



SOPAC



GEF PACIFIC IWRM PROJECT

*Implementing Sustainable Water Resources
and Wastewater Management in Pacific Island Countries*

“Ridge to Reef – Community to Cabinet”

DRAFT REPORT

Second Meeting of the Regional Steering Committee

Koror, Republic of Palau, 19th – 23rd July 2010



SOPAC



First published in Suva, Fiji Islands in 2010 by the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission.

Copyright © 2010, Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission from the copyright holder provided acknowledgement of the source is made. The Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

No use of this publication may be made for resale or for any other commercial purpose without prior permission in writing from the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission.

SOPAC/GEF/IWRM
Project Co-ordinating Unit
Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
Postal Address: Private Mail Bag, GPO, Suva, Fiji Islands
Street Address: Mead Road, Nabua, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 338 1377
Fax: (679) 337 0040
Web: <http://www.pacific-iwrm.org>

DISCLAIMER:

The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission, the Global Environment Facility, or the Global Environment Facility Implementing Agencies.

Cover Figure: [TO BE INCLUDED WITH FINAL HARD COPY PRINT VERSION]

For citation purposes this document may be cited as:

SOPAC, 2010. *Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific Island Countries. Report of the Second Meeting of the Regional Project Steering Committee.* SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/3.

Table of Contents

1.	OPENING OF THE MEETING	1
2.	ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING.....	5
3.	ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA	6
4.	STATUS OF THE REGIONAL PACIFIC IWRM INITIATIVE	6
5.	STATUS OF THE NATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	15
6.	PACIFIC HYDROLOGICAL CYCLE OBSERVING SYSTEM PROJECT AND NATIONAL IWRM DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: ACHIEVEMENTS, LESSONS, AND FOLLOW-UP	18
7.	ENHANCING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN IWRM IN PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES.....	19
8.	ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL INDICATOR FRAMEWORK FOR IWRM AND WATER USE EFFICIENCY IN PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES.....	19
9.	TRACKING CO-FINANCING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND MAINSTREAMING IWRM IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	21
10.	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR IWRM	21
11.	INCORPORATING CLIMATE VARIABILITY AND CHANGE INTO IWRM.....	22
12.	DEVELOPING AN INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY FOR THE PACIFIC IWRM PROGRAMME.....	24
13.	PARTNERSHIPS AND LINKAGES WITH OTHER PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES.....	25
14.	DRAFT BUDGET FOR THE GEF PACIFIC IWRM PROJECT 2010-2011	25
15.	LOCATION OF THE NEXT MEETING	26
16.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING.....	27

List of Annexes

ANNEX 1	List of Participants
ANNEX 2	List of Documents
ANNEX 3	Agenda
ANNEX 4	Terms of Reference for the Regional Technical Advisory Group for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project
ANNEX 5	Community Engagement Report Card Prepared by Dr. Ruth Urben
ANNEX 6	Co-Financing of Project Activities
ANNEX 7	Project Budget for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

REPORT OF THE MEETING

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome Address on Behalf of SOPAC

1.1.1 Mr. Marc Wilson, the Regional Project Manager of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded project entitled “*Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific Island Countries*” (hereafter referred to as the “*GEF Pacific IWRM Project*”) began proceedings at 08:30 on 20th July 2010. Mr. Wilson noted the high level representation of the Government of the Republic of Palau in the opening session, including participation by: His Excellency and President of the Republic of Palau, Mr. Johnson Toribiong; the Minister for Natural Resources, Environment, and Tourism, the Honourable Mr. Harry Fritz; the Chair and Vice-Chair of Palau’s Environmental Quality Protection Board; and other distinguished guests. He further noted the attendance of representatives of the GEF Implementing Agencies and the European Union (EU).

1.1.2 Mr. Wilson noted the important need for improved access to fresh water and sanitation in Pacific Island Countries. He highlighted available information which suggests that 46 percent of Pacific populations have access to improved drinking water compared to the global average of 87 percent, and that 48 percent of Pacific populations have access to improved sanitation compared to 62 percent globally. Similarly he noted that the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals seek to halve by 2015 the number of people without access to basic sanitation, and to halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water. He pointed out that water also performs vital ecosystem services from ridge to reef and suggested that water should be everybody’s business, from community to cabinet.

1.1.3 Mr. Wilson expressed his view that the Pacific Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Initiative, comprised of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project and the EU IWRM National Planning Programme, is a unique example in the Pacific region of the positive impacts associated with effective regional level coordination of two water projects which have different donors. He pointed out that the Pacific IWRM initiative, which seeks to address water availability and wastewater management issues at local, national and regional levels, is truly an example of $1 + 1 = 3$. He noted further the significance of the initiative’s work to develop governance and regulatory support for integrated water resources and wastewater management, and to then demonstrate the beneficial impacts of IWRM via the initiative’s network of national IWRM demonstration projects.

1.1.4 Mr. Wilson proceeded to point out the significance of convening the Second Meeting of the Regional Project Steering Committee in Koror, Palau where water availability and wastewater management is an acknowledged constraint to development. He pointed out that participants only needed to look around themselves to realise how unique the Palauan environment is and the fact that Palauans are proud custodians of that environment. He welcomed participants to the meeting and encouraged all to fully enjoy the experience that is Palau.

1.2 Opening Prayer

1.2.1 Mr. Wilson invited the Chairperson of the First Regional Project Steering Committee (RSC) Meeting, Mr. Suluimalo Amataga Penaia to deliver an opening prayer. Mr. Suluimalo proceeded to deliver a short prayer on behalf of the RSC.

1.3 Traditional Palauan Water Chant

1.3.1 Mr. Wilson invited Mr. Jemmy Belelai, to deliver a traditional Palauan water chant. Mr. Belelai proceeded to deliver a traditional chant and there followed a presentation of flower garlands or “*leis*” to distinguished guests. The text of the traditional Palauan water chant in Palauan and English languages is as follows:

CHESELSEL A RALM

*Odesuokl, Odesueklel, Chang
Kemiu a ngara butechesel, el ulsemuul er a uldasu*

*El dachelbai ra kedul, ma orretel a ngerachel
E ma bodoterkokl a ungil roel a ketmeklel
A chull a lmel a bek el beluu, chiiang*

*A ralm a uchul a klengar, luusbechall ra rokui el ngar
E a ngaruchei a rechad a bo el ngilmii a lecheos
Eng kolkolt a reng e meskid a klisiched
Ma dorael eng kmal bi chiiang*

TRADITIONAL PALAUAN WATER CHANT

*All of you here have the skill and knowledge to carry out our responsibility
Let us find best ways to manage it
Rain is water for all nations*

*Water is life, needed by all that live
We drink to refresh
We drink for sustenance
We drink to live*

1.4 Welcome Address on Behalf of the GEF Implementing Agencies

1.4.1 Dr. Jose Erez Padilla thanked the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) on behalf of the GEF, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for the invitation to attend the Second Regional Project Steering Committee Meeting for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project. He also extended warm thanks to the Government of Palau for being the host country, for the warm hospitality, and the recognition accorded to the event at the highest political level.

1.4.2 Dr. Padilla noted that the Pacific IWRM Initiative is closely aligned with UNDP's country assistance strategies including the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (2008-2012), which in turn is aligned with the Pacific Plan's four goals. He noted further that UNDP supports improved water resources and wastewater management, as well as improved water use efficiency to reduce poverty and to achieve sustainable development objectives at the local, national, regional, and global levels. In this connection he highlighted that UNEP also supports key regional components of the Pacific IWRM Initiative.

1.4.3 Dr. Padilla reminded the meeting that the GEF Pacific IWRM Project is directly addressing the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Target for sustainable access to improved drinking water and sanitation, and will also contribute to the achievement of other MDGs including, *inter alia*, poverty reduction, hunger eradication, and environmental sustainability. He highlighted that the project also supports the WSSD targets of putting in place IWRM and Water Use Efficiency (WUE) plans in developing countries.

1.4.4 Dr. Padilla suggested that the relevance of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project cannot be overemphasized given recent information on where the Pacific region is *vis-à-vis* the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and MDG targets. He informed the meeting that the report to the 2008 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development meeting indicated that developing countries failed to meet the IWRM and WUE targets set for 2005. He informed the meeting further that based on the Joint Monitoring Programme conducted by the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund, between 1998 and 2008, Oceania taken collectively has been off-track with respect to water and sanitation targets. He pointed out that the percentage of the region's population with access to safe drinking water and sanitation facilities had reportedly declined by 1 percent and 2 percent, respectively.

1.4.5 Dr. Padilla reminded the Regional Project Steering Committee of their important role in reviewing project progress, assessing barriers to successful project implementation, and ensuring project management responsibilities are fulfilled by all partners, including UNDP and UNEP. He reminded representatives from the participating countries that they are not only bound by national responsibilities, but that they also have commitments with respect to global agreements such as the

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. He expressed his view that to meet these responsibilities it is critical that all project partners have a clear understanding of what they must do to make such a partnership work, whilst working within the constraints of the administrative and financial systems they are bound by.

1.4.6 In closing, Dr. Padilla noted that through his participation in the rotating country clinics conducted on 19th July 2010, he was delighted to learn that significant progress had been made by the project and that collectively the participating countries were moving towards improving the welfare of Pacific Island people.

1.5 Welcome Address on Behalf of the European Union

1.5.1 Mr. Marius-Adrian Oancea opened his address by thanking the Regional Project Steering Committee for inviting him to represent the Delegation of the European Union for the Pacific at its second meeting. He expressed his pleasure in being able to visit the island group of Palau and to experience the hospitality extended by the meeting's Palauan hosts.

1.5.2 Mr. Oancea proceeded to inform the meeting that the European Union and its member countries provide 55 percent of world development aid and is a major donor in the Pacific. He noted that as part of the 10th European Development Fund (EDF), covering the period 2008-2013, the EU contribution to the Pacific would reach almost 500 million Euros, with 95 million Euros being allocated to regional programmes, with the remaining being disbursed on a bilateral basis.

1.5.3 Mr. Oancea explained that the region's Country Strategy Papers, the mechanism through which countries indicate focal sectors of interest at the outset of each EDF period, clearly shows the importance assigned to water supply and improved sanitation in the Pacific. He informed the meeting that for the 10th EDF, five Pacific Island countries chose water and sanitation as their focal sector. The Cook Islands, Samoa and Tuvalu had selected water and sanitation as the exclusive focal sector, while Kiribati and Nauru had included it in their plans together with renewable energy. He informed the meeting further that significant funding from regional programmes would also be directed to water and sanitation projects.

