

**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**

**THIRD MULTIPARTITE REVIEW**

**5-9 July 2004**

**[Apia, Samoa]**

**Agenda Item 2**

**Working Paper 4**

**Issues Arising from MPR2 and the 2003 Mid-term Evaluation**

## Issues Arising: Second Multipartite Review, Tonga, 26-27 June 2003 and the Mid-term Evaluation

This summary reports on responses to:

- Issues arising from MPR2 at Tonga, June 2003 including MTE recommendations presented at Attachment G to the Summary Record of Proceedings for that Meeting; and
- subsequent action in relation to each recommendation presented in the MTE.

### Summary Record for NCM2

Paragraph Reference	Issue	Subsequent Action
11	FFA component of the project would finish in December 2003 and the SPC component would conclude in December 2004. Therefore, there is a need for a terminal review that might commence in early 2004 with the report being considered by the next Annual Meeting of FFA in May 2004. He also confirmed that a follow up project had been approved for the GEF pipeline and it is hoped that this project would commence in January 2005.	FFA's component concluded as forecast. The Terminal Evaluation was conducted in the first quarter of 2004 as scheduled (see separate report). PDF-B drawdown has commenced and project design is in progress. The commencement date for the Phase II Project will probably be 3 <sup>rd</sup> or 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter 2005.
18	The representative from Samoa requested the PCU to explore options for strengthening the links between the Oceanic component and the Coastal component.	Apart from close collaboration between the PCU and SPC and FFA on Project implementation issues there has been limited formal increase in collaborative links between the ICWM and OFM components of the Project. Nevertheless, the Project has been involved in several collaborative activities that is attempting to improve integrated management of coastal and ocean issues. These have been progressed under the auspices of the CROP Marine Sector Working Group and the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy.
20	In relation to transport the representative from UNDP to NCM-3, Mr Tom Twining-Ward.....advised that any purchases related to the transportation requirements of a project should be done in full consultation with the NTF and be fully justified. NCM-3 had been advised that although details were still to be worked out with UNDP, it was probable that a ceiling would apply to such expenditure. The MPR noted this positive development.	Following MPR2 in Tonga, the Project Manager circulated an advice describing criteria for vehicle acquisition that had been approved by UNDP.
21	In relation to sitting fees, as stated at NCM-3, the representative from UNDP, Mr Tom Twining-Ward, reiterated that UNDP couldn't pay any meeting costs for public servants – as stipulated in the NEX	Audits received to date have reported no non-compliance with this policy.

	Procedures. UNDP would hope that countries honor those guidelines.	
22	The representative from Fiji expressed satisfaction with the way the project is running. He reported that Fiji is fortunate to have a very effective National Task Force (NTF). They had asked him to request the PCU to step back from national implementation activities and provide increased opportunity for the country to run the project.	Following MPR2, the PCU circulated an invitation to all National Coordinators requesting suggestions for moving to output based management. Throughout the year, the PCU has encouraged increased focus on achievements and outputs. In relation to this, the focus during 2004 has been on baseline assessments.
23	The representative from Tonga ..... would like to see the IWP build in mechanisms to increase the potential of project initiatives being sustained beyond December 2006, after the Programme itself terminates.	This will be the focus of work during the last 18 months of the Project. The focus of the Project, identifying root cause issues at both community and national levels, is also a major step towards considering sustainability issues. By correctly understanding root causes it is hoped the Project can support initiatives to improve environmental governance long term – without the on-going need for substantial levels of external support.
25	The Resident Representative for the UNDP Office in Apia requested that future reports to the MPR concentrate on lessons and results and that administrative and managerial issues be minimized.	MPR3 includes a stand-alone agenda item to discuss lessons learned to date. In addition, throughout 2003/2004 country projects had been encouraged to report on outputs and achievements. A section of the NCM4 template produced to support this was dedicated to lessons learned.
29	The representative from UNDP, Mr Tom Twining-..... advised that UNDP attempts to be reasonably flexible in administering the budget but that in some areas there was no room for compromise. One such area was annual audits. He noted that failure to complete annual audits jeopardized future drawdown of funds.	At the time of preparation of this paper two countries had still not submitted audits for 2002 Project accounts. In relation to 2003 audits, eight national projects were yet to submit their audit reports (as of May 2004).
<b>The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE Recommendations appended at Annex 1 for ease of reference)</b>		
35	[Recommendation 1]. The representative from Samoa ..... proposed that SPREP review the SAP in consultation with IWP participating countries.	Although a formal review of the SAP has not been commenced the PCU has promoted the SAP in SPREP Secretariat activities supporting National Assessment Reporting in preparation for Mauritius.
35	[Recommendation 1]. The representative from Tonga suggested, that to promote the prospects for sustaining the initiative, the [SAP review] process be linked to regional preparations for the review of the Barbados Programme of Action as suggested by the PCU.	As above
35	[Recommendation 2]. <u>Participating PICS</u> The representative from Samoa suggested a time frame be proposed for this. It was agreed that the Director of SPREP should be requested	Apart from synergies promoted through the broader SPREP network there have been no major linkages developed during the year between

