Project M&E Plan drafted and implementation commenced. Delayed implementation of little impact on achievement of Project objectives because project activities essentially focused on process issues up until late 2003. Activities aimed at achieving environmental benefit generally commenced in early 2004 in the majority of participating countries. Narrative and financial reporting 100% functional and MPR meets annually to consider Project achievements. Project reports annually to the governing councils of EA's (SPREP, FFA and SPC). Apart from reporting against Log frame expectations, no M&E plan is in place. M&E is the topic for focused discussion at the July meeting of all 14 national coordinators prior to the annual MPR.</p>	<p>Narrative and financial reporting 100% functional and MPR meets annually to consider Project achievements. Project reports annually to the governing councils of EA's (SPREP, FFA and SPC). In addition to reporting against Log frame expectations, national M&E plan are in place in all participating countries. Countries will report on their monitoring plans at the July 2005 MPR.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>
--	-------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--	--	----------	----------

Outcome 2 Enhanced trans-boundary management mechanisms

	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
<p><u>Indicator 1:</u> Formal MoU executed by participating countries;</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>MoU's</p>	<p>MoU's</p>	<p>HS</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p><u>Indicator 2:</u> Stakeholder participation plans</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>>50%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Stakeholder analysis and participation plans prepared for initial stages of project start-up.</p>	<p>Participating countries have generally not actively managed a stakeholder participation plan. However, an increased focus on</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>

developed and implemented						communications during the later half of 2004 has provided increased attention to target audiences (stakeholders) for Project communications and the best means to communicate with them.		
<u>Indicator 3:</u> MPR meeting arrangements formalized	Nil	100%	100%	MPR meeting arrangements and Records of Meeting discussion. Empowering the MPR remains a challenge. Future meetings will attempt to move the MPR from consideration of process issues to considering broader strategic issues associated with addressing the root cause for environmental concerns.	MPR meeting arrangements and Records of Meeting discussion. . .	MS	S	
<u>Indicator 4:</u> NTF re-established in participating countries and meets at least twice annually	Nil	100%	100%	NTF Meeting Records	NTF Meeting Records	S	S	
<u>Indicator 5:</u> Support to existing and potentially new national and/or regional fora provided	Nil (in relation to Project resources)	One. Project participates in, and contributes to, the Marine Sector Working Group.	Project resources demonstrated to have contributed to, and supported, existing or new for a in which ICWM issues are considered.	Financial records, travel reports, meeting records, narrative reports.	Financial records, travel reports, meeting records, narrative reports. An encouraging development during 2004 is several countries was a move to formalize the NTF as the national consultative body responsible for the focal issue being addressed by the Project.	S	S	

Outcome 3 Strengthened processes supporting conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources and community-based stakeholder participation

	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
<u>Indicator 1:</u> Synopsis of information relating to focal areas and focal areas selected	Poor to reasonable	Good	Good	Technical reports prepared during Project inception. No additional activity in relation to this output in 2003/2004.	Technical reports. No additional activity in relation to this output in 2004.	HS	HS
<u>Indicator 2:</u> Generic guidelines for the design, implementation and monitoring of project-related community-based pilot activities	Nil	Complete	Complete	Technical reports, work plans and project documents (strategies). No additional activity in relation to this output in 2003/2004.	Technical reports, work plans and project documents (strategies). No additional activity in relation to this output in 2004/2005.	HS	HS
<u>Indicator 3:</u> National and regional project-related communication strategies	Nil	>50%	100%	Regional communication strategy implementation constrained by reduced staffing due to the resignation of the previous Community Communication Specialist. All participating countries have drafted national communication strategies but implementation varies from reasonable to poor. Significant initiative to apply social marketing theory to natural resource management commenced – includes national level capacity building.	Recruitment of a new Community Communication Specialist in April 2004 led to an immediate improvement in communication-related activity. This is evident through an actively managed website and regular Project-related articles in national and regional print media.	S	S

<p><u>Indicator 4:</u> Project-related social assessment and community participation strategy</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>>50%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>All participating countries had prepared a stakeholder analysis and participation strategy both national level and most at the commencement of community-level project-related activities. Actual implementation of the strategies, particularly in relation to the periodic confirmation of stakeholder interest, was proving challenging. Promotion of participatory processes in community-based natural resource management promoted through sub-regional and in some countries national facilitator training exercises. Most countries completed some participatory stakeholder consultations as part of the strategic planning and design phase of community level pilot activities; and documented results.</p>	<p>Implementation of the strategies, particularly in relation to the periodic confirmation of stakeholder interest, continues to prove challenging at the national level. During the strategic planning and design phase for local pilot activities most countries have undertaken participatory consultations with key stakeholders to identify root causes, solutions, social baseline conditions and develop action plans for implementation and documented results. Only a few countries have specifically prepared plans for stakeholder participation in these activities. To some extent the completion of the Communication Strategy Workbooks and National Communication Strategies in late 2004 have partially addressed this shortcoming</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><u>Indicator 5:</u> Economic strategy for project-related resource management and conservation initiatives</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>>50%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>All participating countries were in the process of confirming root causes for focal area environmental concerns. Resource economic training provided in early 2004 will be applied to participating country Project activities to assess the feasibility of options for addressing root cause(s).</p>	<p>None of the participating countries undertook economic feasibility appraisals of solution options to address the root cause(s) of the focal issue being addressed by the Project. However, two countries commenced economic valuations of the focal issue being addressed (one on waste and the other on freshwater).</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><u>Indicator 6:</u> Community-based pilots addressing SAP focal issue</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p><50%</p>	<p>85%</p>	<p>92% of participating countries are supporting community based pilot activities (1 country is stalled pending receipt of audit).</p>	<p>12 of the 14 countries eligible to participate in the Project were fully engaged throughout 2004. Activities in two countries had stalled pending completion of administrative reporting</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>

environmental concerns					requirements.		
<u>Indicator 7:</u> Lessons and best practice for community-based conservation and resource management	Nil	Insignificant	Significant	Technical and narrative reports. Lessons and best practice information for community-based activities is constantly being assimilated. This output will be the focus of activities in 2005 and 2006.	In addition to on-going efforts to assimilate and document lessons learned and best practice information, a first draft for a Replication Strategy was completed in 2004.	S	S
<u>Indicator 8:</u> National and regional project-related pilots	Nil	Few	Several	Technical and narrative reports. Consideration of potential national level pilot activities has commenced in Fiji and Solomon Islands. Project support for initial consideration of regional scale activities to address root causes for concerns in relation to ICWM commenced.	Most countries started piloting activities supporting national level action to address policy, legislative or other institutional issues contributing to the root cause(s) for the focal issue concerns. In partnership with the University of Adelaide this included an appraisal of national level governance and coordination issues associated with ICWM.	MS	S
<u>Indicator 9:</u> Strengthened national capacity to address priority environmental concerns and trans-boundary environmental issues	Zero (in terms of the application of Project resources)	Weak	Reasonable	Narrative reports, records of National Task Force meetings, workshop and training activity reports. Discussion in NTF's still largely confined to process-related activities. Significant capacity building supported by the project – facilitatory skills development, economic assessment and development of social marketing capacity.	Anecdotal information suggests the capacity to address environmental concerns using an analysis of root cause(s) among national Project staff has increased significantly during 2004. However, the extent that capacity has also been strengthened beyond the Project for country level activities is uncertain.	MS	S
<u>Indicator 9:</u> Sub-regional waste recycling feasibility report	Nil	20%	Complete	Technical and trip reports. Sub-regional feasibility study commenced.	Technical and trip reports. Sub-regional feasibility study on-going.	S	S