1.5.4 Mr. Oancea noted that, given the relevance of improved water and sanitation management to the Pacific at both regional and national levels, he looked forward to a fruitful week of work in support of the Pacific IWRM Initiative. He expressed his view that this initiative has the potential to impact the lives of the inhabitants of Pacific Island Countries in a very positive way.

1.6 Welcome Address by the Chair of Palau's Environmental Quality Protection Board

1.6.1 The Vice-Chair of Palau's Environmental Quality Protection Board, Ms. Tiare Holm welcomed participants to Palau and extended a warm Palauan "*Alii*" to all. Ms. Holm informed the meeting that it was her privilege and pleasure to represent the Palau Environmental Quality Protection Board (EQPB) in the opening session of this important regional event. Ms. Holm informed the meeting further that EQPB is the lead agency for the GEF funded national IWRM demonstration project being implemented in the Ngerikiil Watershed of Palau's Airai State, and that EQPB was looking forward to this valuable opportunity to share lessons learned and examples of best practice in water resource management with colleagues from across the Pacific region.

1.6.2 Ms. Holm expressed her belief that Pacific Islanders have a special appreciation and understanding of water, and how it fundamentally unites all Small Island States of the Pacific Ocean. Ms. Holm pointed out that the Pacific Ocean, despite its vastness, acts to unite rather than separate island communities, and that all islanders recognise the region's valuable but increasingly scarce freshwater resources ultimately originate at some point from the region's great ocean, or "*One Big Water*" as it is often called.

1.6.3 Ms. Holm acknowledged that many of the participants were technical experts in the area of water management and public works, while others, similar to her, focused their professional lives in the field of environment and biodiversity conservation. Ms. Holm expressed her view that it is this range of technical and geographic backgrounds that will be needed to adequately address water and sanitation issues from an IWRM perspective in the Pacific region. Ms. Holm noted that Palau can

learn a lot from the project's suite of IWRM demonstration projects, and that Palau had already had the great fortune of learning about watershed management strategies from neighbours, such as those in Pohnpei State where watershed management had played a key role in terrestrial conservation for several decades.

1.6.4 Ms. Holm informed the meeting that Palau is facing a serious challenge in balancing watershed management with economic development, as is the case in the Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, and Vanuatu. It was noted further that Palau also faced many similar challenges in water resource protection, and that they looked forward to the lessons that could be learned from the experiences of their friends in the Cook Islands, the Fiji Islands, and Niue. Ms. Holm explained also that Palau struggles with ensuring water efficiency and safety, as is the case in the Solomon Islands and Tonga. Similarly wastewater management and sanitation are major issues in Palau, lessons about which Palauans hope to learn from their friends in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Nauru, and Tuvalu.

1.6.5 Ms. Holm noted that the meeting is especially timely as Pacific Island countries continue to develop and progress, and face associated challenges in ensuring safe and healthy resources upon which all island communities are dependent to support their way of life and aspirations. Ms. Holm expressed her view that the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) approach will provide a valuable tool for Island countries to be better equipped to fulfil this responsibility.

1.6.6 As a Palauan who has spent years in the field of natural resource management and conservation, Ms. Holm expressed her view that management and prevention are always especially challenging as the outcomes are rarely immediate. Ms. Holm noted that persistence and dedication are required from governments, partners, and communities to achieve positive outcomes. In this connection, Ms. Holm highlighted the importance of strengthening community participation in planning and managing water resource use.

1.6.7 In closing, Ms. Holm acknowledged the wonderful support to the meeting and to this project from the office of the Governor of Airai State, and sent out a special thanks to the Chairperson of the Palau IWRM Steering Committee, Ms. Henrietta Merei. On behalf of EQPB, Ms. Holm thanked all participants for travelling the large distances to visit Palau and wished all a very productive and enjoyable workshop,

1.7 Official Opening by the President of the Republic of Palau

1.7.1 His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Palau, Mr. Johnson Toribiong began his official opening by extending a warm welcome on behalf of the people and Government of the Republic of Palau to the Chairperson of the Regional Project Steering Committee and other distinguished delegates from the participating Pacific Island Countries, SOPAC, the United Nations Agencies, and the European Union.

1.7.2 H.E. President Toribiong noted that the Second RSC Meeting was an historic event in that it was the first time the Republic of Palau had hosted a regional meeting on water of this significance. He expressed his sincerest thanks to the Committee for choosing Palau as the venue for this important event. He also expressed his hope that participants would find Palau a suitable location for the meeting, and that the hospitality and friendliness of the Palauan people and Palau's unique natural environment would make up for any lacking amenities or inconveniences during their stay.

1.7.3 H.E. President Toribiong highlighted that the theme of the project "*Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management*" accurately reflects the challenges facing Palau and all other Pacific Island Nations. He noted that the meeting was very timely for Palau as only a few months previously the nation had suffered a severe water shortage, creating a need for strict control of water supply through implementation of water hours. He noted further that even though Palau has high rainfall and many rivers and streams, the management, conservation and delivery of water to those who need it is a major challenge facing Palau.

1.7.4 H.E. President Toribiong noted that the availability of freshwater is important to the quality of life and the economic development of every country. He urged all participants to take the meeting as a serious collective effort by Pacific Island Countries to address the important challenges of sustaining

water resources. He extended his personal welcome to the delegations from the Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Fiji Islands, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Tonga, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, and Papua New Guinea. He stated:

"... we are all Pacific Islanders, I like to think of us as brothers and sisters, or cousins who are here in this conference for the first time, so let's try to forge new friendships, and establish a network of friends from around the Pacific."

1.7.5 In closing, H.E. President Toribiong expressed his sincere thanks to the Global Environment Facility for their support to the important project. He was quoted as saying:

"I'm not an expert, but I know without water, no one can survive. Even when the scientists look for life on Mars, the first thing they look for is water. So may I say that without water there would be no life, and that water comes right below love and friendship. So if nothing else, share your friendship and your love while you are here in Palau. I thank you very much and welcome to Palau."

1.8 Group Photograph

1.8.1 Following the official opening of the meeting by Palau's President, participants gathered for a group photograph on the beach of the Sea Passion Hotel in Malakal. Photographs and video footage were taken of participants with the President of Palau. The final list of participants is included in Annex 1 of this report.

2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

2.1 Election of Officers (Chairperson; Vice-Chairperson; and Rapporteur)

2.1.1 Mr. Wilson reminded the Committee that, Mr. Suluimalo Amataga Penaia, IWRM Focal Point for Samoa and Mr. Otheniel Tangianau, IWRM Focal Point for the Cook Islands were elected Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Committee during its first meeting on 14th September 2009. He reminded the Committee further that, according to its Rules of Procedure, the Vice-Chairperson of the previous meeting would act as Chairperson for the current meeting. He noted with regret that due to his commitments as Acting Secretary for the Cook Islands' Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning, Mr. Tangianau was unable to attend the meeting and had nominated Mr. Keutekarakia Mataroa, to Chair the meeting in his place.

2.2.2 Regarding the election of a Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Wilson informed the meeting that Mr. Leerenson Airens, IWRM Focal Point for the Federated States of Micronesia had recommended that, since the Vice-Chairperson elected for the current meeting would Chair the next RSC Meeting, the Committee should elect a Vice-Chair from the country where the next meeting would be convened. The meeting agreed that this was a practical approach and that the election of the Vice-Chair would be deferred until the location for the next meeting was agreed.

2.2.3 Mr. Wilson noted that Mr. Christopher Paterson of the Project Coordinating Unit would take notes during the meeting, and that a Reporting Sub-Committee would be formed to review sections of the report prior to distribution to members for comment. Mr. Vinesh Kumar, Ms. Moriana Phillip, and Ms. Rossette Kalmet, the respective Project Managers for the national IWRM demonstration projects in Fiji Islands, the Republic of Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu, volunteered as members of the Reporting Sub-Committee for the meeting.

2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting

2.2.1 Mr. Wilson proceeded to introduce the discussion and information documents available to the meeting. Mr. Wilson reviewed document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.2 and briefly highlighted the key issues requiring discussion and decision by the Committee. The full list of documents made available to the meeting is contained in Annex 2 of this report.

2.3 Programme of Work and Arrangements for the Conduct of the Meeting

2.3.1 The Chairperson, Mr. Mataroa invited Mr. Wilson to brief participants on the administrative arrangements for the conduct of the meeting. Mr. Wilson outlined the proposed organisation of work as outlined in information document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.3 and dealt with a number of housekeeping items, including social events planned for the week. He highlighted that a recreation day had been planned for Saturday 24th July 2010 and that special rates had been negotiated with local tour operators should participants wish to travel to Palau's Rock Islands and Jellyfish Lake.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

3.1 The Chairperson, Mr. Mataroa introduced the Provisional Agenda prepared by the Regional Project Co-ordinating Unit (PCU) as document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/1 and the Annotated Provisional Agenda, document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/2. The Chairperson invited participants to propose any amendments or additional items for consideration, prior to the adoption of the agenda.

3.2 Dr. Ampai Harakunarak of UNEP's Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination suggested that emphasis should be placed on the regional components of the project during the meeting. The Chairperson responded by agreeing to ensure relevant regional issues are dealt with as and when they arise. The final agreed meeting agenda is included in Annex 3 of this report.

4. STATUS OF THE REGIONAL PACIFIC IWRM INITIATIVE

4.1 Status of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

4.1.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Wilson to present the report on the status of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project available to the meeting as discussion document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/4.

4.1.2 Mr. Wilson began by reviewing the objectives for the Second RSC meeting and for the benefit of new members and observers proceeded to outline the funding and legal arrangements for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project. He noted that the total value of the GEF grant to the project, including the PDF A and B phases, equals US\$10,723,452.

4.1.3 Mr. Wilson noted that the UNDP implemented component focusing on national IWRM demonstration projects had been allocated US\$6,055,891, whilst the UNEP implemented regional components focusing on development of a regional indicator framework, capacity building, and knowledge exchange had been allocated US\$2,127,755. He explained that the GEF paid fees to the GEF Implementing Agencies and SOPAC totalling US\$1,028,008 for their role in project management and oversight. This was broken down as follows: UNDP (US\$727,354), UNEP (US\$247,460), and SOPAC (US\$53,194).

4.1.4 Mr. Wilson reminded the Committee that the project was endorsed by the GEF Chief Executive Officer on 3rd December 2008, and that the UNDP Project Document and UNEP Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) were subsequently signed on 16th February 2009 and 16th May 2009, respectively. He noted further that the first tranches of project funds were received by SOPAC from UNDP and UNEP on 30th March 2009 and 6th July 2009, respectively. He noted that the Inception Workshop and First Regional Project Steering Committee were held in Nadi, Fiji from 14th-19th September 2009.