	to take this up at any opportunity and report back to the next MPR.	the IWP and SPREP Member territory programmes.
35	[Recommendation 14] <u>Transboundary mechanisms</u> No comments submitted.	The PCU and some participating countries have been involved in several national and regional initiatives promoting ICWM. These include national ICWM research projects (in association with Adelaide University) and the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum.
35	[Recommendation 4] <u>Root causes</u> The representative from Tonga noted that the project is too short to address broader national issues. She considered that it should focus on community aspects with the intent to generate lessons that then may have broader application – at the district or national level. The representative from Samoa added that the PCU should provide technical support and advice to Lead Agencies to address deficiencies.	Since the Tonga MPR the Project has attempted to strengthen ties with national lead agencies. The participation of lead agency staff in capacity building activities has been the main focus of this collaboration. However, it has also extended to areas of common interest – such as collaboration to review environment-related legislation.  As stated at the Tonga MPR, the PCU has promoted a 2-pronged approach to Project implementation since early implementation. During the early years this focused on community-based aspects of the Project – a decision based on the experience of similar projects and the fact that community-base activities are resource consuming in terms of time, finances and expertise. However, the PCU acknowledged early in the Project that not all root causes can be addressed through community-level action alone and that some root cause issues needed to be addressed at the district or national level. Project activity as early as 2002 to review environment-related legislation was a Project response to this. Moving forward to 2005 and 2006 the Project will need to increase it’s attention to these higher level issues.
35	The representative from Samoa considered that many National Coordinators still do not appear to have a clear understanding about what pilot activities could be under their projects.	Through information exchange, in-country visits, focused workshops and document circulation the PCU endeavored to provide National Coordinators with materials and resources to promote an understanding of the Project. Generally, throughout the year an increased understanding of the Project developed.
35	The representative from Palau suggested ..... the PCU address all correspondence to the Head of the Lead Agency with copies to the National Coordinator.	The head of lead agencies, and/or other key lead agency staff, are now routinely copied in on Project communications. As a minimum this is done on a weekly basis when circulating the weekly updates.
35	The representative from Samoa considered there is a need to develop capacity, not only among National Coordinators, but also within lead agencies and the NTF itself.	Capacities building during the year (the economics course, the social marketing training, sub-regional and national participatory planning workshops) have included other lead agency staff and representatives

		from locally-based NGOs.
35	The MPR requested the PCU to provide regular updates on progress with implementation of the recommendations and that the next SPREP Meeting provided the first opportunity for this. Reports should be circulated to MPR members and to National Coordinators.	The Status Report for the Project, including activities associated with addressing the recommendations of the MTE was presented to the 14 <sup>th</sup> SPREP Meeting in September 2003.
36 and 38	The representative from UNDP, Mr Tom Twining-Ward.....produced an informal paper.....to contribute to discussion..... (para. 36)  The representative from Fiji proposed the MPR accept the UNDP paper. The representative from Samoa seconded this.	See Appendix A below.
43	The representative from UNDP, Mr Tom Twining-Ward, added that ..... a pilot is not just a project confined to activities in one community. Activities addressing the focal issue beyond the project will also form legitimate activities under the pilot. However, it is important that all activities associated with the pilot are assigned realistic performance indicators. He also noted that the IWP cannot expect to complete a comprehensive community-based project in the 3.5 years remaining – SPBCP couldn't do it in 10 years so, he asked, what chance did the IWP have in 3.5 years? ..... He noted that different countries will have different needs as the pilots are implemented and, as is provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by SPREP and each participating country, there may come a time in the not too distant future when a re-allocation of the current equal apportionment of funds is necessary.	NCM4 will focus on monitoring and evaluation. The outcome of NCM4 will be presented to MPR3.  No re-allocation of Project funding among participating countries has occurred to date.
44	..... Mr Tim Clairs..... noted that .....at next year's MPR it will be critical that participating countries start reporting back on what they are going to be doing about measuring success as those pilots are implemented. The MPR will need to take on a role of monitoring the results using sets of informative indicators.	NCM4 will focus on monitoring and evaluation. The outcome of NCM4 will be presented to MPR3.
45	The Director of SPREP, Mr Asterio Takesy, appealed to UNDP/GEF to provide assistance to SPREP in exploring ways by which the territories of the region may be also able to participate in the initiatives of the IWP.	Apart from synergies promoted through the broader SPREP network there have been no major linkages developed during the year between the IWP and SPREP Member territory programmes.
51	The Director of SPREP, Mr Asterio Takesy, noted that, for next year's MPR to focus on results and lessons, the SPREP/PCU would	MPR3 includes a stand-alone agenda item to discuss lessons learned to date. In addition, throughout 2003/2004 country projects had been

