



SOPAC



SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/10

Date: 18th June 2010

Original: English

Second Meeting of the Regional Project Steering Committee
and Inception Workshop for the SOPAC/UNDP/UNEP/GEF Project:
*“Implementing Sustainable Water Resource and Wastewater
Management in Pacific Island Countries”*

Republic of Palau, 19th – 23rd July 2010

**DEVELOPING A PACIFIC REGIONAL PROJECT FOR COMMUNITY-LED
WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**

Background

1. Communities and improved, sustainable, water resource management

Community involvement is correctly identified as a *sine qua non*¹ for IWR(WW)M (Integrated Water Resources (and Waste Water) Management). Rural or urban, the people who live in communities are users of water and possibly abusers of water, for domestic purposes, for productive purposes, for local level industries [fishing, crafts, food processing]; they are conservers of water or wasters of water; they are managers or mis-managers of the land and surfaces on which water falls and through which it can be harvested; they are the beneficiaries of the environment which the water resources support and its caretakers or despoilers. Through household water consumption they account for a guesstimate of over 80% of national water consumption in less-industrialised Pacific countries [HYCOS, 2010, pers. comm.]

For as long as the communities remain unaware of the threats to their water resources and the risks from their abuse, they remain unlikely to contribute to improved water resource and waste water management. For this reason, many WRM (water resources management), Disaster Management and CC (climate change) activists - Government and Non-Government - are engaged in the first, essential, step of communication and awareness building with the communities, and are effective in their work. But the end purpose of this awareness building is for action, for the changes in behaviour that are needed to secure water and health for all users, human and environmental, for the future.

Too often, communities become aware, become mobilised for action, and then become demobilised and demotivated as they find they do not have and cannot access key resources necessary to implement their plans. Key resources can be finance for inputs: septic tank rehabilitation; roof RWH gutters and connectors for rainwater harvesting; eco-sanitation construction; vegetative replanting; pig-sty relocation and improved pig waste disposal; kits for water quality monitoring; media for lobbying appliance retailers and businesses for greater water efficiency (in washing machines, in hotels). Key resources will also be human resources to provide the initial impetus to mobilise the communities; to provide technical or institutional and managerial specialist input into the design and implementation of the planned action; or to provide the follow-up and backstopping that communities cite as an important motivator and contributor to success.

2. Pacific Regional Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management Project

The recent Pacific-regional initiative for improving water resources and wastewater management, the GEF-funded Pacific IWRM (Integrated Water Resources Management) Project, through its fourteen national IWRM demonstration projects, clearly recognises that community involvement is a requirement for IWRM and thereby, improved WR(WW)M. For many of the national projects, this involvement and its resource allocation are also primarily through awareness building and through community participation and uptake of whatever are the technologies and improved practices that are the core of each national demonstration project, technologies and practices that in most cases, were designed with limited or no community consultation.

Country demonstration projects and project budgets, developed through a country-led process that was supported by professional inputs sourced through the EU-IWRM Programme, were designed to use the limited project resources to address critical national IWRM priorities, as identified by the key water resources stakeholders and partners. With multiple priorities in-country and limited budget, community engagement in WRM through community planned and community-led micro-WRM projects did not feature in final project designs and budget allocations. As a result, the demonstration projects do not have the budget to enable them to engage with the community in this way. Unintentionally, this short-changes the potential of the IWRM approach and short-changes the potential of the national resources and the GEF resources invested in the project. Communities and community groups remain as unequal partners in WRM decision making and WRM action: as the less-equal partners, they are less able to require accountability and transparency from the more-equal partners and IWRM is jeopardised. With supplementary resources to fund community-led initiatives, this imbalance could be redressed and the IWRM approach made more resilient.

¹ *Sine qua non* (Latin) 'without which, not', meaning that without communities, IWRM is not possible

3. Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project

A second GEF funded regional project, PACC (Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change) is also in its early stages of implementation. It has a stated commitment to stakeholder and community consultation and in six countries (Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, RMI, Tonga, Tuvalu) focuses on climate change adaptive improvements to water or wastewater management. Currently, the national projects are preparing their guidelines for later full project implementation and the future allocation of resources to communities for community led interventions cannot be known.

4. Alternative fund sources for community action

The imperative for additional funds for community IWR(WW)M action is not uniform. Samoa expects to be able to apply to the UNDP administered GEF Small Grants Programme and other countries (e.g. Niue, FSM, Nauru) have this in mind as an option. In RMI (Republic of the Marshall Islands), a main constraint for such community-action focused projects is the scarcity of human resources (HR) available to service them. However, even where other fund sources do exist, countries make the point that these are limited; may not be exclusively water-focused, and so must be competed for against other sectors and users; the application process may be time consuming; and the outcome is piecemeal rather than programmatic. For these reasons, the GEF-Pacific IWRM Regional PCU is considering drafting a proposal for a regional project to support community level and community-led climate change adaptive WR(WW)M micro-projects

A regional community-action project for climate change adaptive WR(WW)M?