Outcome 4 To support the establishment of new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary fish stocks and associated national capacities.							
	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2002)	End of Project Target Year (2003/2004)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
<u>Indicator 1:</u> Capacity for increased regional effectiveness in global ocean fisheries negotiations developed	High	Strengthened	Secure	<p>John/Len – this column is what you contributed last year. You need only to add to the 2005 column to the right please.</p> <p>Meeting reports, governing council records for EA’s (SPC and FFA), narrative and MPR reports.</p> <p>As a coordinated negotiating block participating countries demonstrated the capacity to implement effective negotiation strategies during the concluding sessions of the Preparatory conference to establish new institutional arrangements for the management and conservation on oceanic fish stocks in the western and central Pacific.</p>		HS	
<u>Indicator 2:</u> Improved FFA capacity to efficiently manage high quality information in support of the monitoring and surveillance requirements of participating countries.	Good	Good	Enhanced	<p>This task was completed in 2003 with an appraisal of data management capacity at the Forum Fisheries Agency and the implementation of measures to enhance data management capability.</p>		S	

<p><u>Indicator 3:</u> Training and advice provided to strengthen fisheries monitoring capabilities to secure added regional benefit through improved national and regional oceanic fisheries management arrangements</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Narrative reports, MPR reports, reports to SPC governing council and technical meetings and technical reports. Fisheries monitoring capacity continues to be strengthened, partially as a result of Project activities, and national and regional benefits from the fishery (economic rent, employment and direct investment) continue to improve. However, considerable gaps in fisheries monitoring capacity remain.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><u>Indicator 4:</u> Enhance national capacity to manage tuna stocks within EEZs.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Narrative reports, tuna fisheries management plans, MPR reports, reports to EA governing council meetings and technical reports. While still seeking to maximize income, tuna management plans for national seas (EEZs) have been drafted and adopted by the majority of participating countries. Implementation still proves problematic due to the size of maritime areas and challenges created by limited monitoring and enforcement capacity.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p></p>
<p><u>Indicator 5:</u> Improved scientific advice relating to regional tuna stocks, non-</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Narrative reports, MPR reports, reports to SPC governing council and technical meetings and technical reports. Collaborative efforts with other programs is achieving encouraging progress in understanding western and central</p>	<p>S</p>	<p></p>

target species and the oceanic ecosystem available to support management decision-making.					Pacific warm pool marine ecosystem issues relating to oceanic fish stocks – including incidental species taken in regional fisheries targeting tuna and billfish.		
<u>Indicator 6:</u> Advice and support to FFA Island States in their efforts to develop and implement arrangements for a new regional tuna management and conservation body provided	Low	Moderate	High		Narrative reports, tuna fisheries management plans, MPR reports, reports to FFA governing council meetings and technical reports. Support to participating countries through five sessions of the Preparatory Conference largely supported from Project resources. Many targets agreed by participating countries at the commencement of negotiations actually achieved with widespread general regional satisfaction. Commission not yet established and functional but significant agreement on the structure and process agreed among stakeholders.	HS	
<u>Indicator 7:</u> Proposal to replicate methodologies and best practices for sustainable ocean fisheries management	None	None	Complete		PDF-B application approved, funds secured and planning work commenced for a second phase to the OFM component of the Project.	HS	

Outcome 5 Maximise regional benefits of lessons learned from management of oceanic and coastal and watershed resources			
Value in	Mid-term	End of	2005 Measure
			2005 Measure
			Last
			This

	year 0	Target (2003)	Project Target (2006)			year Rating	year Rating
<u>Indicator 1:</u> Project-related information management processes established.	Nil	Partial	Complete	Narrative and financial reporting, MPR records, web site information, technical reports and M&E plan. In early 2004 a M&E plan was drafted for the Project. It will serve the basis for a 3-day technical meeting involving national project staff in July 2004. The outcome will be generic M&E plans for each of the focal areas of primary concern to the Project. The plans will be adapted at the national level to suit local project circumstances. The Project M&E includes an annex describing Project information management.	Narrative and financial reporting, MPR records, web site information, technical reports and M&E plan. .	S	S

Outcome 6 Catalyze donor support for conservation and sustainable oceanic, coastal and watershed management initiatives							
	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target (2003)	End of Project Target (2006)	2004 Measure	2005 Measure	Last year Rating	This year Rating
<u>Indicator 1:</u> Short and long term partnership arrangements	Nil	5 partnerships formalized	10 partnerships formalized	Narrative and meeting reports, reports to EA meetings, including governing councils, reports to the MPR, and MoUs. Considerable progress was made establishing mutually beneficial partnerships during the year – both with projects being implemented from the EA (SPREP) and with others, including NGOs. Partnership arrangements varied from joint implementation to contracted technical services. As project activities become better established at the national level partnership opportunities should	Narrative and meeting reports, reports to EA meetings, including governing councils, reports to the MPR, and MoUs. Several new partnerships were established for national level activities. They included a study of governance issues in respect of ICWM in Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu and partnership with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat on a waste valuation initiative in Tonga that will be undertaken in 2005..	MS	MS

				continue to increase.				
<u>Indicator 2:</u> Replication strategy developed and implemented	Nil	Nil	Complete	Strategy and meeting reports. Planning for replication activities commenced – partially through documentation of lessons learned as implementation proceeds.	Strategy and meeting reports. First draft of the Project Replication Strategy will be discussed at the 2005 MPR.	MS	S	

Overall rating **S**

3.3 WORK PLAN	TIMING
For outcomes rated MS or U please describe priority Actions planned for the following reporting period to overcome constraints	Date Entered: 2005 Expected Completion: 2006
<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Project social assessment and participation strategy</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: During the 2004 MPR, at both Meetings of National Coordinators in 2004, in Quarterly Narrative Reports and periodically in weekly updates, country projects have been urged to give increased consideration to the formal identification and ongoing engagement of key stakeholders. To some extent the completion of the Communication Strategy Workbooks and National Communication Strategies have partially addressed this shortcoming. In addition a focus on implementation of monitoring plans in 2005 and measuring progress with stakeholder participation will also assist in addressing this shortcoming. It is an issue that has received considerable attention in the Project’s Draft Replication Strategy. In 2006 it will also receive detailed consideration during final Project reporting and assessment particularly in relation to recording lessons learned and best practice from the Project.</p> <p>BY WHOM: Project Coordination Unit</p>	Date Entered: 2005 Expected Completion: 2006
<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Project economic strategy</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: National components of the Project have not undertaken an economic appraisal of the viability of different solution options they have considered to address the root cause(s). The principle reason for this is that the necessary expertise is generally not available in-country to undertake the appraisal. Because national level activity has involved a large number of activities and, as there is no local level experience in undertaken economic feasibility appraisals in respect of environmental or natural resource management, this task has not received priority attention. While the PCU continues to promote economic feasibility appraisals prior to implementing remedial action this is yet to be taken up in national projects.</p> <p>BY WHOM: Project Coordination Unit, national project staff and National Task Forces.</p>	Date Entered: 2005 Expected Completion: 2006