	need to be in constant contact with participating countries – to work collaboratively to document them.	encouraged to report on outputs and achievements. A section of the NCM4 template produced to support this was dedicated to lessons learned.
--	---	---

**Summary Record of Discussion, MPR2, Tonga, June 2003.  
Appendix G**

*Responses in italics*

**REGIONAL MECHANISMS**

- There appears to be agreement on the need for stronger IW-related regional coordination. The issue could be taken up at the Regional Oceans Forum, as an appropriate body to discuss sustainable regional mechanisms.

*In December 2003 the Project convened an informal meeting of experts to discuss ICWM with the aim of developing a strategy to ensure ICWM issues would be appropriately considered in the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum that was convened at the University of the South Pacific, Fiji in February 2004. The Project staff (National Coordinators and PCU) participated in the Forum. Since the Forum PCU staff have continued to work with the Marine Sector Working Group to promote improved regional coordination on Project-related issues.*

- The Regional Oceans Forum could be an opportunity to highlight IW issues in general and the IW Project specifically. It is also an opportunity to contribute to Objective 4 of the project, including catalyzing donor participation. It might be possible to bring forward to 2003 funds allocated for the project donor conference in 2005, so they are used in conjunction with the IW Project's contribution to the Regional Oceans Forum.

*As reported above, the Project made a significant contribution to the Ocean Forum. Funds were re-programmed, as suggested to support this.*

**NATIONAL ISSUES**

- Strengthening national participation and ownership is recognized as a key issue. There is broad agreement with the relevant MTE recommendations<sup>1</sup>.

*Efforts to promote increased national ownership of the Project continue to be explored.*

- The PCU could strengthen its working modality so that it maintains regular contact with Lead Agency Directors and addresses all communication to the Directors (cc to National Coordinators).

*The head of lead agencies, and/or other key lead agency staff, are now routinely copied in on Project communications. As a minimum this is done on a weekly basis when circulating the weekly updates.*

---

<sup>1</sup> R5, R12, R13, R14, R18, R19, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26, R30 and R32.

- Responsibility and performance could be assigned to the national Lead Agencies. To achieve this, indicators of success for pilot activities would need to be developed, linked to overall indicators of the project's impact. The indicators of success would be endorsed by the NTFs, agreed with the PCU and shared with UNDP for comment.

*Further attention to this recommendation can undertaken following the development and adoption of monitoring and evaluation plans for national components of the Project.*

- The PCU would work with National Coordinators to incorporate the indicators of success into annual workplans, by developing annual progress targets. Annual reviews could be undertaken by the PCU as part of its ongoing adaptive management arrangements.

*It will be possible to better address this recommendation following the adoption of national monitoring plans. This is the focus of discussion at NCM4.*

- National Coordinators could be requested to commence their knowledge management practices, including full documentation of national systems and processes, lessons learned and examples of Good Practices. The PCU could analyze the varying processes undertaken to select pilot activities and target communities in order to synthesize Good Practice.

*Some projects have documented national institutional arrangements during the year. The PCU is unaware of any national project documenting examples of lessons learned and good practice. However, the template for reporting to NCM4 provides an opportunity for this to occur. In addition, the PCU, over the last 18 months, has been gradually "building" a lessons learned document – an early draft of which will be discussed at MPR3.*

- The PCU and UNDP should develop general guidelines for use of funds for pilot activities. The guidelines could perhaps include broad budget ranges or caps for different types of inputs. The guidelines could then be applied to the indicative budgets prepared by the Lead Agency and budget ranges agreed upon with the PCU. Lead Agencies should be free to decide how to apply funds within the guidelines. SPREP, as the Executing Agency would be free to call for an audit at any time.