4.1.5 Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline the goals and objectives of the overall project and each of the project components and presented a Google Earth based video highlighting the locations and objectives of each of the national IWRM demonstration projects. In this connection, he reminded participants of the "*Communiqué of Concern*" issued by the First RSC Meeting regarding the ~US\$2 million dollar cut from the project budget following a reduction of the GEF allocation for this important project under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (PAS) at the time of project approval. He noted that the RSC's concern largely focused on the affects of this budget cut on the ability of the project to deliver much needed on-the-ground technical support for improved water management and sanitation, and to facilitate the effective exchange of information and examples of best practice between and amongst countries.

4.1.6 Mr. Wilson proceeded to review the UNDP administered GEF grant funds received by SOPAC and disbursed to the countries. He noted that in the short 9 month period since the Inception

Workshop, US\$1,043,786 had been disbursed to the countries for national IWRM demonstration project execution. He noted however that in-country progress and expenditure had been hindered largely as a result of delays in the turn around of cash advance requests by UNDP.

4.1.7 In this connection, Mr. Wilson reminded the Committee that it was agreed during the first meeting that, at the end of each quarter, National Project Managers would submit their acquittals and cash advance requests for the next quarter by the 8th day of the subsequent quarter. It was further agreed that these would be compiled by SOPAC and submitted to UNDP by the 15th day, and that funds would then be disbursed to SOPAC for disbursement to the countries by the 21st day.

4.1.8 He proceeded to review the timelines for the receipt of country financial reports, their compilation by SOPAC, and the disbursement of funds from UNDP to SOPAC, and ultimately to the countries. In the case of end of Quarter 3 2009, it was noted that all country acquittals were received by the 8th day after the end of quarter. SOPAC subsequently took less than a week to review, compile, and submit a quarterly FACE form to UNDP. He noted further that it then took UNDP three weeks to process the FACE form and that SOPAC received funds in the 6th week of the quarter for immediate disbursement to the countries.

4.1.9 In the case of Quarter 4 of 2009, Mr Wilson pointed out that there was a delay of several days in countries meeting their 8 day reporting deadline due to government offices closing down for Christmas holidays. He noted that it then took UNDP four weeks to process the FACE form submitted in the second week of January, the result being countries receiving their advance in the eighth week of the quarter despite immediate disbursement by SOPAC once received from UNDP.

4.1.10 In the case of Quarter 1 of 2010, Mr. Wilson pointed out that it took two weeks for countries to submit their reports and an additional two weeks for SOPAC to compile them for submission to UNDP. He explained that this was due to a last minute request from the UNDP Multi-Country Office in Fiji for each country project to develop detailed costed work plans for the second quarter, with listings of anticipated quarterly output(s)/outcome(s) and quarterly performance indicators against logframe activities and outcomes.

4.1.11 In the Quarter 1 2010 instance, and despite all countries meeting the request for detailed quarterly work plans within a week, Mr. Wilson pointed out that it then took UNDP five weeks to process the FACE form, resulting in a situation where countries received funding in the tenth week of the quarter. He noted that this problem was complicated by the introduction by the UNDP Multi-Country Office in Fiji of a rule to the effect that if a country did not spend 80 percent of an advance for a given quarter it would not be eligible for an advance in the subsequent quarter.

4.1.12 Mr. Wilson proceeded to express his opinion that continual delay in the processing of FACE forms and disbursement of funds by UNDP, combined with the newly introduced 80 percent rule, was crippling project progress and playing havoc with project delivery in country. He noted that this was particularly concerning at this early stage of the projects where stakeholder buy-in and support will largely depend on the ability of Project Management Units to deliver and meet community expectations.

4.1.13 Mr. Wilson pointed out that the Cook Islands, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, and Vanuatu had consistently missed the 8 day deadline for acquittals. He noted this was largely due to internal administrative issues, although he was confident action had been taken to ensure all countries met the 8 day deadline in future reporting periods. He then proceeded to review demonstration project expenditures against overall GEF grant funds for each project, and pointed out that whilst most projects were close to or above the 17 percent expenditure target identified at inception for end June 2010, several projects were lagging. He suggested that it may be a good idea for the RSC to establish expenditure targets that could be reviewed at each RSC meeting and to develop guidelines for the reallocation of funds should countries end up in a situation where they are unlikely to utilise the full GEF grant available to them.

4.1.14 Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline progress with respect to the UNEP implemented regional components of the project. He began by detailing the funds received and the UNEP disbursements by SOPAC to date, noting that the cumulative expenditure to end June 2010 was US\$556,564 and that the cash position of the UNEP components of the project was currently US\$98,835 in deficit.

4.1.15 Regarding “*Component 2: IWRM and WUE Regional Indicator Framework*” Mr. Wilson pointed out that a GEF and EU co-funded Adviser on Mainstreaming and Indicators had been appointed in December 2009. He noted that since the inception workshop all demonstration project logframes had been revised in accordance with results-based principles including use of SMART indicators. He explained that a draft regional monitoring and evaluation framework for IWRM in the Pacific, including indicator development, data analysis, and consultation with country representatives had been undertaken, and that options for a monitoring and evaluation framework was presented to the SOPAC STAR Session in Vanuatu in the final quarter of 2009.

4.1.16 Mr. Wilson noted further that the project had participated in a UNEP workshop in Nairobi which enabled consultation with colleagues from the Caribbean and Africa with respect to IWRM indicators and monitoring and evaluation framework development. This involved consideration of training options for ridge to reef water management. He explained that the project was also working on adapting the UNEP Fresh Water Vulnerability Index methodology to the Pacific region for atolls and island river systems. He suggested that a key task of the Regional Technical Advisory Group once developed, for the project, may be to review appropriateness of project indicators and to make recommendations to the RSC on regional and national IWRM indicators. He informed the RSC that, as “*Component 3: Policy, Legislative and Institutional Reform for IWRM and WUE*” was being 100 percent co-financed by the EU National IWRM Planning Programme, a status report would be presented by Ms. Rhonda Robinson under a separate agenda item.

4.1.17 Regarding “*Component 4: Regional and National Capacity Building and Sustainability Programme*” Mr. Wilson explained that a project website (<http://www.pacific-iwrn.org>) had been developed and was launched during the 5th GEF International Waters Conference convened in Cairns, Australia in October 2009. He noted that the website was subsequently voted as the most outstanding GEF International Waters Website during that conference. He noted that work is ongoing on compiling the resource base for SIDS IWRM (publications and reports for IWRM) as part of the IWRM Resource Centre, and that as a spin off from that, Niue and FSM had developed and launched IWRM websites.

4.1.18 Additionally the project had in October 2009 provided input to global guidelines for IWRM Planning in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), including the Pacific (October 2009). Mr. Wilson noted further that a reporting format to capture lessons learnt had been developed and deployed in the 13 demonstration projects, and that lessons learnt had been collected by country on a quarterly basis as part of routine progress reporting. These had been used to draft articles on IWRM focusing on case studies from the region for inclusion in the Pacific Partnership newsletter. He noted further that a strategy for capacity development for the implementation of IWRM in Pacific SIDS had been developed, and that a Post Graduate Certificate in IWRM would be delivered for project managers and focal points by the International Water Centre as part of this. He informed the meeting that the first course of this training programme would commence on 25th July 2010.

4.1.19 Following the conclusion of Mr. Wilson’s presentation, the Chairperson opened the floor for questions. Mr. Airens, IWRM Focal Point for the Federated States of Micronesia raised a query regarding the fees paid to UNDP and UNEP, and specifically asked how these funds which equate to almost US\$1 million are spent. Dr. Padilla responded by explaining that the GEF does its business through Implementing Agencies (e.g. UNDP, UNEP, World Bank) and Executing Agencies (e.g. Regional Development Banks, SOPAC). He explained further that the GEF reimburses Implementing Agencies for the costs of project oversight and evaluation. He noted that the fee has been revised over time, and for this project was 9 percent of the total project cost. He informed the RSC that the fee is split equally between UNDP/GEF in Washington, the UNDP/GEF office in Bangkok, Thailand and the UNDP Multi-Country Office in Fiji and is used to cover staffing and other costs.

4.1.20 Dr. Harakunarak of UNEP’s Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination explained further that it is the duty of the Implementing Agencies to help Executing Agencies implement projects. The RSC was informed by Dr. Harakunarak that in the case of UNEP the fee is used to cover staffing and travel costs to enable UNEP to help projects, and that the fee cannot be used in any way to fund project activities outlined in project logframes or work plans.

4.1.21 The Chairperson noted that the rotating country clinics conducted on Monday 19th July highlighted the need for accountability, not only within the Executing Agency (i.e. SOPAC) but within the Implementing Agencies also. In this connection, Mr. Suluimalo asked what if anything had been agreed with UNDP regarding actions required to reduce the lengthy delays in the disbursement of funds to the country projects.

4.1.22 Mrs. Asenaca Ravuvu, Team Leader – Environment of UNDP's Multi-Country Office in Fiji responded by firstly thanking Mr. Wilson for his comprehensive presentation. Mrs. Ravuvu noted that it was indeed agreed during the Inception Workshop and First Regional Project Steering Committee Meeting in September 2009 that UNDP would process FACE forms and disburse funds within one week of having received the form, but the reality was this has taken UNDP from 3-5 weeks over the past 3 reporting periods.

4.1.23 Mrs. Asenaca explained that UNDP has fiduciary responsibilities described in global United Nations rules that aim to provide for the good use and management of project funding at the country level. Mrs. Asenaca informed the RSC that one such global rule is known as "*The 80 Percent Rule*", which states that "*if at the end of a quarter a country has not acquitted 80% of its funds it will not qualify for a further advance*". Mrs. Asenaca noted that clarification regarding whether or not this global rule could be relaxed for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project had been sought from her Office in Fiji. It was noted further by Mrs. Asenaca that the extensive delays in disbursing Quarter 2 funds to the countries was due to difficulties in convincing the finance division to make the acquittal.

4.1.24 Ms. Deborah Barker-Manase, IWRM Focal Point and General Manager of the Republic of Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Agency, shared her experience that such delays in the disbursement of funds can have critical implications at the national level, particularly for projects involving intensive community consultations such as the Laura Water Lens IWRM project. Ms. Barker-Manase explained that in building relationships with communities it is important to deliver on agreed actions, and such uncertainty associated with the receipt of advances makes project planning and implementation extremely difficult. Ms. Barker-Manase expressed her view that disbursing quarterly advances to countries in the last month of a quarter and to expect countries to spend 80 percent of the advance at the last minute is completely unreasonable.