<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Partnerships</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: It has proven difficult to engage partners to date for several reasons. The generally low level of activity in the environment sector within most participating countries means that there's a limited pool to recruit partners from. Apart from the national lead agency, the engagement of other government agencies in the Project has generally been limited to National Task Force-associated activities. Even this has proven a challenge, as most government agencies are under-resourced to the extent that most find it difficult to effectively execute their core functions. Although the NGO community is growing, in terms of number, membership and diversity of activities, there remain relatively few NGOs with adequate resources to effectively engage in the IWP. Almost without exception, those NGOs that are proving productive have an extremely demanding workload with limited potential to accommodate a new initiative such as the IWP. Like the government agencies, which serve as the primary contact for the Project in participating countries, NGOs are still building capacity, from a reasonably low base, to be able to participate in Projects such as the IWP for mutual benefit. Where possible, the IWP has sort to make a contribution to building this capacity. In addition, the objectives and scope of activities for the IWP are quite specific. Without compromising these there have proven to be few opportunities for engaging a large number of partners. The Project will continue to actively search out partnership possibilities in the remaining 18 months of the Project.</p> <p>BY WHOM: Project Coordination Unit and national Project staff and Project-associated agencies.</p>	<p>Date Entered: 2005</p> <p>Expected Completion: 2006</p>
--	--

3.4 RISKS.

	Risk Description	Describe Status of Risk at start of project (Year 0)	Describe Status Last Year	Describe Status this Year	Rating*
A	PCU may be inadequately resourced to service implementation requirements of 14 participating countries and three co-executing agencies.	Modest to substantial. Large geographically dispersed project working with under-resourced national administrations and relatively small PCU. Project staff capability to be determining factor.	Modest. PCU relatively small fully challenged servicing 14 countries and three executing agencies.	Modest - Situation is unchanged. The PCU, with three specialist staff and a manager is fully stretched servicing 14 countries across such a hue geographical area..	M
B	Regional organizations and country participants may not be able to work co-operatively to the extent necessary for project success.	Modest. The Pacific islands region has a good history of inter-agency and multinational cooperation. The risk relates to coastal processes where harmonization and cooperation is not as advanced as for the oceanic sector.	Low – for the oceanic component where the history of regional collaboration serves the Project well. Modest for the coastal component where there are not the same drivers for cooperation.	Low to Modest- For the ICWM Component, some challenges in relation to this risk were discussed by the MTE. The Evaluation recommended a low key role for the PCU and increased national autonomy for national-level Project activities. While the relationship between the EA and most participating	L

				<p>countries s good the relationship with others has been challenged. Most of the challenges arising relate to maintaining good faith with the Project Document, strategies to achieve Project objectives and the management of Project resources.</p>	
C	<p>Recruitment of PCU staff delayed or recruitment of appropriate staff proves problematic</p>	<p>Modest. Project startup was impact as a result of delayed staff recruitment. The quality of applicants for PCU posts was generally good. Recruitment of national staff delayed significantly.</p>	<p>Modest. OFM component and PCU staff dedicated, capable and enthusiastic. Some national staff challenged by either the administrative or technical components of the Project – or both.</p>	<p>PCU staff turnover has not been unreasonable to date. The Project is approaching a critical period when the PCU will need to be at full strength to backstop countries document the lessons their projects have generated over the last 5 years and complete Project reporting.</p>	M
D	<p>Collaborative relationships with other stakeholders, particularly other South Pacific regional agencies and NGOs, difficult to establish.</p>	<p>Modest. Executing agency relationships very good. Relationships with other CROP agencies good – promoted through technical working groups such as the Marine Sector Working Group. Relationship with NGOs – at the regional and national level requires strengthening.</p>	<p>Modest. Marine Sector Working Group continues to provide a reasonable basis for inter-agency cooperation at the regional level. Positive developments with some NGOs for the coastal component (TNC and FSPI for example) and through the activities of the Roundtable for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas. Still significant room for additional partnerships across many aspects of the Project.</p>	<p>The MSWG continued to serve as a good inter-agency consultative body for Project-related initiatives. Sustainable working relationships with NGOs is proving difficult mainly because both the Project and the NGOs have very demanding work schedules with limited resources to invest in developing collaborative arrangements.</p>	M
E	<p>Project capacity to adequately conceptualize and implement a community based approach for the ICWM component.</p>	<p>Modest. The Pacific Islands region has significant experience in community-based processes – which should serve the Project well.</p>		<p>Similar comment to that provided in 2004.</p>	M

			challenge. The main concerns continue to relate to the time frame available to adequately complete the community-based process. This is partly impacted by the relatively small PCU and it's limited capacity to service the backstopping requirements of all 14 participating countries.		
F	GEF funds may not be adequately complemented by country commitments and funding from other donors.	Modest – the potential to collaborate with many existing and planned locally- and externally-supported projects was considered good.	Substantial – national commitment remains weak. PCU and national capacity to engage others in co-financing arrangements proving difficult – due to differences in priorities, objectives and individual project funding constraints.	Remains substantial. .	S
G	Continued country commitment to a regional approach.	Low – particularly for the OFM component that is built around the internationally acknowledged high level of regional collaboration. The same drivers do not exist in respect of coastal issues.	Low – particularly for the OFM component that is built around the internationally acknowledged high level of regional collaboration. Additional effort will be required to achieve a similar level of cooperation for the ICWM component.	As for 2004.	L
H	Key regional institutions and national governments working co-operatively.	Low – effective collaborative arrangements exist.	Low – effective collaborative arrangements exist.	Low to Modest – while government agencies work very well, one-on-one, with regional agencies, collaboration between government agencies at the national level, such as the environment and fisheries agencies, varies from reasonable to inadequate among participating countries.	L
I	Changes in economic political	Modest – but varies from country	Modest for most countries –	The Modest/Substantial	M

	and social conditions may detract from country commitment to, and feasibility of, pilot projects and regional approach.	to country.	Substantial for others such as Solomon Islands where there is a high level of ethnic tension.	assessment remains. While social and economic issues to impact on implementation, apart from political stability, political will to support the Project throughout implementation has been inadequate. This applies to many projects, is not confined to the IWP.
<i>Additional Risks or unexpected problems encountered during the last year of implementation</i>				
<i>E</i>	<i>As in 2004, extreme climatic events – cyclones and typhoons – affected Project activities (Cook Islands, PNG, Samoa and Vanuatu)</i>			
<i>F</i>				

(*) H= High ; S= Substantial ; M=Modest ; L= Low. Please refer to Instruction sheet for definition of ratings for risks

<p>Please describe actions taken or planned to manage High and Substantial risks</p> <p>While direct budgetary support from governments has been limited during implementation to date there are encouraging signs that the situation is gradually changing. In Cook Islands, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji and.....governments have commenced internal processes to support IWP-related initiatives beyond the Project's termination in December 2006. In Cook Islands, the Environment Unit is committed to supporting the Project staff to continue the national effort to protect freshwater resources, the Solomon Islands Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources is to institutionalize the IWP as the coastal fisheries management unit, with a focus on support to community-based initiatives to establish marine protected areas, the Department of Environment and Conservation in Papua New Guinea is to incorporate the IWP (including existing staff) into their 2007 programme of work to continue IWP-initiated efforts to support community-based initiatives to manage local waste. In Fiji, the IWP is also serving as the nucleus of post-2006 activities by the Department of Squatter Settlements, Environment and Conservation to strengthen the government's efforts to manage waste.</p>