*The PCU developed and circulated guidelines, as suggested. The guidelines, which have also been placed on the IWP website focus on waste pilot activities.*

- MTE recommendations R5, R22 and R24 are recognized as very important. National pilot activities should address root causes identified in SAP [R5]. Furthermore, pilot activities should focus on innovative approaches and solutions to the SAP root causes. This may not necessarily be limited to local community-level activities [R22 and R24].

*In association with UNDP, the Logframe was further refined following MPR3. NCM4 will review the revised LogFrame following which MPR4 will be asked to review and adopt it[R5].*

*As stated at the Tonga MPR, the PCU has promoted a 2-pronged approach to Project implementation since early implementation. During the early years this focused on community-based aspects of the Project – a decision based on the experience of similar projects and the fact that community-base activities are resource consuming in terms of time, finances and expertise. However, the PCU acknowledged early in the Project that not all root causes can be addressed through community-level action alone and that some root cause issues needed to be addressed at the district or national level. Project activity as early as 2002 to review environment-related legislation was a Project response to this. Moving forward to 2005 and 2006 the Project will need to increase it's attention to these higher level issues.*

*Following MPR2, the PCU circulated an invitation to all National Coordinators requesting suggestions for moving to output based management. Throughout the year, the PCU has encouraged increased focus on achievements and outputs. In relation to this, the focus during the last 2 months has been on baseline assessments [R24].*

- To facilitate the achievement of MTE recommendations R5, R22 and R24 the PCU could develop guidelines for national pilot activities to ensure the focus is on demonstrating innovative approaches to tackling the SAP-identified root causes<sup>2</sup>. The development of appropriate measures of success would also be an important element.

*The PCU has developed and circulated strategies and guidelines, as suggested. This guidelines and strategies will be supplemented during NCM4 when National Coordinators will develop monitoring and evaluation plans, based on GEF/IW indicators, that can be adapted for pilot activities in each of the Project focal areas.*

**REGIONAL PROJECT, SPREP AND SAP INTEGRATION  
STRATEGIC COORDINATION**

<b>MTE Recommendations</b>	<b>UNDP Response</b>	<b>Subsequent Project Action</b>
Use SAP as broad strategic framework to link existing multiple strategic plans and policies. [R1], [R16]	Maybe, but not clear if the SAP is still the most appropriate regional instrument	<p>The PCU undertook a review of institutional and collaborative arrangements for ICWM in the region. This served as a resource paper at the informal expert's consultation held at SOPAC in Suva in December 2003. It also served as a basis for consideration if institutional arrangements in the Marine Sector Working Group in the lead up to the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum.</p> <p>Although a formal review of the SAP has not been commenced the PCU has promoted the SAP in SPREP Secretariat activities supporting National Assessment Reporting in preparation for Mauritius.</p>

<sup>2</sup> See para 94 of MTE Report and [R6], [R21] and [R25]

Integrate IW Project better into SPREP Secretariat [R10]	Yes, up to a point – bearing in mind the SPBCP experience	Good integration (particularly in relation to communications, participatory processes, and social marketing) has occurred with SPREP projects since MPR2.
Align the SPREP Action Plan with the IW SAP [R11]	Yes, as well as with other IW-relevant instruments	The review of the current Action Plan is currently underway. The PCU is participating in this process. Although the SPREP Action Plan is unlikely to be “aligned with the SAP” opportunities for better integration of the SAP to the new Action Plan will be explored and canvassed.
Project should review existing agreements, strategic plans, policies and forums in relation to IW SAP, with a view to building linkages, collaboration and harmonization [R17]	Yes, see draft MPR recommendation	The PCU undertook a review of institutional and collaborative arrangements for ICWM in the region. This served as a resource paper at the informal expert’s consultation held at SOPAC in Suva in December 2003. It also served as a basis for consideration if institutional arrangements in the Marine Sector Working Group in the lead up to the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum.
PCU and SPREP should develop joint activities with other programs and organizations to address root causes in IW SAP [R27]	Yes	Although no joint activities to address root cause issues have been formalized, the Project and SPREP programmes have cooperated well during the last 12 months to develop complementary activities to address environmental governance problems in SPREP Member countries. These activities have been mainly in the areas of communication, participatory processes and social marketing to promote behavioral change.