4.1.25 Mr. Russ Kun, IWRM Focal Point and Acting Secretary of Nauru's Department of Commerce, Industry and Resources informed the meeting that his understanding was that the Project Coordinating Unit at SOPAC was responsible for collating, reviewing, and synthesising the country financial reports for submission to UNDP as a single form. He noted that he simply could not understand how it could take UNDP so long to process this form and to send funds to SOPAC for disbursement to the countries. To assist with the resolution of this issue, the Chairperson requested that a copy of the United Nations "*80 Percent Rule*" be circulated to all members of the RSC by UNDP for their collective review by the end of that day.

4.1.26 Mr. Suluimalo noted that according to Mrs. Asenaca "*The 80 Percent Rule*" is a global United Nations rule, and that on the other hand all countries have their own national financial rules. He asked if it would be possible to explore integrating these global and national rules to reach a compromise that satisfies both systems. Mr. Suluimalo proceeded to express his understanding that the GEF demonstration projects were aimed at being country driven and not donor driven, and that the blanket rule introduced by UNDP is not consistent with this. He noted that the rule does not reflect the reality of the Pacific Island Countries where natural disasters such as tsunamis and cyclones can have sudden and lengthy impacts on the ability of governments to deliver projects.

4.1.27 Mr. Wilson noted that from a Project Manager's perspective, it would be foolish not to carry over at least 1/3 of a given quarters funds if the project consistently received funds a month late, or carry over 2/3, if your funds were coming 2 months late. He informed the meeting that he had had discussions with the UNDP representatives at the meeting and that he was confident they were working strenuously to find a workable solution to this problem.

4.2 Status of the EU IWRM National Planning Programme and Linkages with the GEF Project

4.2.1 The delivery of the status report of the EU IWRM National Planning Programme was deferred to the split session organised on 22 July 2010. The following is a record of that session as prepared by the EU IWRM National Planning Programme staff.

4.2.2 The Chairperson invited Ms. Rhonda Robinson to deliver a presentation on the Status of the EU IWRM Planning programme. Ms. Robinson began this presentation with an overview of the IWRM concepts and principles, the Pacific IWRM programme as a whole, and then a status report on the EU funded IWRM Planning Programme. The status report included progress against key result areas, an overview of programme expenditure and funds remaining, achievements for programme management and a broad statement of key activities for the remainder of the programme. A key point of note in the presentation was the underspending in the programme including utilisation of country allocations. The presentation is included in this report as Annex #.

4.2.3 During the latter part of the presentation on programme status, Mr. Oancea, the Representative from the Delegation of the European Union was invited to make a statement regarding the no-cost extension being sought by the programme. Mr Oancea advised the meeting that SOPAC were currently working on the documents required for the extension as advised by the EU, including a revised work plan and budget as well as an addendum to the original contribution agreement. He further advised that this process was nearing completion and the documents would be officially submitted to the EU for consideration for approval which would take place before the end of the year.

4.2.4 This concluded the presentation and questions were sought from the floor. Most of the discourse during this question time was surrounding the under expenditure of the programme, country allocations, the extension request, and what some saw as the merger of the EU-GEF IWRM programmes. Specifically, the IWRM Focal Points for Fiji and the Republic of Marshall Islands both requested that the country allocations and expenditure be provided in more detail rather than in summary, which was noted by the Planning Team and would be followed up on after the meeting with countries directly. The IWRM Focal Point for Fiji also stated that he would like the programme to include the involvement of countries in the extension process being carried out with the EU. Nauru reiterated that they would like to see some progress on their initial request for the development of a water policy framework through the Planning programme and questioned what they saw as growing merger between the EU and GEF IWRM programmes and sought some clarification on the latter.

4.2.5 Ms. Robinson assured countries that whilst working on the revised budgets to cater for the extension the funding allocations for the countries have not been reallocated to other areas and remaining funding allocations were still available to them. Ms. Robinson also reminded countries that this funding has been available since programme inception in 2008 and encouraged countries to act on utilising these funds as soon as possible given the remaining time available and the current under expenditures. Ms Robinson responded to the concerns raised by Fiji by stating that the programme would work to including countries more in the extension process through frequent communication and could consider other mechanisms if appropriate such as a sub committee to look at this specifically following the meeting. In response to Nauru, Ms Robinson assured them that the programme was aware of their request for assistance and that this would be actioned during and following the meeting.

4.2.6 Dr. James Dalton of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and former member of the Pacific IWRM Programme was invited to explain the issue of the GEF and EU IWRM programme merger. Dr. Dalton pointed out that the original Pacific IWRM Programme design was to harmonise on the ground integrated water management demonstration activities with policy support from the EU funded Planning Programme. He also added that at the IWRM Planning Inception Meeting convened in Niue in 2008, the country allocations were put on the table, and that some countries took advantage of this and made headway with recruiting staff, and/or used the funds for strategic consultancies to assist them with IWRM planning and strategic national water reform. He explained that some countries did not utilise these funds for various reasons, but this allocation has always been available. He noted that original presentations of this approach were made at the Pacific Partnership/2nd GEF Planning Meeting convened at Sonaisali, Fiji in April 2007.

4.2.7 Mr. Dave Hebblethwaite, the recently appointed IWRM Advisor to the IWRM Planning Programme, proceeded to present an overview of IWRM planning approaches. He noted the significant social capital that existed in the region, as demonstrated by the collaborative approach

taken by participants in the Palau workshop. He also acknowledged that sustainable water resources management had been applied for many hundreds of years in the region, as confirmed by the very existence of Pacific communities. He pointed out however, as in many countries around the world, the pressures of population growth, economic development and climate change call for new approaches to water management.

4.2.8 In this light, Mr. Hebblethwaite outlined the context of IWRM planning as a concept, including the environment in which it formed and the core principles that make up the foundation of the IWRM approach. He discussed the benefits of considering IWRM as a process with a suite of useful tools, rather than as an aspirational but ultimately unattainable destination. He proceeded to examine the practical implications of IWRM's stated objective of maximising economic, social and environmental outcomes, along with how IWRM approaches can ensure these issues are fully considered in water resource decision making. Mr. Hebblethwaite gave examples of IWRM planning components, including overarching goals, identification of priority issues, status and trends, and specific objectives and actions against each of these.

4.2.9 Particular attention was given to the seven components of the IWRM planning roadmap promoted by SOPAC, including:

- **Policy:** Providing guiding principles, direction to action, and commitment to sustainable management. Policies should be aspirational, while still cognisant of current capacities and constraints.
- **Awareness:** Enabling effective participation of all stakeholders, and engaging decision makers.
- **Consultation:** Allowing the identification of problems, strengths and weaknesses, key players and priority issues.
- **Institutions:** Providing a functional enabling environment, and the necessary capacity, resources, relationships and mandates.
- **Information:** Ensuring that the best understanding is achieved with the information available, and effective communication of this information.
- **Coordination:** Providing a mechanism for the management of the IWRM planning process appropriate to local circumstances.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Ensuring that progress is assessed and change effectively responded to.

4.2.10 Mr. Hebblethwaite stressed that while countries were not expected to fully realise all of these components at once, tangible progress against each will strengthen their capacity to progress meaningful IWRM planning. He highlighted that this is why EU IWRM Planning Programme is seeking to work with member countries to identify discrete and feasible activities that can be successfully completed during the life of the programme, and successfully built upon by countries' IWRM activities beyond the programme.

4.2.11 Following the completion of presentations, the group was divided into three smaller working groups that were facilitated by Mr. Hebblethwaite, Dr. Dalton and Ms. Subhashni Raj to answer two strategic questions:

1. *In your country, who are the key points of influence in water management, and*
2. *How can responsible Ministers become more effectively engaged in IWRM issues?*

4.2.12 For the first question, all 3 groups found that Political Leaders, Heads of Departments, Utilities, Media, Traditional leaders and community groups were the key persons of influence with group 3 identifying the private sector as well as the National Water Apex Body being influential in the decision making process. Group 1 also highlighted that it was a process where there were drivers for the decision making process. In the case of the traditional leaders where they may not in some cases have direct links to the political process but are outside this, they are still able to influence the decision making process. Group 2 also noted that whilst the political analysis revealed that the political leaders were the most influential set of people, the others on the list could be used as an entry point to influence the process.

4.2.13 The groups were also thinking along the same lines for question 2, with all three identifying the need for a high level regional action such as a Ministerial/Minister's forum (incorporated into the national planning process to make a ministerial deliverable). They also saw media, communication, consultations, and briefings for Minister Engagement as key entry points to more effectively engage their Ministers in IWRM issues. Group 1 put forward the unique idea of targeting Stakeholders and effectively relaying to them that they have ownership of IWRM issues. Group 2 highlighted how putting a dollar value on action vs inaction on IWRM (via Cost Benefit analysis and other economic tools) may be able to better engage Ministers to take action. Whilst group 3 presented practicality calling it "Ministers in the Real World", where the Ministers are taken to the demo sites and field trips to get them to better understand IWRM and the surrounding water issues.

4.2.14 This session was followed by country clinics designed to enable the open communication of specific country experiences in the development of IWRM policy and planning. The recent experiences of Samoa, Palau and FSM were shared in small group environments, allowing for free discussion of ideas and comparison of country programmes. Participants split into two groups and rotated between two 25 minute clinics exploring the following country experiences:

Clinic 1 - Samoa: Participants discussed Samoa's experience in the development of a water allocation policy, including the development of the enabling legislative and institutional settings. This is the first allocation policy to be developed in the Pacific, and its development will provide important lessons to the regulation of water exploitation across the region.

Clinic 2 - Palau and RMI: Participants discussed the recent experiences of Palau and RMI in generating a range of IWRM planning activities through the interrogation and adaption of their existing GEF logframes. This approach has allowed these countries to draft a clear program of activities to support the initiation of national water apex bodies and IWRM planning, culminating in national water summits proposed for World Water Day 2011.

4.2.15 The EU IWRM planning session was concluded with an exercise in practicing the "*elevator speech*". The participants undertook the exercise to prepare for the occasion if and when they met their minister what they would say to them to get them to progress IWRM planning in country.

4.3 Terms of Reference for a Regional Technical Advisory Group for Pacific IWRM

4.3.1 The Chairperson invited the Regional Project Manager to introduce this agenda item. Mr. Wilson proceeded to introduce document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/6 "*Draft Terms of Reference for a Regional Technical Advisory Group*". Mr. Wilson pointed out that to facilitate the achievement of the project's goals and objectives, it is a requirement of the Project Document that a Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project be established with responsibility for: overseeing the scientific and technical elements of the project; ensuring effective implementation of activities undertaken during project execution; and providing sound scientific and technical advice to the Regional Project Steering Committee (RSC).