<p>4. ADJUSTMENTS TO ORIGINAL PROJECT STRATEGY Indication of any major adjustments in strategies, targets and outcomes.</p>
<p>a. Have the project's expected outcomes changed in the course of implementation? <i>As reported in last year's PIR. No further changes adopted.</i></p> <p>b. Explain how and when changes were made.</p> <p>c. Was the logical framework matrix of the project updated to reflect changes in activities/outputs/objectives?</p> <p>d. Has this affected the project's objectives or overall goal?</p>
<p>5. LESSONS</p>
<p><i>5.1 Are there lessons that could benefit the design or the implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three and indicate which one/s could be worth of developing case studies</i></p>

In addition to the lessons described in last year's PIR/APR, for the ICWM Component:

- a. Although the lessons learned documentation and the Replication Strategy ill discuss the benefits of participatory natural resource management projects based on social assessment, resource economics and communication, some additional focused attention to this, as a case study, could be valuable.
- b. As project implementation has progressed it has become increasingly obvious that national capacity to engage in a project such as the IWP has been adversely affected by a combination of limited capacity at both individual and institutional levels and the enormous number of national, regional and international expectations/obligations of poorly resourced national environment agencies. Future projects should include a need analysis to assesses national capacity and identify training needs. This should be a mandatory first phase as a precursor to actual project implementation.
- c. Integration across environment and resource management sectors continues to present significant challenges for the Project. Formal stakeholder assessment has assisted in clarifying the interests, roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders particularly at national level. However, meaningful engagement by these stakeholders in project implementation has been mostly limited. Part of the explanation is described at b) above. Future projects should include a commitment from governments to work through projects to review policy, legislation and institutional arrangements. This should include a commitment to implement recommendations that will result in improved clarification of roles and responsibilities of key government stakeholders, reduced overlap of mandates and strengthened consultative arrangements.
- d. Baseline assessments (ecological, social (including documentation of individual and community behavior) and economic) and associated monitoring plans should also be critical elements of the first phase of future projects. Subsequent support should be contingent on these being completed to an acceptable standard. While the IWP has managed to address this issue in a general way considerable additional effort during the early implementation phase of the Project could result in improved environmental outcomes.
- c. For the OFM component,[last year's comment - a useful lesson has been the utilization of existing institutional process to assist with Project implementation. This has generated broad mutual benefits for the Project, for related institutional activities in the co-executing agencies (SPC and FFA) and for other donors associated with related activities implemented through those institutions. This is a useful candidate for a case study.
- d. A further lesson for the OFM Project has been the needs for follow up to address the capacity of participating countries to implement the Western and Central Convention.

5.2 Have these lessons been exchanged with other GEF or NON-GEF-funded projects? If so, please list the projects and describe the process.

For the ICWM Component, Project experiences are shared across the Organisation. SPREP staff take these lessons to other fora, such as the Roundtable for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region, the CROP Marine Sector Working Group and sub-regional meetings, convened periodically to discuss issues on common concern among Pacific sland countries such as waste and coastal resource management. These issues are also discussed during meetings of National Coordinators and the Multipartite Review.

For the OFM component this..... has been shared through the wide distribution of the Terminal Evaluation – to national stakeholders, international donors with complimentary activities in the region, and other regional organizations.

6. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES

This section refers to collaboration among institutions to achieve mutually shared or agreed upon objectives and goals that draws on individual strengths and maximizes synergies. For the purpose of this report partners are

based natural resource management. As explained in last year’s APR, this relates to i) developing a thorough understanding of stakeholder interests, and participation options early in the project cycle, ii) applying resources to understanding the root cause for environmental concerns as opposed to developing projects that address only symptoms, iii) understanding economic issues associated with natural resource management – particularly undertaking a feasibility assessment of options being considered to address the root cause(s) for environmental concerns and assessing economic issues associated with poor environmental governance, and iv) paying more rigorous attention to communications.

- As described above at Section 3.4 (Risks) the move by several governments, in 2004, to integrate the work of the IWP to government agency activities after 2006, with core government funding support, is an encouraging demonstration of a commitment to sustain project initiatives.

7.2 What are the critical conditions that must be maintained in order for these changes to be sustained?
Please refer to instructions for additional guidance.

Condition Required	Indications that it will be maintained
Supportive environment within key government agencies.	Submission to budgetary allocation committees to secure government funding for IWP-linked programmes and initiatives from 2007.
Increased resources to sustain initial project activity.	Co-financing to support Project initiatives secured through partnerships with other government initiatives, the NGO community and the private sector.
More attention to capacity building at the national level.	Increased provisions (in terms of financial support and opportunities) by government agencies for the identification of training needs, strategic plans to address needs and a monitoring process to periodically assess changes in capacity operational at the national level.

7.3
 a. Does the project make use of a micro-finance facility?
 No
 b. If so, was such a facility developed specifically for the project, or was an existing one used? How effective is it?

8. NON-PROJECT ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY CO AND UNDP/GEF IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT
This section aims to identify activities carried out by UNDP (either the country office or the GEF unit) that were not a part of the project, or which resulted from an unanticipated problem, but that have directly contributed towards the achievement of project objectives. It encompasses activities such as advocacy, policy dialogue, and knowledge management efforts. If soft assistance is not an issue for the project or too sensitive to address, this section can be left empty.

9. MONITORING AND EVALUATION			Comments
CO Field Visit	LAST:	NEXT:	
UNDP GEF Field Visit	LAST:	NEXT:	

<i>Tripartite Review</i>	LAST: July 2004	NEXT: July 2005	
<i>Mid-Term Evaluation</i>	PLANNED: For the ICWM Component - May 2003	DONE: Yes	
<i>Final Evaluation</i>	PLANNED: For the OFM Component – March 2004 For the ICWM Component – June 2005	DONE: Yes DONE: No	
<i>Other (*)</i>	SMPR – September 2003 – no feedback received!		

(*) Please explain whether the project has been subject to any additional review e.g. Country Evaluations, GEF Specially Managed Project Review (SMPR), GEF Thematic Reviews.