#### REGIONAL MECHANISMS

More thorough consideration of “transboundary management mechanism”. Strengthened inter-governmental, inter-agency, inter-disciplinary and inter-sectoral collaboration [R4]	Yes, but this doesn’t say much. Will be subsumed into R17	The PCU continues to contribute to the Marine Sector Working Group. The PCU undertook a review of institutional and collaborative arrangements for ICWM in the region. This served as a resource paper at the informal
--	---	--

		expert's consultation held at SOPAC in Suva in December 2003. It also served as a basis for consideration if institutional arrangements in the Marine Sector Working Group in the lead up to the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum. Further work in relation to considering institutional arrangements has been put on hold until the final Integrated Strategic Action Framework that will support the implementation of the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy is released.
Extend MPR to be home of the SAP [R7]	No	No action
MPR reformed as "Heads of Environment" [R8]	No, but UNDP could consider the idea beyond the project	No action
SPREP to use IW Project to determine and develop its IW role in relation to other regional institutions and international agencies [R11]	Yes	SPREP already has a good internal mechanism for collaborating with other regional and international agencies. However, opportunities to utilize the particular strengths of the Project to enhance this will be explored.
RTF/PTAG re-convened as small advisory group to the IW Project [R15]	No	No action
Use IW Project to link to and strengthen MSWG [R16]	Good idea. Need to work through	In progress – as reporting above – at least in terms of active participation. The need for "strengthening" will be re-examined once the Integrated Strategic Action Framework to support the implementation of the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum have been released.

## NATIONAL ISSUES

Each NTF should prepare a national IW SAP [R2]	No, but do a root cause analysis and link back to the SAP	No action
Less attention on local community-level activities, more attention to addressing root causes identified in SAP [R5]	Yes, although wording of this recommendation could be better.	As stated at the Tonga MPR, the PCU has promoted a 2-pronged approach to Project implementation since early implementation. During the early years this focused on community-based aspects of the Project – a decision based on the experience of similar projects and the fact that community-base activities are resource consuming in terms of time, finances and expertise. However, the PCU acknowledged early in the Project that not all root causes can be addressed through community-level action alone and that some root cause issues needed to be addressed at the district or national level. Project activity as early as 2002 to review environment-related legislation was a Project response to this. Moving forward to 2005 and 2006 the Project will need to increase it's attention to these higher level issues.
PCU to work primarily through Lead Agency Director rather than National Coordinator [R12]	Yes	The Lead Agency head has routinely been copied in to Project-related communications. It is anticipated that this provides the National Coordinator and the Lead Agency with better opportunities for coordination and collaboration.
Responsibility and performance should be assigned to the Lead Agency. Lead Agencies should drive IW Project activities in-country [R13], [R19]	Yes	The Project continues to explore opportunities for empowering Lead Agencies and the National Task Force in relation to the implementation of the Project.
NTFs should be encouraged and enabled to take on broader role [R14]	Yes	As above.
Lead Agency and NTFs should engage fully in the project and use it to examine IW issues and solutions [R18]	Yes	As above.

Each country should assign responsibility for the IW SAP to a national umbrella body, with the NTF appointed as a dedicated sub-body for the IW Project [R20]	Up to the country, but the idea could be encouraged	The PCU has received no feedback from participating countries in relation to this since MPR2.
Pilot activities should focus on innovative approaches and solutions to the SAP root causes. This may not necessarily be limited to local community-level activities [R22], [R24]	Yes	See above relating to 2-pronged approach.
Pilot activities should build on existing initiatives [R23]	Yes	This has been encouraged – as has the development of mutually beneficial partnerships to promote opportunities for achieving Project objectives.
Pilot activities should be used directly as learning exercises, integrating a capacity-building component [R25]	Yes, with full documentation by NCs	This has been promoted by the PCU.
Broaden capacity support to include needs of Lead Agencies and NTFs [R26]	Yes	Capacities building during the year (the economics course, the social marketing training, sub-regional and national participatory planning workshops) have included other lead agency staff and representatives from locally-based NGOs.
Integrate pilot activities with the overall LogFrame [R30]	Yes	The revised LogFrame to be considered by NCM4 attempts this. NCM4 will further revise the LogFrame and present it to MPR3 for review and adoption.
Lead Agencies should develop indicative budgets in consultations with NTFs and PCU [R32]	Yes	All 14 participating countries developed indicative work plans and budgets for 2004.