4.3.2 Mr. Wilson outlined a set of proposed regional and national activities for the RTAG; it's proposed membership; and rules of procedures for the operation of the group. Dr. Padilla suggested and the meeting agreed that a representative of the GEF Implementing Agencies could be represented on the RTAG. It was also agreed that a Demonstration Project Manager would be represented on the advisory group.

4.3.3 The Committee was then invited by the Chairperson to nominate members for the RTAG. Ms. Kalmat nominated Dr. Ulukalesi Bale Tamata of the University of the South Pacific as the CROP Agency representative on the group. This was seconded by Mr. Kumar. Ms. Metiek Kimie Ngirchechol nominated Mr. Christopher Paterson of the Regional Project Coordinating Unit as a regional expert member. Mr. Peter Sinclair was also selected as a regional expert member. This was seconded by Mr. Colin Simmons. Ms. Barker-Manase nominated Mr. Airens as a Public Water Utility representative member for the Advisory Group, which was seconded by Ms. Ngirchechol. Ms. Ngirchechol expressed her hope that Mr. Airens could also act as the Northern Pacific representative on the RTAG.

4.3.4 Mr. Kun nominated Dr. Milika Sobey of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature as the Non-Governmental Organisation representative for the group, and this was seconded by Mr.

Vinesh. Mr. Pisi Seleganiu nominated Mr. Sam Semisi as the Demonstration Project Manager representative and this was seconded by Mr. Kun. Ms. Lynna Thomas nominated Mr. David Duncan as a Regional Expert and this was seconded by Mr. Seleganiu. Regarding the GEF Implementing Agency representative, it was agreed that Mr. Jinhua Zhang of UNEP's Division of Environmental Assessment and Early Warning would be approached regarding his interest and availability. The final agreed Terms of Reference for the RTAG are included in this report as Annex #.

4.4 Proposed Funding Rules for National IWRM Demonstration Projects

4.4.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Wilson to present discussion document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/6 "*Proposed Project Funding Rules for National IWRM Demonstration Projects*". Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline the progress of the country projects in reaching the 17 percent expenditure target identified at inception for end June 2010. He then presented a graphic comparing the project time elapsed so far against the amount of project time remaining, noting that 6 quarters had elapsed since project endorsement and that only 14 quarters remained. He pointed out to Project Managers that before they know they will be half way through the project, explaining that this will present significant difficulties for projects that are left with a large percentage of GEF grant funds unspent.

4.4.2 In this connection, Mr. Wilson suggested that the RSC may wish to give some consideration to the following questions: what should the Executing and Implementing Agencies do regarding Demonstration Projects that are performing poorly?; should RSC establish some expenditure benchmark ranges for RSC 3 and what actions should be considered if these are not met?; should project funds be reduced and reallocated?; and should project scope be reduced and funding reduced accordingly and reallocated?

4.4.3 Mr. Wilson proceeded to present the results of some simple modelling of the rate of expenditure needed for the timely delivery of demonstration project outputs and outcomes. He suggested some approximate expenditure targets of end Quarter 2 2010 (17 percent); end Quarter 2 2011 (55 percent); end Quarter 2 2012 (80 percent); and end Quarter 2 2013 (95 percent). He presented a graph comparing actual versus predicted expenditures to date and explained that spending in the project had been ahead of that planned at inception, but during the Quarter 2 2010 had taken a significant downward trend as a result of the lengthy delays on behalf of UNDP.

4.4.4 He then proceeded to introduce a proposed expenditure benchmark and funds withdrawal mechanism. He suggested that national projects which fall below agreed RSC established expenditure benchmarks should be required to justify their failure to the RSC. He also suggested that if they fall 25 percent below the target, 50 percent of the underspent funds and a further discretionary 25 percent should be resumed to the Reallocation Pool. He suggested that these rules could be tempered by allowing for the RSC to waive all or part of the discretionary 25 percent after hearing an explanation from a Project Manager.

4.4.5 For example, Mr. Wilson pointed out that if the above rules were to apply to the current meeting of the RSC, then Papua New Guinea, Nauru, the Cook Islands, Vanuatu, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Fiji Islands would collectively lose US\$185,331 to the reallocation pool. He noted that it would be unfair to do this at such an early stage of the project, but that it would be necessary for the Committee to think about this sooner rather than later if the project objectives are to be achieved in a timely manner.

4.4.6 He suggested that as a dry run, underspent countries should be requested to provide an explanation to the RSC. Mr. Wilson suggested that in the case of Papua New Guinea, Mr. Tony Kuman, IWRM Focal Point for Papua New Guinea, needed to be frank with the Committee about what was causing the serious delays with that project. Mr. Kuman explained that he was wearing three hats in his current role, and that the project really needed a dedicated and full time Project Manager capable of addressing project design issues and coordinating project implementation.

4.4.7 In the case of Nauru, Mr. Haseldon Buraman explained that the Nauru project had been establishing baselines as a means of planning project activities. He noted that he and his team were passionate about seeing the project done properly and that they had decided to do the upfront

planning work well, to ensure expenditure resulted in the planned results, rather than being pushed into spending money with the sole aim of meeting expenditure targets.

4.4.8 In the case of the Cook Islands, Mr. Paul Maote explained that due to the delays in project approval, both the European Union and NZ AID had developed and were implementing projects with activities which overlap those planned for the IWRM project. He noted that this required time to redesign the project during which time expenditures were minimal. He also noted that he had been working away from Rarotonga for several months to assist with cyclone recovery efforts on the outer islands in the first half of 2010, during which time zero progress was made on the IWRM project. He also explained that recent government restructuring had left him without an office which was hindering project delivery.

4.4.9 In the case of Vanuatu, Ms. Rossette Kalmet explained that the project had experienced several false starts prior to her appointment as Project Manager in late 2009 and subsequent relocation to Santo Island in February 2010. Ms. Kalmet informed the RSC that the first disbursement was only made available to her in March 2010, and that previously identified consultants were already engaged and unable to assist with important project start-up work.

4.4.10 In the case of the Federated States of Micronesia, Mr. Wendolin Roseo Marquez began by apologising to the RSC. He noted that the National Government financial system he operates within only enables him to use money if it is in the IWRM project account, meaning no activities can be completed if disbursement of funds to him are delayed for whatever reason. He noted that progress in 2010 was hindered significantly by such delays, and in second quarter he was left with 1 week to deliver his work plan for the entire quarter. Mr. Airens supported Mr. Marquez, and noted further that it would be unacceptable at this stage to criticise projects for underperformance given the erratic nature of cash disbursements to the countries. He suggested also that expenditures largely depend on project designs and the programming of activities.

4.4.11 In the case of the Fiji Islands, Mr. Colin Simmons noted that they had encountered significant difficulties in recruiting a Project Manager, and that this had only occurred in the weeks prior to the meeting. He noted the under-expenditure was largely in the project management component.

4.4.12 Dr. Padilla pointed out that Mr. Wilson's work in undertaking an assessment of this issue and proposing possible solutions was commendable. He expressed his view however, that there is a need to examine the real causes of the delays in the processing of FACE forms by UNDP and the subsequent advance of funds to the countries. Dr. Padilla expressed his understanding that limited capacity in the Pacific region is a very real problem, and that any discussion of reallocation of funds should take into account the ability of countries to turn reallocated funds into tangible on the ground results. He suggested that if countries were to be subjected to such rules then they would require sufficient warning, and that they may need quarterly updates of their expenditure positions to be communicated to them by the Project Coordinating Unit.

4.4.13 Dr. Padilla pointed out that differing project designs would likely mean differing expenditure patterns and that some projects may indeed have exponential expenditure curves. He asked rhetorically how UNDP and GEF may deal with such delays. He noted that one option may be to request an extension, although this would likely be difficult due to pressure to finish the project on time. In this connection, Dr. Harakunarak informed the meeting that the GEF Secretariat had recently released operational guidance that second milestone extension requests for projects will not be accepted, meaning the GEF Secretariat will only consider one milestone extension request per country.

4.4.14 Mr. Wilson responded by expressing his view that there is not a lack of capacity in the Pacific, but that this is a constant excuse repeatedly rolled out to justify non-performance. He stated that he is not ignoring the difficulties of doing business in the Pacific, including natural hazards, but the project should be careful about using these difficulties as an excuse for not doing our collective best to manage projects properly and to resolve bottlenecks in the countries and Implementing Agencies.

4.4.15 Mr. Airens noted that the Committee still had not received any clarification from UNDP regarding what was causing the extensive delays in the disbursement of funds to the country projects.

Mrs. Asenaca reminded the RSC that the 80 percent rule is something we have to live with, and pointed out that as soon as UNDP receives a FACE form they can process it on the same day and have funds disbursed the next day. The delays were due to the expenditure not meeting 80 percent and the need for extensive discussions and negotiations with the finance section regarding the release of funds. Mrs. Asenaca informed the meeting that they were waiting for confirmation from the UNDP's Resident Representative in Fiji regarding whether this rule can be relaxed for the GEF Pacific IWRM project. In this connection, Ms. Ngirchechol queried if funds could be advanced on a 6 month basis with quarterly report. Mrs. Asenaca said this would not be possible.

4.4.16 Ms. Barker-Manase suggested that as the RSC had considered bottlenecks and delivery problems in the countries, it may also be useful for the Committee to look closely at bottlenecks in the Implementing Agencies. Ms. Barker-Manase urged Project Managers to maintain a log of communications, particularly relating to submission of quarterly reports and any subsequent communications received. Mr. Airens agreed and noted that whilst he was not a Project Manager, he had been involved in IWRM project development from the outset and was somewhat perplexed that he had just at this meeting learnt of the 80 percent rule and its implications for country projects.

4.4.17 On the final day of the meeting, Dr. Padilla noted he was pleased to be able to inform the meeting that the UNDP Multi-Country Office had heard the concern of the countries with respect to the 80 percent rule and had issued the following recommendation:

Recommendation:

1) Advance is issued based on approved quarterly work plans and **MUST** be reported and acquitted by the end of each quarter;

(2) Where the project acquittal represents 60% of the project advance issued; the remaining carry-over of funds are to be acquitted within the following criteria's:

a) 20% acquitted within 45 days from the reporting end date of the quarter for which advance relates to;

b) Remaining 20% balance acquitted prior to the end of next quarter.

5. STATUS OF NATIONAL IWRM DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

5.1 Country Presentations

5.1 The Chairperson invited the National Project Managers to deliver country presentations on a key highlight of their national projects. These presentations and summary reports of demonstration project status, including opportunities for information sharing and exchange identified during discussion are available on the GEF Pacific IWRM Project website <<http://www.pacific-iwr.org>>.