10. FINANCIAL INFORMATION –

Please present all financial values in US\$ millions (e.g. 3,502,000 = 3.502)

10.1 PROJECT FUNDING. Please present all financial values in US\$ millions (e.g. 3,502,000 = 3.502)							
		GRANT	Loans (*)	Credits	Equity invest.	In -kind	Total
A. GEF FUNDING	P	12.000					12.000
	A						
B. CO-FINANCING:							
UNDP (TRAC)	P	.060					.060
	A						
UN AGENCY	P	.877					.877
	A						
GOVERNMENT	P	8.058					8.058
	A						
BILATERAL DONORS	P						
	A						
MULTILATERAL DONORS	P						
	A						
REGIONAL BANKS	P						
	A						
NON-GOVERN. ORG.	P						
	A						
PRIVATE SECTOR	P						
	A						
OTHER	P						
	A						
TOTAL CO-FINANCING	P	8.995					8.995
	A						
TOTAL FUNDING					Proposed		20.118
					ACTUAL		

P=Proposed ; A=Actual

(*) Concessional or market rate

10.2 PROJECT DISBURSEMENTS. From project start up to date of this report	
<i>Cumulative actual disbursement (\$millions)</i>	US\$9,019.986
<i>Cumulative planned disbursement (\$millions)(*)</i>	US\$11,055,000
<i>Disbursements ratio (% of actual vs. planned expenditures)</i>	75

(*) As stated in original budget in PRODOC

11. PROCUREMENT DATA

Note : For projects or project components executed by UNOPS this section ***must not*** be filled in - data will be provided by UNOPS headquarters-

Please report the **US\$ value (in Thousands)** of UNDP/GEF Payments to Supplying Countries for Procurement in GEF Donor Countries. Please enter Project **expenditure** from project start up to the date of this report into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project. Please report only on contracts over US\$ 2000.

Supplying Country (only donor countries)	Personnel (in US\$)	Sub-contracts (in US\$)	Equipment (in US\$)	Training (in US\$)	Total (in US\$)
Australia	940,057	293,363	5,000		1,238,420
Britain		12,500			12,500
Canada	211,277	6,800			218,077
Cook Islands	53,354	17,066	3,844		74,264
France	303,490				303,490
Ireland	281,602				281,602
New Caledonia			8,812		8,812
New Zealand	621,416	20,211	80,723		722,350
Fiji	75,425	42,397	4,205		122,027
Niue	92,575		12,478		105,054
Federated States of Micronesia	21,507				21,507
Palau	74,396	29,944			104,340
Kiribati	81,507	8,619	11,313		101,439
Tuvalu	70,400	14,279	2,296		86,975
Tonga	57,693	14,801	13,473		85,966
Marshall Islands	42,745		9,882		52,626
Nauru	23,059				23,059
Papua New Guinea	50,773	47,182	13,632		111,586
Solomon Islands	59,555	8,662	17,019		85,235

Supplying Country (only donor countries)	Personnel (in US\$)	Sub-contracts (in US\$)	Equipment (in US\$)	Training (in US\$)	Total (in US\$)
Samoa	173,956	40,209	31,283		245,448
USA		42,500			42,500
Vanuatu	57,633	28,279			85,912
Regional				1,650,494	1,650,494
TOTAL	3,212,419	626,811	213,960	1,650,494	5,783,684

IMPACTS AND RESULTS RELATED TO THE NEW GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITIES
--

1. Indicate what is the intervention type(s) the project addresses.

Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic Action Programme (SAP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demonstration	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientific Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge Management	<input type="checkbox"/>
National Reform	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional Reform	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional Inst. Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
SAP Implementation	X
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Indicate which OP or Ops project falls under.

OP8	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP9	X
OP10	<input type="checkbox"/>

For OP8 and OP9 projects, respond questions 3 – 8.

For OP 10 projects go to question 9.

Coverage Indicators specific for OP8 and OP9.

3. Is the project concerned with a Large Marine Ecosystem

a. Large marine ecosystem	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to question 4
b. Fresh water basin	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to question 5
c. Aquifer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to question 6

4. Indicate the code of the LME the project is concerned with.

LAC	Code	Africa	Code	Asia	Code
California Current	1	Mediterránea Sea	11	Bay of Bengal	18
Gulf of California	2	Canary Current	13	Gulf of Thailand	19
Gulf of Mexico	3	Guinea Current	14	South China Sea	20

Pacific Central America Coast	4	Benguela Current	15	Sulu-Celebes Sea	21
Caribbean Sea	5	Aqulhas Current	16	Indonesia Sea	22
Humboldt Current	6	Somali Costal Current	17	East China Sea	23
Patagonia Shelf	7	West Asia	Code	Yellow Sea	24
South Brazil Shelf	8	Arabian Sea	26	Sea of Japan	25
East Brazil Shelf	9	Red Sea	27	Eastern Europe	Code
North Brazil Shelf	10	Pacific	Code	Baltic Sea	28
		Pacific SIDS	?	Black Sea	30

5. Indicate the code of the name international river basin and subbasin if appropriate.

Name of Basin:	
Name of Sub-basin:	

6. Indicate the code for the aquifer (Table to be completed)

Name of Aquifer	
-----------------	--

7. Indicate what are the mayor treats that the project addresses.

Threat Addressed by Project Component	
- Pollutants	X
- Over-fishing	X
- Land Degradation	
- Habitat Destruction	X
- Excessive Water Withdrawals	
- Invasive Species	

8. Indicate the geographical region where the project is taken place.

Regions	
Africa	
East Asia and Pacific	
Europe and Central Asia	
Latin America & Caribbean	
Middle East and North Africa	

South Asia	
Pacific Ocean	X

Coverage indicators specific for OP10

Coverage indicators for OP10 must reflect the fact that they are not focused on threats to a particular transboundary waterbody but at demonstrating particular approaches to reducing the threat of contamination of waterbodies globally.

9. Is this a demonstration project

a. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. No	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Does the project address a global contaminant.

a. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. No	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. What type of global contaminant does the project address.

Name of contaminant 1:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 2:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 3:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 4:	<input type="text"/>

12. Does the project address a Ship related contaminant

c. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. No	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. What type of ship related contaminant does the project address.

Name of contaminant 1:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 2:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 3:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 4:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 5:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 6:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 7:	<input type="text"/>
Name of contaminant 8:	<input type="text"/>

14. Does the project include as a major objective technical support.

e. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. No	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. What subject of technical support does the project address (Table to be completed).

Subject 1:	
Subject 2:	
Subject 3:	
Subject 4:	
Subject 5:	
Subject 6:	
Subject 7:	
Subject 8:	

II. Process Outcome Indicators.

1. Process Outcome Indicators for Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses (TDA)

Please select the condition that most clearly described the situation of the TDA:

Government Involvement (TDA):		
Issue	Criteria	Select one:
Degree to which governments support and endorse the TDA	-TDA has endorsement by the chiefs of state of all governments. -All governments have provided necessary staff and funding for the country's TDA-related activities. Governments provided very little co-funding to support the TDA activity.	X
	-TDA has endorsement of all governments at the chief or state or ministerial level. -One government has not provided necessary staffing and/or financial support for the country's TDA-related activities.	
	-TDA has endorsement of all but one government. -More than one but less than half the governments have not provided necessary staffing and/or financial support to the country's TDA-related activities.	
	-More than one government has not endorsed the TDA. -Half or more of governments have not provided necessary staffing an/or financial support for the country's TDA-related activities	

Stakeholder Participation (TDA)
--

Issue	Criteria	Select One:
Degree to which the process incorporates stakeholders	-Stakeholder analysis has been carried out and has identified all significant stakeholders. -Public stakeholder participation plan is fully implemented and documented. -All significant stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted.	
	-Stakeholder analysis carried out but has not identified all significant stakeholders. -Not all of public stakeholder participation plan is implemented or documented. -All but a few stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted.	
	-Stakeholder analysis has been carried out but has failed to identify several significant stakeholders. -Much of the stakeholder participation plan is not implemented. -A number of stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted.	
	-Stakeholder analysis has not been carried out. -Governments have not published a detailed plan for stakeholder participation. -Most stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted. Although the TDA did not complete a thorough stakeholder analysis and participation plan – it has subsequently been done during SAP implementation for the ICWM component.	X

Sound Information (TDA)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which a process has been established to access the best available information	-Advisory group or other mechanism is established to ensure access to best available information from all relevant sources. It has adequate resources and meets regularly. -TDA process incorporates most recommendations and information from mechanisms and provides feedback to them.	
	-Advisory group or other mechanism is established but resources are inadequate or meetings are sporadic. -TDA process incorporates some recommendations and information but does not provide feedback.	X
	-TDA process does not incorporate any recommendation and provides no feedback.	
	-No advisory group or other mechanism for access to best available information is established.	

