AGENDA ITEM 9.3.3: Waste Management Donor Coordination

Purpose

1. To update Members on the proposal to establish a regional coordination mechanism for waste management and to seek endorsement of an interim measure.

Background

2. At the 23rd SPREP Meeting in 2012, the Secretariat presented a proposal for the establishment of coordination and monitoring mechanisms to improve delivery of the Regional Solid Waste Management Programme. This proposal noted the recent increase in support and funding for various regional and national initiatives which requires an effective and sustainable structure that would: (i) eliminate duplication; (ii) allow for pooling of limited resources; and (iii) promote exchange of ideas and lessons learnt to benefit countries, projects and relevant organisations involved in waste management.

3. The 23rd SPREP Meeting directed the Secretariat to: (i) further develop the proposal for establishment of an efficient regional coordination mechanism to include cost implications, and to ensure wide distribution of this proposal for comment; and (ii) to continue to use existing fora to collate information on national waste management activities.

4. The Secretariat is currently collecting information and experiences from regional organizations in the Caribbean and other regions, which will be compiled into a report and widely circulated to members when completed (anticipated for early 2014).

5. After further in-house consultations and discussion, the Secretariat proposes the following approach as an interim measure towards improving regional coordination of waste management support.

   a. The first component would require Members and the Secretariat to provide short annual updates of national waste management projects and programmes in advance of each SPREP Meeting (using the simple reporting format in Attachment 1). The Secretariat would then collate the information and present it under a recurring agenda item at each SPREP Meeting to be endorsed for accuracy/completeness. The endorsed information would then be uploaded to the SPREP website.

   b. Members will be able to provide ad-hoc updates as often as they wish between SPREP Meetings, through official National SPREP Focal Points.
c. The second component would involve face-to-face discussions between the Secretariat and known development partners in the Pacific. This would involve visits to development partners, including visits to Suva, Sydney, and Wellington (Attachment 2) to collate information on relevant bilateral and multi-lateral activities with Members. Information obtained from these meetings would be fed into the report presented in (a) above.

d. The Secretariat will also make every effort to visit Members’ aid coordination units/departments during in-country assistance missions to discuss and update on waste management projects/programmes.

6. It is proposed to evaluate the described mechanism after 3 years, through the following metrics:
   
a. Response rate (proportion of Members that complete and submit an annual report as per Attachment 1).
   b. Number of projects and programmes that duplicate or overlap in assistance.
   c. Number of new donor efforts in areas in which duplication or overlapping had been identified.
   d. Number of new efforts in areas identified as gaps.
   e. Website usage statistics (including number of visits, and repeat visits).

Cost Implications

**Scenario 1:** Visits to development partners (Fiji, Australia, New Zealand) will be combined with country-assistance missions or other approved travel as far as possible. In some cases, this may require additional domestic flights between the most common transit locations and the Development Partners location, and a few days additional stay in country.

Recommendations

7. The Meeting is invited to:
   
   ➢ **endorse** the interim approach to improve regional donor coordination in waste management; and
   
   ➢ **provide** guidance to the Secretariat and Members on the reporting format and approach suggested.
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