5.2 Demonstration Project Work Planning and Budgeting

5.2.1 IWRM Demonstration Project Managers and Focal Points were reminded of quarterly financial and progress reporting requirements during the rotating country clinics conducted on 19th July 2010. Participants then partook in an evening sessions facilitated by Regional Project Coordinating Unit members to finalise work plans and budgets for the next 18 months of project implementation.

5.3 Scientific and Technical Support Needs

5.3.1 Mr. Duncan presented an assessment of the technical components of the National IWRM Demonstration Projects as outlined in discussion document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/6 "*IWRM Demonstration Project Technical Support Needs*". The review focused on the mechanisms for delivering and ensuring the quality of work undertaken in the technical components of the projects. It also highlighted the breadth of technical expertise required to deliver each project and the need for country PMUs to consider all options available to deliver technical components. It highlighted further that there are significant similarities between demonstration projects and the synergies that may be delivered by better information exchange between country PMUs. Mr. Duncan then led Project Managers in an exercise that highlighted the limited information exchanges currently existing between projects.

5.3.2 Mr. Duncan presented options for delivery of project technical components and quality assurance. As an example of these options, Mr Haseldon Buraman presented on the student placements recently completed in Nauru and the strong positive contribution that these students made to progressing the technical components of the Nauru demonstration project. The value of the virtual network amongst project staff, CROP Agencies, and other organisations currently under development by the PCU was highlighted by Dr. Padilla. Dr. Duncan then led Project Managers through group discussions of technical delivery and quality control options. These discussions were undertaken in project sub-groups reflecting similar demonstration project types.

Table 1 Proposed Delivery and Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Technical Delivery

<p>Watershed Management FSM, Palau, PNG, Samoa and Vanuatu</p>	<p>Delivery Mechanisms Government Agencies Technical Assistance Educational Institutions PCU out of country support Local consultants Quality Assurance PCU support RTAG Project technical committees National technical committees Independent consultants</p>
<p>Wastewater Management & Sanitation RMI, Nauru and Tuvalu</p>	<p>Delivery Mechanisms Exchange of data across country projects HYCOS PCU Public Works Departments Technical Assistance Quality Assurance Consultants</p>
<p>Water Resources Assessment & Protection Cook Islands and Fiji</p>	<p>Delivery Mechanisms NGOs Government Agencies Universities Quality Assurance Due diligence (before engagement) Information sharing (national/ regional) External Audit Constant monitoring (against project objectives/ standard)</p>
<p>Water Use Efficiency & Water Safety Solomons Islands and Tonga</p>	<p>Delivery Mechanisms Government Agency NGOs – particularly awareness and communication Resource owners Local consultants International consultants Graduate / research students Quality Assurance CROP Agency review Intergovernment reviews RTAG review</p>

5.4 Mobilising Communities for Natural Resource Management

5.4.1 The session was introduced by Ms. Ruth Urben of the Regional Project Coordinating Unit, linking it to two of the themes of the country presentations from the previous day: Partnerships and Community Engagement. A further link was made to the future and the nature of the community engagement that demonstration projects might be reporting by year 4. Ms. Urben proceeded to inform the meeting that representatives of national and regional offices of non-government organisations had

been invited to present short case studies on their approach to working with Pacific Communities for sustainable natural resources management.

5.4.2 Ms. Umai Basilius, Director of Policy and Planning, Palau Conservation Society (PCS), outlined the PCS guiding principles as: community consensus, collaborations and partnerships, capacity building, clear roles and responsibilities, transparency and accountability. Ms. Basilius used the Babeldoab Watershed Alliance (BWA) as a case study, with community action planning directed at improving water quality and reducing sediment load in the rivers and coastal areas. Responding to a question from Mr. Bruce Missingham of the International Water Centre (Monash University, Australia), Ms. Basilius emphasised that community consultations included representatives from all communities in the catchment and all sectors.

5.4.3 Mr. Patterson Shed, Director of the Conservation Society of Pohnpei, was invited to deliver a presentation. Mr. Shed explained that the mission of the Conservation Society of Pohnpei (CSP) is *“to preserve and enhance the natural heritage of Pohnpei State by promoting community-led resource management and compatible economic development”*. His presentation entitled *“The Miracle of Partnership”* illustrated brief case studies of: community managed marine protected areas and catchment management; and the complementarity and synergy of government, NGOS and the community working together for sustainable and replicable local level interventions. He highlighted that the support of traditional authorities is an absolute requirement.

5.4.4 Mr. Milner Okney, Education and Awareness Specialist of the Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS), gave a brief overview of the RMI water resources and the main issues. He outlined the MICS strategy of working with communities, and the use of local co-ordinators on each atoll, who are trained as community mobilisers and as data collectors for partner scientific institutes. He highlighted that through MICS, communities are mobilised to develop local conservation plans within the RMI National Bio-diversity Action Plan, and to develop ordinances in support of the local plans.

5.5.5 Dr. Sobey of the Oceania Office of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) spoke about the community focused catchment-management work in Kandavu, Fiji, and the key contributors to its effectiveness. In common with preceding speakers, Dr. Sobey outlined the need for participatory situation analysis by the community leading to action plans with outputs/outcomes identified by the community to meet their needs. It was explained that these should also include recognition and use of the communities' own knowledge, the need to secure or enhance livelihoods, and capacity development of the local youth and the community managing and monitoring its own plan. Dr. Sobey concluded by stating that without support and co-operation of government agencies, the impact of IUCN would be severely reduced. It was also clarified that IUCN works across the Pacific Region and can support any member country.

5.5.6 Dr. Urben closed the session by expressing her sincere thanks expressed to all agencies for their very relevant and practical inputs and encouragement to Project Managers to contact the NGOs for specific guidance or advice on tools and techniques for community mobilisation, analysis and planning.

6. PACIFIC HYDROLOGICAL CYCLE OBSERVING SYSTEM PROJECT AND NATIONAL IWRM DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: ACHIEVEMENTS, LESSONS, AND FOLLOW-UP

6.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Llyod Smith, Project Coordinator and Mr. Peter Sinclair, Project Advisor for the EU funded Pacific Hydrological Cycle Observing System (HYCOS) Project to provide a summary of project achievements, lessons, and follow up. It was noted in opening that the Pacific HYCOS project is focussed on improving water resource assessment and monitoring to provide the basis for more informed decision making on water resource management and planning issues.

6.2 It was noted that the project commenced in July 2006 and would be completed in December 2010. The project, originally designed for 5 years, was modified to fit into a 3 year project cycle. A 1 year no cost extension was approved in July 2008 to assist with final implementation and the consolidation phase of the project. The project is funded under the EU Water Facility with a total budget of €2.524 million euros and an additional €1 million euros in SOPAC co-financing projects.

6.3 The RSC was informed that the Pacific HYCOS project had entered its final six months with a focus on completing outstanding activities and its consolidation. It was highlighted that securing funding sources for continued support to Pacific Island Countries (PICs) post December 2010 will also be a focus in the remaining time.

6.4 The background to the project and project design was presented followed by the financials for the project from commencement to 30th June 2010. As at 30th June 2010, 2.4 million of the 2.5 million euros available for the project had been spent. It was noted that an estimated €100,000 euros was available for the final six months of the project although had largely been committed. A detailed breakdown on a country by country basis of expenditure was provided.

6.5 Major achievements over the project life were presented and included examples of the equipment and technologies installed in each country as well as the capacity building modes engaged during implementation. Major legacies of the project identified included the regional hydrometric database, catalogue of Pacific HYCOS surface water catchments, and the Pacific HYCOS website with supporting manuals and operating procedures.

6.6 Impediments and challenges to implementation, with lessons learnt were identified. The HYCOS PMU has recommended an ongoing need for continued regional based support to PIC's in hydrology. There remains a need for consistent reliable and long-term data on countries water resources required for water resource development, infrastructure design, planning and climate change. It was noted that the HYCOS model presented a regional solution to a multi-national problem providing a cost effective approach to ongoing, technical support needs in PICs.

6.7 A model for a follow up to HYCOS was proposed along with options and expected costs. The preferred model identified involves a core of 4 staff, a surface water hydrologist, hydrogeologist, and 2 junior water technicians and was presented with estimated annual staff and operational cost of \$840,000FJD. The core water resource assessment and monitoring team would be able to continue to advance data collection, analysis and reporting in the region to PICs. It was identified that the team could also expand and contract around this critical mass to accommodate the specific resourcing requirements, as project needs and funds demanded and allowed.

6.8 The presentation was concluded with two case studies which identified HYCOS activities which with hydrological data and its subsequent analysis was used by countries to assist in making informed decisions related to water resources.

6.9 Ms. Ngirchchol thanked the Pacific HYCOS team for their support to Palau over recent years, which contributed significantly to advancing understanding of water systems and building national capacity for hydrological data collection. Ms. Ngirchchol noted that this support included the set-up of hydrological monitoring equipment at 2 additional sites, and requested if a breakdown of the total HYCOS investment in Palau could be provided. It was explained that this type of information is often useful in communicating with politicians. Ms. Ngirchchol queried how the remaining project funds would be spent. Mr. Sinclair noted that much of the remaining funds had been committed and may be used for some minor equipment replacements or repair if required.

6.10 Ms. Barker-Manase also thanked the Pacific HYCOS team for their excellent support to the Republic of Marshall Islands, where the data generated through the project on the Laura water lens is highly valued. Ms. Barker-Manase asked if communications activities would be part of the proposed follow-up actions as there is a real need to work on the integration of science and data into policy development and decision making. Mr. Sinclair explained that the project had worked hard through the development of the Pacific HYCOS web portal (<http://www.pacific-hycos.org>) to make all data available to decision makers in a centralised, easily accessible online location. He noted that they had also worked with Mr. Tiy Chung to provide information to the community on El Nino and the need to be prepared for water shortages.

6.11 Mr. Suluimalo noted that hydrology is not wet or bad weather friendly. He sought Mr. Smith's opinion on whether a wet weather allowance would improve the willingness of staff to make field visits during storm and flood events. Mr. Smith explained that such allowances are paid in many places and would certainly assist in easing the burden on staff responsible for running off to weather stations to collect data during early hours of the morning etc. In this connection, Mr. Smith recommended the

need for National Hydrological Services to recruit and foster young and enthusiastic hydrologists were possible.

6.12. Mr. Mala Finau sought clarification from Mr. Smith regarding the quality of Fiji's hydrological data set. Mr. Smith commented that whilst tens of millions of dollars had been spent on data collection in Fiji, there were still many holes in the data sets, and recommended that this could be improved via the installation of highland gauges and the repair or replacement of damaged gauges.