Process Results (TDA)

Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which TDA analyzes specific causes and options for addressing them	-TDA analyzes the causes of trans-boundary environmental degradation, specifying sectors, socio-economic sources, and locations, and identifies options for addressing them.	
	-TDA analyzes the causes of environmental degradation, specifying sectors, socio-economic sources, and locations, but does not identify realistic options for addressing them.	X
	-TDA analyzes causes, specifying sectors, socio-economic sources, and locations, but does not specify sources, location and sectors..	
	-TDA fails to properly identify root causes nor does it identify sources, locations and sectors causing problems.	

2. Process Indicators for Strategic Action Programmes (SAP)

Government Involvement (SAP)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which governments support the SAP	-SAP has endorsement by the chiefs of state of all governments. -All governments have provided necessary staff and funding for the country's SAP-related activities..	
	-SAP has endorsement of all governments at the chief or state or ministerial level. -One government has not provided necessary staffing and/or financial support for the country's SAP-related activities. Almost all Governments have not provided the staffing or funding to support the implementation of the SAP – rather there has been a reliance on SAP resources.	X
	-One government has not endorsed the SAP. -More than one but less than half the governments have not provided necessary staffing and/or financial support to the country's SAP-related activities.	
	-More than one government has not endorsed the SAP. -Most governments have not provided necessary staffing an/or financial support for the country's SAP-related activities.	

Stakeholder Participation (SAP)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One

Degree to which the process incorporates stakeholders	- Stakeholder analysis has been carried out and has identified all significant stakeholders. - Public stakeholder participation plan is fully implemented and documented. -All significant stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted.	
	- Stakeholder analysis carried out but has not identified all significant stakeholders. - Not all of public stakeholder participation plan is implemented or implemented. - All but a few stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted. <i>For the ICWM component the majority of stakeholders have been consulted and engaged through a participation plan although the level of participation varies between countries and between sites. A number of stakeholders feel that they have not been adequately consulted. For the OFM component, the recent Terminal Evaluation noted that stakeholder engagement required strengthening.</i>	X
	- Stakeholder analysis has been carried out but has failed to identify several significant stakeholders. - Much of the stakeholder participation plan is not implemented. - A number of stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted.	
	- Stakeholder analysis has not been carried out. - Governments have not published a detailed plan for stakeholder participation. - Most stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted.	

Sound Information (SAP)		
Issue	Criteria	SELECT ONE
Degree to which a process has been established to access the best available information	- SAP fully reflects information and analysis in TDA. - Advisory group or other mechanism is established to ensure access to information from all relevant sources which is incorporated into the SAP	X
	- SAP reflects most information and analysis in TDA. - Advisory group or other mechanism is established and some information is incorporated into the SAP	
	- SAP fails to incorporate TDA information and analysis on several important points. - Advisory group or other mechanism is established but little of the information is incorporated into the SAP.	
	- SAP fails to reflect most information and analysis in TDA. - No advisory group or other mechanism for access to best available information is established	

Process Results (SAP)

Issue	Criteria	Select One
Specificity of commitments to policy/regulatory reform	For each problem identified in the TDA, the SAP includes commitments to quantitative targets, timetables for policy/regulatory reform.	
	For one or more problems identified in the TDA, specific commitments to policy/regulatory reforms targets, and timetables have been defined. This relates to the OFM component and the fact that, with significant Project support, timelines and reform targets relating to new institutional arrangements for the management and conservation of western and central Pacific tuna have been finalised.	X
	No commitments to policy /regulatory reform have specific targets, timetables. The focus of the Project in relation to the ICWM component has been on community-based processes with attention in 2004 turning to higher-level policy and institutional issues.	X
	SAP does not include commitments to specific policy/regulatory reforms addressing all problems identified in the TDA.	

Priority issues addressed by the SAP

What are the key priority issues addressed by the SAP.

Issue 1:	Degradation of water quality
Issue 2:	Degradation of associated critical habitats
Issue3:	Unsustainable use of resources
Issue 4:	
Issue 5:	
Issue 6:	
Issue 7:	
Issue 8:	

3. Process Indicators for Joint Institutional Arrangements (JIA)

Government Involvement (JIA)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which governments support the	All member governments: - Allocate staff resources to the JIA. - Assign high level officials to the JIA. - Have line items for support of the JIA in their budgets. In relation to the OFM Component.	X

JIA	One government does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocate staff resources in support of the JIA. - Assign high level officials to the JIA. - Have a line item in its budget in support of the JIA. 	
	More than one but less than half of the governments do not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocate staff resources. - Assign high level officials. - Have a line item in its budget in support of the JIA. In respect of the ICWM component 	X
	Most governments do not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocate staff resources. - Assign high level officials. -Have a line item in support of the JIA in its budget. 	

Stakeholder Participation (JIA)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which the process incorporates stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has been carried out and has identified all significant stakeholders. - Public stakeholder participation plan is implemented and documented. - All significant stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis carried out but has not identified all significant stakeholders. - Not all of public stakeholder participation plan is implemented or documented. - All but a few stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted. Both the OFM Component (as part of the design process for Phase II of the OFM Project) and the ICWM Component have completed thorough stakeholder assessments. Engaging all relevant stakeholders continues to present challenges, as described above. 	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has been carried out but has failed to identify several significant stakeholders. - Much of the stakeholder participation plan is not implemented. - A number of stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has not been carried out. - Governments have not published a detailed plan for stakeholder participation. - Most stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted. 	

Sound Information (JIA)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One

Degree to which a process has been established to access the best available information	-Advisory group or other mechanism is established to ensure access to best available information from all relevant sources. It has adequate resources and meets regularly. -JIA incorporates information from mechanisms into its operations and provides feedback to them. In relation to the OFM component.	X
	-Advisory group or other mechanism is established but resources are inadequate or meetings are sporadic. -JIA incorporates some information from mechanisms into its operations but provides little or no feedback. In respect of the ICWM component each participating country has established a National Task Force and each National Coordinator has an informal technical support group, called a Project Development Team, that provides informal advice when required.	X
	-Advisory group or other mechanism is established but have few resources or seldom meet. -JIA does not incorporate any recommendation into its operations and provides no feedback.	
	-No advisory group or other mechanism for access to best available information is established.	

Process Results (JIA) ??		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree of authority and level of staffing of the JIA	-JIA has authority to coordinate activities between countries, make policy recommendations to member countries and influences significant policies of member states. -JIA has adequate full-time staff.	
	-JIA has formal management authority for management functions but has little influence on the policies of member states. -JIA has inadequate full-time staff.	
	-JIA has formal authority for management functions but has no influence on policies. -JIA has little or no full-time staff of its own.	
	-JIA has no formal management authority. -JIA has no staff of its own.	