5. Regional Project for Community-led Water Resources Management

The regional project would enable communities to convert their increased WRM awareness into climate change aware action. The project would resource material and financial inputs for the community, to match those contributed by the community: and would resource the technical (TA) and non-technical (nTA) human resource assistance that communities will need.

Query

→ Is this the right direction to pursue?

What follows are first thoughts, for discussion with the GEF-IWRM Regional Steering Committee.

6. Project purpose

Along the lines of

“To strengthen community institutional and physical capacity to manage their water resources (and wastewater) to meet their livelihood needs in a climate change affected future”

Query

→ Any suggestions?

7. Project Design

A project to resource community-planned and community-led local IWRM and CC compatible actions:

- direct WRM actions e.g. water and waste water management;
- indirect WRM actions via e.g. land management for improved water management;
- capacity development of community, linked to their WRM action plan;
- capacity development of in-country service providers (SP), linked to project activities [up to a ceiling (maximum) % of total project funds];
- linked to GEF-IWRM demonstration communities – exclusively or partially;
- regional / national service provider (SP) managerial fee and costs;
- local level post for a community support officer/assistant;
- and for consideration
 - livelihood (income generating) activities as an incentive/enabler for improved catchment management).

Managed through:

- Implementing Agency of the donor (UNDP and UNEP for GEF-Pacific IWRM),
- co-ordinating regional service provider (as Implementing Partner),
- national and/or local service provider(s), with in-country management responsibilities and mechanisms to be determined,
- and community groups.

Queries

→ Any comments?

8. Fund allocation to community:

As a competitive grant subject to agreed eligibility and appraisal criteria: e.g. box below

- grant funds awarded by in-country panel (linked to national water resource institutional structure) against agreed appraisal criteria;
- up to an agreed maximum amount per community and per participating household;
- not available to individuals;
- full disbursement by community within 2 years?

Examples of eligibility criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ community committee; ▪ supported by community; ▪ by-laws; ▪ bank account [or proxy via SP]; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ agreed minimum number of participants; ▪ socially inclusive (gender, vulnerable groups); ▪ management plan endorsed by community + by relevant professionals + by service provider; ▪ reporting capability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ community contribution in cash/kind; 	

Queries

What would be the scope of the project?

- how many community action plans may be proposed per year?
- how many could be awarded and serviced per year?
- typical values/budget for community managed IWRM+CC compatible projects?
- typical costs for community level capacity building / day / week / person
- community capacity to manage funds and bank accounts?
- options for social inclusiveness – participation of women and vulnerable groups?
- appropriate linkages with local government institutions

9. Project Duration

3 years (2011-2013 to parallel to GEF-IWRM) or
5 years (2011-2015 allowing for replicability, scaling up, start-up lag time)

- The earliest date for commencement, if a project proposal is developed and approved, would be 2011. This should give over 2 years for funding community actions arising directly from or linked to IWRM demonstration projects.
- For community projects, 3 years would be a recommended minimum duration to allow for start-up and implementation; with a longer duration for replicability.

Query

→ Opinions on project duration?

10. Service providers

What modality will work best for IWRM in the Pacific, the people, the communities, the national governments? The table following identifies some of the key tasks and functions that will be needed to implement the project and suggests the type of agencies that might be responsible.

First ideas:

- i Implementing Agency as required by the donor for fund flow;
- ii A regional organisation as the Implementing Partner to manage the project for the Implementing Agency (and donor), co-ordinating workplanning, budgeting, reporting, monitoring and regional experience sharing: also co-ordinating the in-house or outsourcing of any country level services required, if these latter functions are not taken by the National Lead Agency/National Service Provider (NSP);

The regional organisation (Implementing Partner or regional service provider (RSP)) might, as examples, be:

- CROP agency e.g. SOPAC-SPC (Secretariat of the Pacific Community) or other;
 - Regional (I)NGO (LLEE, IUCN, WWF or other, with pan-Pacific or partial-Pacific coverage, directly or through partners) and extensive experience in community-led project management;
 - UN Implementing Agency that also executes projects e.g. UNDP.
- iii National level lead agency or service provider (SP) (eg Water Apex Body) or its local level equivalent; or Community Affairs department of Government to be responsible to, sub-contract to local agencies / NGOs as local service providers, provide in-country supervision, back-up, support and capacity building;
 - iv Local level agency or service provider or additional staff post to mobilise and support communities and liaise with other partners, provide local level capacity building etc.;
 - v Community and community management unit or community based organisation (CBO) to plan, implement, manage, monitor.