7. ENHANCING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN IWRM IN PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES

7.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Urben to facilitate a session in which the Committee was asked to deliberate on the outcome of Agenda Item 5.4 "*Mobilising Communities for Natural Resource Management*"; and to outline the type of actions that they plan to facilitate through the GEF Pacific IWRM Project, to achieve their project vision (or intent) for community engagement. Members were further invited to identify the outcomes or indicators that they regard as appropriate for showing progress in community engagement. It was explained by Dr. Urben that these indicators could be used as the basis for a community engagement reporting framework. Participants proceeded to work in thematic groups to identify indicators and there followed a *tour de table* in which results of the exercise were reported. Dr. Urben compiled these to produce a simple community engagement report card which is included in this report as Annex #.

7.2 Dr Urben proceeded to elicit views and ideas from the Committee on a possible regional level project to support and resource community-based micro-projects under the IWRM and climate change adaptation umbrella. Preliminary ideas of the regional Project Coordinating Unit for such a project were summarised in document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/10 "*Developing a Pacific Regional Project for Community-led Water Resources Management*".

7.3 It was noted that Samoa expects to be able to apply to the UNDP administered GEF Small Grants Programme and other countries (e.g. FSM and Nauru) have this in mind as an option. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands it was identified that a main constraint for such community-action focused projects is the scarcity of human resources available to service them. It was discussed that even where other fund sources do exist, these are limited and may not be exclusively water-focused, and so must be competed for against other sectors and users. Similarly the application process may be time consuming, and the outcome is piecemeal rather than programmatic. It was pointed out by Dr. Urben that the regional PCU is considering drafting a proposal for a regional project to support community level and community-led climate change adaptive water resource management micro-projects. It was noted by Mr. Wilson that the intention was that this would likely be done in the context of a GEF Medium Sized Project.

7.4 It was noted by Dr. Padilla that the country allocations under the GEF Resource Allocation Frameworks would limit the overall funds available for such a project and the amount of money that could be sought in a single grant application. It was agreed that Dr. Padilla would provide information to the Project Coordinating Unit regarding these arrangements and the country allocations. Dr. Harakunarak noted that the maximum grant for Medium Sized Projects continued to be capped at US\$1 million.

8. ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL INDICATOR FRAMEWORK FOR IWRM AND WATER USE EFFICIENCY IN THE SMALL ISLAND STATES OF THE PACIFIC

8.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Duncan to present document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/11 entitled "*Establishing a Regional Indicator Framework for IWRM and Water Use Efficiency in the Small Island States of the Pacific*".

8.2 Mr. Duncan proceeded to remind the meeting that the need for a regional participatory Monitoring and Evaluation framework was highlighted at the September 2009 Project Inception Meeting. He noted that since that time, opportunities have arisen to link this framework with other regional initiatives, including the Asian Development Bank's Asian Water Development Outlook (AWDO), the UNEP Pacific Water Vulnerability Assessment (PWVECA), and the UNEP/SPREP Pacific Environment and Climate Change Outlook. He explained that all three of these initiatives are

seeking to establish regional indicators for water management and that the overlaps between these projects and programmes and the regional monitoring programme required for the GEF IWRM project provide significant opportunity to bring these programmes together. He explained that accordingly, the PCU has been coordinating with these projects to ensure that the GEF IWRM monitoring and evaluation framework aligns with the frameworks adopted for these projects. In this way it is hoped to synergise future monitoring to maximise the value of monitoring data collection.

8.3 Mr. Duncan advised the RSC that ideally, the regional indicator framework would provide key information to Pacific and Global decision makers regarding water resource management in the Pacific. He suggested that additionally, the framework should link to other regional reporting requirements, including the Millennium Development Goals, and that by linking these processes, data collection and collation can be streamlined and resources efficiently directed at the most appropriate monitoring and evaluation processes. He then proceeded to outline the principles for the development of a participatory Monitoring and Evaluation framework and the proposed indicator types outlined in the Project Document.

8.4 In terms of bringing regional indicator frameworks together, Mr. Duncan explained that the AWDO, UNEP Pacific Water Vulnerability Assessment and the PECCO are all high-level assessments of water indicators, consistent with the outputs that are likely to be required of the GEF IWRM regional framework. He noted that all three reports are targeted to a key audience of decision-makers, both regionally and globally. He noted further that all three are constructed of numeric indicators and composite indices, and try to bring together a range of stress, status and response indicators.

8.5 Mr. Duncan noted that there are strong synergies between the frameworks, with MDGs for improved water supply and sanitation featuring in all frameworks. He highlighted the similarities between the PWVECA and the AWDO extend to the inclusion of indicators for productivity and ecosystem health/stress. He informed the RSC that the AWDO approach focuses on available numeric data, so uses proxy indicators for management through distance resilience, whereas the PWVECA uses an expert assessment of the management status, with consensus, and the PECCO framework for water assessment is currently under development. He noted that all frameworks composite together lower-level indicators (or sub-indicators) to produce high level indices.

8.6 Mr. Duncan pointed out that the key challenge presented by the AWDO and PWVECA are that they consider high level indicators, most of which are unlikely to provide significant evidence of change over periods of say 10 years, and extremely unlikely to show significant change over 2 to 5 years for most countries. These include indicators such as climatic indicators [e.g. rainfall totals and variation], high-level demographics [e.g. population] and broad scale land use [e.g. country or island scale vegetation cover]. He suggested that development of the the GEF IWRM indicators framework must be done in the context of these as it will contribute to the sustainability of any system established.

8.7 Mr. Duncan suggested a way forward for consideration by the Regional Technical Advisory Group. It was agreed that this would be considered by the RTAG and reported back to the RSC the following day.

9. TRACKING CO-FINANCING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND MAINSTREAMING IWRM IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

9.1 Mr. Paterson presented document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/12 entitled "*Co-financing of Project Activities*". He explained that co-financing is a key principle underlying GEF efforts to have a significant positive impact on the global environment, and informed participants that GEF grants are intended to be "incremental", i.e., adding value in terms of global environmental benefits to national/local investment in environmental projects. He noted that co-finance for GEF projects is important because:

- a) Co-financing expands the *resources* available to finance environmental objectives;
- b) Co-financing is an important indicator of the strength of the *commitment* of the counterparts, beneficiaries, and Implementing and Executing Agencies to those projects; and

- c) Co-financing helps ensure the *success* and local acceptance of those projects by linking them to development planning, and thereby maximises and sustains their *impacts*.

9.2 Mr. Paterson pointed out that it is a requirement of the GEF that co-financing be reported and monitored by source, by type, and by the stage of the Project Cycle. He pointed out that the Project Implementing Agencies and Executing Agency are required to inform the GEF Secretariat whenever there is a potentially substantive co-financing change (i.e., one affecting the project objectives, scale, scope, strategic priority, conformity with GEF criteria, likelihood or project success, or outcome of the project). As such, he explained it is important for projects to develop a user-friendly system for tracking and reporting on co-financing.

9.3 A proposed system for the monitoring and tracking of co-financing, and an overview of the use of the information gathered as part of mainstreaming IWRM in Pacific Island Countries was discussed amongst participants and is included in this report as Annex #.

10. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR IWRM

10.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Wilson to introduce document SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/13 entitled "*Capacity Development for IWRM*". Mr. Wilson began by reminding the Committee that Component 4 of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project document has the objective of IWRM and WUE capacity development, and establishing global SIDS learning and knowledge exchange approaches. He noted that this is to be achieved through three outputs:

- 4.1 *National and regional skills upgraded in project management and monitoring including water champions and APEX bodies for both men and women*
- 4.2 *Active twinning programmes in place between countries facing similar water and environmental degradation problems*
- 4.3 *Effective knowledge management networking and information sharing inter and intra-regional.*

10.2 Mr. Wilson reminded the Committee further that a rapid appraisal of immediate training and capacity building needs in support of National Demonstration Projects was undertaken during RSC 1, during which the Committee was invited to identify the top three immediate priorities. The aggregated outcome was that Technical Development in Water Resources was of highest priority followed by project management, and accounting and reporting. He explained that in looking at PICs future needs the RSC identified development needs focused on community, institutional, and committee capacity development. He noted that the PCU undertook to use these priorities along with, the project design and other regional capacity needs assessments to inform it in developing the training and development initiatives for the project.

10.3 Mr. Wilson explained that In order to develop a more systematic professional competency and knowledge network around IWRM in each PIC it had been decided that the Pacific IWRM Initiative would sponsor the design, development and delivery of an accredited Pacific Post Graduate Certificate in Integrated Water Resources Management within an appropriately located and accredited higher educational institution with demonstrable experience in delivering accredited Postgraduate IWRM Courses.

10.4 He informed the RSC that the International Water Centre (IWC) had been selected to provide this training, and that the target group for this programme would be current National IWRM Focal Points, Pacific IWRM Demonstration and Planning Project Staff, IWRM relevant government officials, civil society including both business and community representatives involved in water resource management. He noted that the attractiveness of this programme was that it also provided entry qualification for a nested Masters in Integrated Water Resources Management, i.e., a seamless progression to a Graduate Diploma and Masters.

10.5 Mr. Wilson explained that the first week of this training would be convened in Palau immediately following the meeting. He noted that Dr. Bruce Missingham of IWC was present in the meeting. Mr. Missingham provided a brief presentation on the post graduate training programme on IWRM offered by IWC.

11. INCORPORATING CLIMATE VARIABILITY AND CHANGE INTO IWRM

11.1 The Chairperson invited Dr. Padilla to deliver a presentation on incorporating climate variability and Change into IWRM. Dr Padilla opened by stating that he was impressed by the progress of the project to date, leading a round of applause. He highlighted the key aspects of his presentation as identifying the effects of climate change on IWRM in the Pacific island countries and adaptation mechanisms and options to take adaptation forward in the Pacific. He noted that the effects on Pacific island states of sea level and temperature rise, more intense rainfall, changed river flows and lake levels and higher surface water temperatures were likely to be significant.

11.2 Dr. Padilla made the distinction between mitigation (avoiding the unmanageable) and adaptation (managing the unavoidable). Participants were then led by Dr. Padilla in an exercise to assess country climate change impacts in their countries and associated adaptation measures. In the climate change exercise, country members identified climate change challenges including droughts, reduced agricultural productivity, increased natural disasters, seawater intrusion of coastal aquifers, increased erosion, deforestation, reduced water supply security, increased sedimentation, species decline, coastal inundation, salinisation and pollution risks to groundwater.

11.3 Dr. Padilla summarised the core adaptation strategies to be planning strategies considering climate change pressures and adaptation strategies; raising awareness at a country and local level through education to increase anticipation and preparedness and mainstreaming climate change adaptation into national policy and legislation. Notably, whilst many countries identified infrastructure responses to climate change as a key strategy, these countries also identified financial constraints on implementing these strategies.