#### UNDP ISSUES

Provide critical monitoring and mentoring function for effective technical delivery [R9]	Yes, already trying to do: TC visits, Juha's visit, IW:LEARN project....	Limited activity in relation to this since MPR2.
Link to NCSAs [R26]	Yes	Arrangements for the implementation of the NCSA are still being developed. The PCU has had input to discussions relating to possible logistical arrangements for supporting NCSA in the SPREP Secretariat.
Look at reducing reporting requirements [R28]	Yes	No apparent action. A new UNDP system,

		Peoplesoft, was introduced to the Project in early 2004.
Revise LogFrame [R29]	Yes, including the need for impact indicators	As reported above.
Budget revisions should be approved by MPR [R31]	No	No action
Arrange reliable fund transfer system [R33]	Yes	Refinements still being attempted – some delays still experienced mainly as a result of the adoption of the Peoplesoft system.

## Summary Recommendations from the MTE Report

### The Strategic Action Programme

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

### Regional Participation

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

### Project Concept and Design

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

### Project Management Arrangements:

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

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

#### Enhancing Trans-Boundary Mechanisms – Objective 1.

- [13] National Task Forces: NTFs should be encouraged and enabled to take on the broader role envisaged in the Project Document. It is suggested that a National SAP for IW issues should be formulated by this group, as a participatory problem analysis and strategic planning exercise between key national stakeholders, to form the basis for national pilot activities under the IW Project.
- [14] Regional Task Force: An RTF/ PTAG should be re-convened as a small, ad hoc group of individuals able to provide expert advice (individual or collective) on matters relevant to the IW programme, to the MPR, PCU, Lead Agencies, IA and EA.
- [15] CROP MSWG: MSWG members should make more use of the IW Project as an opportunity to engage in addressing the region's IW issues, with Project resources being used to undertake specific pilot activities. For example, Project resources could be used to

facilitate strengthening of the MSWG itself as an integrating mechanism. Another important initiative for the MSWG would be to formulate clear, substantial links between the recently-released Ocean Policy, with, on the one hand, the relevant regional Conventions (Noumea/ SPREP Convention; Waigani Convention), and on the other, with the IW SAP and the many other Regional Strategies.

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

#### Strengthening Integrated Coastal Waters Management – Objective 2.

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

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

#### Extending and Replicating ICWM – Objective 4.

- [19] Communications: The IW Project should continue to pilot effective means of transferring knowledge, in particular to ensure that information is accessible and applicable to stakeholders and activities in participating countries. This should include devising and

supporting innovative methods of using pilot and demonstration activities directly as learning exercises, integrating a capacity-building component with each pilot activity, based wherever possible on local resources, skills and experience.

- [20] Capacity-building: Project support for capacity building should be broadened to systematically address the needs of the Lead Agencies and NTF member agencies in relation to ICWM. The Project should collaborate with the GEF enabling activity on National Capacity Self Assessment being implemented in all the participating countries.
- [21] Partnerships: The PCU and SPREP should deliberately develop joint activities with other programmes and organisations to explore possible solutions to the range of root causes identified in the regional IW SAP and proposed national SAPs.

#### Project Administration

- [22] Strengthened Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation: Given the onerous reporting schedule, it is recommended that opportunities for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the system should be sought. Possibilities include combining the several different overall Project progress reports that are produced.
- [23] Logical Framework: The quality and efficiency of progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation should be improved by using a revised Logical Framework as the common basis. Pilot project activities – at local, national or regional level – should be integrated with the overall Logical Framework. The pilot projects’ substantial outputs are to contribute to the overall Project’s substantial outputs.
- [24] Project Financing: Following the MTE, each LA in consultation with the NTFs and PCU should prepare a plan of the main Outputs to be produced and an indicative Output budget for the second 3.5 years of the Project. This Outputs and budget plan should be refined prior to the start of each new year, with additional detail for the forthcoming year. The PCU should prepare a comparable 3.5 year Outputs budget for the whole Project in conjunction with the development of a more detailed Logical Framework. UNDP and the PCU should arrange a reliable system for transferring funds to Lead Agencies in advance of them being needed. To ensure consistency and transparency in budget adjustments, changes should be approved by the MPR.