Queries

- What is an appropriate division of functions between the Regional Implementing Partner (or Regional Service Provider (RSP)) and National Lead Agency or Service Provider (NSP)?
 - Regional Partner to co-ordinate fund administration, and reporting to donor?
 - National Lead Agency (eg Water Apex Body) or its local level equivalent as Service Provider (SP); or Community Affairs or other to mobilise communities, sub-contract to local agencies / NGOs as local service providers, provide in-country supervision, back-up, support and capacity building?

Pacific Regional Project for Community –led WRM Action					
	Main functions / tasks	Regional Service Provider (RSP)	National Lead /SP (NSP) GO? NGO? PMU?	Local SP (LSP) NGO? GO? PMU?	Community
1.	<u>Regional level preparation</u>				
2.	? Proposal development	✓	✓		
3.	<u>Regional level management</u>				
4.	Regional co-ordination, budget, reports, M&E	✓			
5.	<u>National level management</u>				
6.	National budgeting, reporting, M&E	✓ ?	✓ ?		
7.	Grant fund management	✓ ?	✓ ?		
8.	Grant awarding		✓		
9.	<u>Local Service Provider (SP) level management</u>				
10.	Backstopping local service providers	✓ ?	✓ ?		
11.	Local service provider capacity development	✓	✓ ?		
12.	Local service provider management	✓ ?	✓ ?		
13.	Local service provider contracting	✓ ?	✓ ?		
14.	Local SP capacity development	✓	✓		
15.	Backstopping local SP	✓	✓		
16.	<u>Community level management</u>				
17.	Backstopping community			✓	
18.	Community capacity development	?	✓	✓	
19.	Action plan M&E, reporting, communication		✓ ?	✓	✓
20.	Action plan management, implementation				✓
21.	Action plan input procurement		✓ ?	✓ ?	✓ ?
22.	Community budget management			✓	✓
23.	'Technical' feasibility assessment of plan		✓	✓ ?	
24.	Action plan development			✓	✓
25.	Community mobilisation			✓	

Queries continued

- What is an appropriate division between the National Lead Agency (SP) and the Local SP (NGO, GO, Community Based Organisation (CBO) PMU?)
- What is the role of the local SP, what is appropriate local staffing, how does the local Service Provider (SP) link with the PMU?
- Uniformity or diversity? Does one model need to be applied across all countries or is there scope for flexibility? For example, Samoa has a Water Co-ordinating Unit which is authorised to administer and allocate water development funds, to award contracts etc. In Niue, the Water Apex Body might provide these functions, subject to its mandate.
- What is the HR capacity in country (in view of workload, existing duties, skills) to handle the proposed project – within government and outside government?

11. Ideas on this proposal

Members' ideas on the need for and nature of such a project are invited

12. Summary of queries for discussion

5 Regional Project for Community-led Water Resources Management

- i Is this the right direction to pursue?

6 Project purpose

- ii Suggested phrasing for the project purpose?

7 Project Design

- iii Comments / opinions on the overall design?

8 Fund allocation to community: project scope

- iv How many community action plans may be proposed per year?
- v How many could be awarded and serviced per year?
- vi Typical values/budget for community managed IWRM+CC compatible projects?
- vii Typical costs for community level capacity building / day / week / person?
- viii Community capacity to manage funds and bank accounts?
- ix Options for social inclusiveness – participation of women and vulnerable groups?
- x Appropriate linkages with local government institutions?

9 Project Duration

- xi Opinions on project duration? 3 years? 5 years?

10 Service Providers and responsibilities

- xii What is an appropriate division of functions between the Regional Implementing Partner and National Lead Agency or Service Provider (SP)?
- xiii What is an appropriate division between the National Lead Agency (SP) and the Local SP (NGO, CBO, GO, PMU)?
- xiv What is the role of the local SP, what is appropriate local staffing, how does the local SP link with the PMU
- xv Uniformity or diversity? Does one model need to be applied across all countries or is there scope for flexibility? For example, Samoa has a Water Co-ordinating Unit which is authorised to administer and allocate water development funds, to award contracts etc. In Niue, the Water Apex Body might provide these functions, subject to its mandate.
- xvi What is the HR capacity in country (in view of workload, existing duties, skills) to handle the proposed project – within government and outside government.
- xvii How would the link to the demonstration projects be maintained?
- xviii What is the appropriate role for the PMU?

13. Competition

Guess or create a project acronym

FATA	From Awareness to Action
FIFA	
AAA	
AFA	
Others??	Over to you!