4. Indicators for the Inter-Ministerial Committee Process

Government Involvement (Inter-Ministerial Committee)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One

<p>The degree to which relevant ministries have given political support to the process</p>	<p>All relevant ministries support the process by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allocating staff resources -Assigning a high level official -Responding to information requests. -Collaborating in the implementation of a plan with targets that are being met. In relation to the OFM component, due to the significance of the resource issues under consideration, for most participating countries all relevant ministries have been engaged. They all generally fully participated in the implementation of the “plan” to establish new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of western and central Pacific oceanic fish stocks. 	X
	<p>One relevant ministry does not support the process by failing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allocate staff resources -Assign high level officials -Respond to information requests. -Targets are not being met. 	
	<p>More than one but less than half the relevant ministries do not support the process by failing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allocate staff resources. -Assign high level officials. -Respond to information requests. -No clear targets set. 	
	<p>Most relevant ministries do not support the process by failing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allocate staff resources -Assign high level officials -Respond to information requests. For the ICWM component national implementation still tends to rely on Project resources. This is a function of extremely under-resourced government agencies and the high number of competing demands. 	X

<p>Stakeholder Participation (Inter-Ministerial Committee)</p>		
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Criteria</p>	<p>Select One</p>
<p>Degree to which the process incorporates stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has been carried out and has identified all significant stakeholders. - Detailed public stakeholder participation plan is implemented and documented. - All significant stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stakeholder analysis carried out but has not identified all significant stakeholders. - Not all of public stakeholder participation plan is implemented or documented. - All but a few stakeholders feel they have been adequately consulted. In relation to the ICWM component. 	X

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has been carried out but has failed to identify several significant stakeholders. - Much of the stakeholder participation plan is not implemented. - A number of stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder analysis has not been carried out. - Governments have not published a detailed plan for stakeholder participation. - Most stakeholders feel they have not been adequately consulted. 	

Sound Information (Inter-Ministerial Committee)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which a process has been established to access the best available information and analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory group or other mechanism is established to ensure access to best available information from all relevant sources. It has adequate resources and meets regularly. Participating countries receive high quality advice (science and management) through established processes supported by the co-executing agencies. – in relation to the OFM component. - Committee incorporates most recommendations and information from mechanisms into its deliberations and provides feedback to them. Not so much a Committee established for the Project itself but, in relation to the OFM component, multisectoral consultation is promoted through national tuna management committees and regional advisory groups. 	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory group or other mechanism is established but resources are inadequate or meetings are sporadic. - Committee incorporates some recommendations and information into its deliberations but does not provide feedback. In respect of the ICWM component 	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory group or other mechanism is established but have few resources or seldom meet. - Committee does not incorporate any recommendation into its deliberations and provides no feedback. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No advisory group or other mechanism for access to best available information is established. 	

Process Results (Inter-Ministerial Committee)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Specificity of commitments to policy/regulatory reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee adopts quantitative targets and, timetables addressing all priority actions identified in the SAP. This has been achieved for the OFM component. 	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee adopts targets and timetables for some but not all priority actions identified in the SAP. 	

	Committee adopts commitments to specific policy and regulatory reforms for all priority actions identified in the SAP but no targets and timetables. <i>Varies across the 14 participating countries. Generally governments recognize some policy and institutional reform is required. The commitment to achieve this is not always sufficient to achieve positive change.</i>	X
	Committee does not adopt commitments to specific policy/regulatory reforms for any priority actions identified in the SAP.	

5. Indicators for Mobilizing Resources for agreed activities

Efforts to obtain mobilizing for resources for agreed activities.

Financing found for all investment needs	(100%)	
Financing found for most of investment needs.	(>75%)	??
Financing found for less than half of investment needs	(<50%)	
Financing found for few needed investments.	(<25%)	

6. Indicators for Demonstration Activities

Replication Strategy (Demonstration Activities)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree of success of replication strategy	Replication strategy is in place and elicits strong interest by stakeholder. Significant replication is taking place and has been documented.	
	Replication strategy or plan is in place and elicits interest by stakeholders in replication, but minimal or no replication taken place or has been documented. <i>For the OFM component there is little or no replication potential in the Pacific Islands region – but very high potential in other ocean regions. Draft Replication Strategy for the ICWM Component has been prepared and will be discussed at the 2005 MPR.</i>	X
	Replication strategy has been developed and adopted but elicits no interest in replication from stakeholders.	
	No strategy or plan has been developed aimed at encouraging Replication or no significant actions have been taken to adopt plan or strategy.	

Criteria for Success (Demonstration Activities)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Appropriateness and measurability of criteria for successful demonstration	Criteria for success are both appropriate and measurable. For the ICWM component this is well documented in individual monitoring plans developed by all 14 participating countries.	X
	Criteria for success are appropriate but not measurable.	
	Criteria for success are not appropriate or measurable.	
	No criteria for success of demonstration are adopted.	

Monitoring and Evaluation (Demonstration Activities)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of success	Plan for monitoring and evaluation of success results and replication is implemented in full and data collected has been analyzed.	
	Plan for monitoring and evaluation of success and replication under implementation, data is collected but there is no analysis or reporting. For the ICWM Component.	X
	Plan for monitoring and evaluation of success is drafted but not implemented.	
	No plan for monitoring and evaluation of success is drafted.	

Stakeholder Participation (Demonstration Activities)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Degree to which the	Stakeholder analysis has been carried out and has identified all significant stakeholders and future adopters have been fully engage in design and implementation. Participation has been documented.	

process incorporates stakeholders	<p>Stakeholder analysis carried out and identified all significant stakeholders, and future adopters. Some important stakeholders and adopters did not fully participate in design and implementation. Not all of stakeholder participation plan is implemented For the ICWM Component activities have included: stakeholder analysis and participation plans conducted in initial startup phase of national level; the involvement of most (but not all) stakeholder in participatory consultations for the strategic planning and design phase of demonstration projects, social baseline assessments; stakeholders identified who are responsible for specific actions or activities being implemented to address root causes such as in work or action plans. However limited formal participation plans for demonstration activities have been developed in most countries. However it is envisaged more attention to stakeholder participation in demonstration activities will be undertaken during implementation of monitoring plans and in monitoring levels, quality and effectiveness of stakeholder participation in project activities. End of project reviews will also conduct a thorough review and analysis of stakeholder participation in demonstration activities. This would provide an overview of the IWP approach, processes, and methods and lessons learned.</p>	X
	<p>Stakeholder analysis carried out but has not identified several significant stakeholders and future adopters. Little or no participation of stakeholders and future adopters in design and implementation-..</p>	
	<p>Stakeholder analysis has not been carried out. No significant participation of stakeholders and future adopters in design or implementation.</p>	

IV. Indicators for Stress Reduction.

1. Types of Stress Reduction Indicators at the project level.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pollution - Over-fishing - Habitat Loss 	<p>For the ICWM component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the status for the adoption and enforcement of local and national policy, legislation and/or regulations relating to groundwater pollution/degradation. - the status for the adoption and enforcement of local and national policy, legislation and/or regulations relating to waste management. - Status of waste recycling plans/strategies. - The status of water reserve (protection of freshwater) plans and legislation. - The status of watershed rehabilitation plans/strategies. - The status of marine protected area plans/strategies. - Status of plans/strategies for reduced waste contamination in groundwater. - The status of local and national policy, legislation, regulations, and enforcement, including through customary practices, for coastal fisheries. - The status of plans/strategies to reduce fishing effort. - The status of alternative income strategy(ies) to reduce pressure on focal issue. - Trends in breaches of compliance and or level of fines raised from breaching rules and or enforcement costs incurred. - Status of institutional resource support for Government agencies with a mandate for focal area management. - Status of country adoption of legal or policy reforms associated with the Focal Issue(s).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excessive Water Withdrawals 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land Degradation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Invasive Species 	

2. Program Performance Indicators Related to Stress Reduction.

2.2.1. Progress in Monitoring and Reporting on Selected Environmental Stresses.

Process Indicators for Stress Reduction		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Situation of impact Monitoring and Reporting	Monitoring systematically gathers and reports relevant data related to the baseline. Reported data is adequately documented and analyzed	
	Monitoring plan for stress reduction is under implementation but no data have been reported or analyzed. <i>For the ICWM component – some data has started to be generated.</i>	X
	Monitoring plan for stress reductions has been established and adequate staff budget provided.	
	No plan for monitoring stress reduction has been established.	

3. Progress in Achieving Stress Reduction Objectives.

Process Indicators for Stress Reduction		
Issue	Criteria	Select one
Stress Reduction: Achievements in Stress Reduction	Project has documented achievements significantly beyond the targeted stress reduction improvement.	
	Project has documented achieving or close to achieving the targeted stress reduction improvement.	
	Progress in achieving stress reduction objectives is on target.	
	Progress towards achieving stress reduction objectives is significantly behind targets.	X

V. Indicators for Environmental Status.

1. Indicators for Monitoring and Reporting on Environmental Status.

Environmental Status		
Issues	Criteria	Select One
Situation of impact monitoring system	Monitoring systematically gathers, reports and analyzes data related to the baseline.	
	Monitoring plan for environmental status is under implementation but no data have been reported or analyzed.	X
	Monitoring plan for environmental status has been established and adequate staff budget provided.	
	No plan for monitoring environmental status has been established	

VI. Indicators for Results of Scientific Assessments

Accessibility of out come to relevant stakeholders (Scientific Assessment)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which information generated by scientific assessment is relevant to all stakeholders	All or nearly all relevant stakeholders are aware of and clearly understand key finding of the assessment. <i>For the OFM component this is broadly true.</i>	X
	Most relevant stakeholders are aware and clearly understand key finding of the assessment. <i>For the ICWM component there is limited scientific input or activities related to two of the focal areas of interest – freshwater protection and waste management. Previously (in the last 20 years) a considerable amount of scientific information has been collected for coastal fisheries – but it’s collection and use has decreased significantly in the last decade – a reflection on capacity to support this work at the national level..</i>	X
	A significant number of relevant stakeholders are unaware of or do not clearly understand key findings of the assessment.	

	Most relevant stakeholders are mostly unaware of or do not understand key findings of the assessment.	
--	---	--

Accessibility of out come to relevant policymakers (Scientific Assessment)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which information generated by the scientific assessment is relevant to the Policymakers	All or nearly all relevant policymakers are aware of or clearly understand key finding of the assessment. For the OFM component	X
	Most relevant policymakers are aware and clearly understand key finding of the assessment.	
	A number of relevant policymakers are not aware of or did not clearly understand key findings of the assessment.	
	Most policymakers are not aware of or did not understand key findings of the assessment. For the ICWM component policy makers understand the findings of the assessment - in this case the TDA – but they lack the resources and capacity to be able to effectively address them.	X

Usefulness of out come to relevant policy or programming issues (Scientific Assessment)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Usefulness to relevant policy or programming issues	The TDA assessment has been cited or used extensively in discussing and making decisions.	
	The TDA assessment has been cited and used in several instances in discussing or making decisions.	X
	Assessment has rarely been cited or used in discussing or making decisions, but only slightly.	
	Assessment has not been cited or used at all in discussing and making decisions.	

Contribution of out come to scientific knowledge (Scientific Assessment)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Contribution to scientific knowledge	Assessment clearly represents new scientific knowledge and understanding of issues. In respect of the OFM component.	X
	Assessment is consistent with state of the art scientific knowledge and understanding of issues.	
	Contribution to scientific knowledge and understanding of issues are unclear or debatable. The ICWM component is well placed in terms of contributing to the knowledge base for social sciences including economics.	X
	Assessment makes no significant contribution at to scientific knowledge.	

Rigor of research methodologies used (Scientific Assessment)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Rigor of research methodologies used	Assessment is scientifically sound and draws on state of the art concepts and methods. For the OFM component of SAP implementation - it sets global precedents.	X
	Concepts and knowledge and overall rigor are state of the art. Rigor of methodologies used are debatable. For SAP implementation, concepts and methodologies are rigorous and sound. The capacity to implement them is the challenge.	X
	Concepts and knowledge are not state of the art. Rigor of methodologies used are debatable. This was the case for the TDA – which was a broad-brush general consultative exercise rather than one that was scientifically rigorous.	X
	Assessment behind state of the art knowledge and methods.	

VII. Indicators for Results of Knowledge Management Activities

Accessibility to relevant stakeholders (Knowledge Management)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which information generated by knowledge management activities is relevant to all stakeholders	All or nearly all relevant stakeholders are aware of the information and found it easy to access and understand.	
	Some relevant stakeholders are unaware of the information or information was found by some difficult to access and understand. Probably true for both OFM and ICWM stakeholders	X
	Many relevant stakeholders are unaware of the information or many of those aware of the information , difficult to understand.	
	Very Few relevant stakeholders are aware of the information or find it accessible and easy to understand.	

Accessibility to relevant policymakers (Knowledge Management)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which information generated by knowledge management activities is relevant to all	All or nearly all relevant policy makers are aware of the information and found it easy to access and understand.	
	Some relevant policy makers are unaware of the information or information was found by some difficult to access and understand. For the OFM Component	X
	Many relevant policy makers are unaware of the information or many of those aware of the information , difficult to understand. For the ICWM Component – but this is improving.	X

policymakers.	Very Few relevant stakeholders are aware of the information or find it accessible and easy to understand.	
----------------------	---	--

Usefulness to Stakeholders (Knowledge Management)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which knowledge management activities are relevant to stakeholders.	All relevant stakeholders find the information useful in policymaking. In relation to the OFM component	X
	Most relevant stakeholders find the information useful in policymaking. Increasingly the case for the ICWM component.	X
	Many relevant stakeholders do not find some of the information useful in policymaking.	
	Few relevant stakeholders find the information useful in policymaking.	

Usefulness to relevant policymakers (Knowledge Management)		
Issue	Criteria	Select One
Extent to which knowledge management activities are relevant to policymakers.	All relevant policymakers find some of the information useful in policymaking. In relation to the OFM component	X
	Most all relevant policymakers find some of the information useful in policymaking. Increasingly the case for the ICWM component.	X
	Many relevant policymakers do not find some of the information useful in policymaking.	
	Few policymakers find the information useful in policymaking.	