11.4 Other adaptation strategies identified in the exercise included reforestation; technical and scientific studies to identify adaptation strategies; water safety plans; improving farming practices; flood early warning systems; development of best management practices; modifying sanitation practices; conjunctive water uses and financial assistance.

11.5 Dr Padilla outlined the available adaptation funds from UNDP for climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the associated GEF funding windows. The funds identified were the GEF Trust Fund (STAR Allocations); International Waters Focal Area; the Least-Developed Countries Fund (LDCF); the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and the Adaptation fund. The first three of these are identified as the GEF-5 sources.

11.6 The Adaptation fund was described as separate from the other funds as international organisations and countries are able to access this fund directly, depending on capacity and accreditation. Dr Padilla offered to link Nauru with the relevant UNDP office to look at accessing this fund.

11.7 Indicative STAR allocations for each of the countries were presented. Dr Padilla pointed out that only climate change, biodiversity and land degradation areas attract funds under the STAR allocations. Table 1 was presented, identifying the STAR allocations available to each country.

Table 1 – STAR Allocations

Country	Climate Change	Biodiversity	Land Degradation	Total
Cook Islands	2.00	2.14	0.50	4.64
FSM	2.00	3.49	0.90	6.39
Fiji	2.00	4.56	0.59	7.15
Kiribati	2.00	1.69	0.56	4.25
Marshall Is.	2.00	2.02	0.50	4.52
Nauru	2.00	1.50	0.50	4.00
Niue	2.00	1.50	1.05	4.55
Palau	2.00	1.92	0.50	4.42
PNG	2.00	13.32	1.17	16.49
Samoa	2.00	2.43	0.93	5.36
Solomon Is.	2.00	3.60	0.65	6.25
Tonga	2.00	1.59	0.75	4.34
Tuvalu	2.00	1.50	0.59	4.09

Vanuatu	2.00	2.55	0.89	5.44
---------	------	------	------	------

11.8 Dr Padilla explained that each country can expect a minimum allocation of \$4 million USD. If the total allocation for a country is less than \$7 million USD, it is possible to access this through just one proposal (climate change, biodiversity or land degradation), or at the discretion of the country, a multi-focal proposal can be submitted. Notably, it will be more difficult to access the funds through a multi-focal process. It was highlighted that Papua New Guinea and Fiji, with allocations over \$7 million USD, cannot access all their funds through just one proposal focus, but must either submit a single multi-focus project or multiple projects to access all of the funds allocated.

11.9 Dr Padilla clarified that the International Waters Programme (IWP) differs from the STAR allocations as the funds accessed for climate change adaptation through IWP are managed as a global fund, without specific country allocations. Each IWP proposal is considered on its merits. Dr Padilla offered to work with country representatives to facilitate UNDP-country partnerships to access the IWP funds. He offered to help countries link with other UNDP contacts to access funds through STAR allocations.

11.10 It was explained by Dr Padilla that climate change proposals are assessed against the reduction of greenhouse gasses, biodiversity index proposals against protection of existing biodiversity (hence high allocation to PNG) and land degradation criteria are focussed on remediation. Following Samoa's statement of intent to provide one single proposal linking these individual areas, Dr Padilla offered to seek clarification on submission of a multifocal project for projects under \$7M.

11.11 In providing guidance to eligible countries for the LDCF (Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu), Dr Padilla highlighted the need for countries to submit completed National Action Plans for Adaptation (NAPAs) and for the proposal to be consistent with them. He stated that funds available under the LDCF are about \$6 million USD per country and urged countries with existing projects to consider options to access outstanding funding available to them.

11.12 Dr Padilla informed the RSC that the SCCF is primarily intended for countries not eligible for the LDCF. However, he also mentioned that some projects have been approved projects for countries eligible for LDCF funding, but noted that the funding available is significantly less than that available under the LDCF.

11.13 The Adaptation Fund was referred to briefly by Dr Padilla, but does not have as much money as expected. He indicated that currently the funds available for this fund are about \$90M and encouraged countries to speak to him about accessing this funding. Dr Padilla reminded country representatives that each country has a GEF Focal Point. He urged them to approach their GEF Focal Point as soon as possible into project planning as competition for proposals was normally strong, and offered to provide contact details to country representatives.

11.14 The UNDP GoAL-WaSH Programme was briefly outlined by Dr Padilla, with its focus on sanitation and hygiene interventions. He identified the priority placed by UNDP on countries struggling achieving MDGs.

12. DEVELOPING AN INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY FOR THE PACIFIC IWRM PROGRAMME

12.1 The Chairperson invited Mr. Wilson to introduce this agenda item. He proceeded to inform the RSC of initiatives implemented by the PCU since inception to facilitate improved internal communications between and amongst project managers, focal points, and PCU staff. In this connection, he explained that each country had been assigned PCU focal persons: Mr. Paterson was overseeing demonstration projects in Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands; Mr. Duncan for the Cook Islands, Tonga, and Tuvalu; Dr. Urben for Nauru, Niue, and Samoa; and himself for Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu. He explained that the whole PCU was providing support to the Fiji demonstration project.

12.2 Firstly he noted that the PCU had found Skype to be a useful tool for maintaining regular contact with project managers. He pointed out that the Skype contact details for PCU members were

available on the homepage of the project website at <http://www.pacific-iwrm.org>. He suggested that there was a tendency for project managers to remain quiet when facing difficulties with their projects as they feel this reflects on their ability. He encouraged project managers to maintain regular informal communications using tools such as Skype or Gmail chat so that the PCU can best help with any implementation issues or concerns as soon as they arise.

12.3 There was a *tour de table* in which participants were asked if they had used Skype or not. Mr. Kun, Mr. Kuman, Mr. Paul Maote, and Ms. Kalmet indicated that they had not used Skype. It was agreed that efforts would be made to sign these participants up on Skype, and Mr. Wilson urged members to maintain regular contact with their PCU focal persons. He noted that the IWRM post graduate course organisers from the International Water Centre would also likely be relying on Skype and similar tools in support of training course delivery.

12.4 As an aside, Mr. Wilson noted that Skype often has promotions, such as a current one which enables users to call landlines for free anywhere in the world. Mr. Finau asked what where the benefits of Skype over e-mail, pointing out that e-mail works well so why introduce a new tool. Mr. Wilson responded by noting that Skype provides instantaneous discussion, enabling the fast resolution of issues and that as the PCU was serving the demonstration projects this is important. He noted that 8 person voice conferences and video can also be supported depending on bandwidth. Mr. Paterson pointed out that some government departments block Skype and webmail clients, and it was agreed project managers should seek special approval for access to these programs should they face this problem. Alternative options proposed include use of Internet cafes or organisation of a dedicated Internet line, the costs of which could be claimed against the project.

12.5 Problems with the SOPAC e-mail server were also identified. Several participants noted difficulties in getting e-mails through to SOPAC staff, and it was noted that the SOPAC e-mail blocks e-mails above the size of 2MB or those with "*.zip" files attached. Mr. Wilson pointed out that sometimes Microsoft Outlook asks for a security certificate before sending an e-mail to a SOPAC e-mail address, and that it is a good idea to always copy e-mails to gefiwrm@sopac.org.

12.6 Mr. Mataroa suggested that the project may wish to establish an FTP site for the easy transfer of project progress and financial reports, and other materials. He pointed out further that, whilst he understood Facebook was blocked by SOPAC, this tool may serve as a powerful online networking tool amongst IWRM programmes staff and focal points.

12.7 Ms. Ngirchchol asked if it would be possible to expand on the rugby tipping competition held by the PCU and provide a centralised online area where project managers and IWRM staff could share information and experiences. In this connection, Mr. Paterson proceeded to demonstrate an online discussion board the PCU was developing at <http://www.pacific-iwrm.org/community>. He outlined how this could be used to support the sharing of information and experiences, but that for it to work it would require a long term commitment from the members of the Committee. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Duncan pointed out that this could be used to share technical information across the key thematic areas of the demonstration projects.

12.8 The Chairperson led a discussion regarding the Committee's interest in this tool. Ms. Barker-Manase suggested that there would be differing interest depending on Internet connectivity in the countries, but suggested that such tools may assist project deliver. It was agreed that the PCU should trial the use of the discussion board. Mr. Wilson noted that he would present a summary of usage of this discussion board at the next RSC meeting.

13. PARTNERSHIPS AND LINKAGES WITH OTHER PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES

13.1 The Chairperson invited Ms. Ngirchchol to deliver a presentation on behalf of Mr. Seleganiu and herself with respect to their recent visit to Montego Bay, Jamaica for CEHI-5 conference. Ms. Thanked the Pacific IWRM initiative for its support to their attendance at the meeting, and outlined the key sessions of the conference. It was noted that all presentations and materials could be accessed online at [http:// www.cehi.org.lc/cef5/index.htm](http://www.cehi.org.lc/cef5/index.htm).

13.2 Dr. Dalton briefly introduced the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, explaining that it is has the largest global network of environmental organisations. He noted that it is membership

based, currently having 130 members (44 from the Pacific, including Fiji, Nauru, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and shortly, Tonga), who may be national governments, federal or state governments or agencies, independent agencies, NGOs or Foundations. Members meet every 4 years and contribute to directing the IUCN programme.

13.3 Dr. Dalton pointed out that the Oceania office is young, and implements 4 programmes: Species; Marine; Wetland and Water (under Dr. Mililka Sobey); and Energy. He explained that under the Water and Nature Initiative (WANI), there are 3 project sites for water resources management, Samoa, Fiji-Kadavu and Fiji-Nadi in partnership with the GEF IWRM demonstration project. Within these, support is given to improving environmental governance, leadership and learning, environmental and climate adaptation toolkits, including CRISTAL, evaluations of ecological benefits and with a strong commitment to multi-stakeholder partnerships, both traditional and innovative, and community level governance. Dr. Dalton noted that other focal areas are: sea mounts, long line fishing, the Pacific Red List, the Mango Initiative and newly, the Pacific Ocean Challenge, which will compile data on threats to the Pacific Ocean and source funds for future interventions

13.4 The Chair, on behalf of the Cook Islands, Mr. Airens and Mr. Suluimalo requested information on how to become members. It was noted that Dr. Sobey could provide this information. Mr. Mala asked for advice on who the Fiji Focal Point was and for possible sources of funding support available through IUCN. Dr. Dalton explained that IUCN has core funding from a range of sources which can be used to help countries, and his unit tries to source extra funding for water programmes, prioritising member countries, while not excluding non-member countries. He advised that Samoa could share their experience with other countries. Dr. Sobey informed Mr. Malla that the Focal Point for Fiji is the Ministry of the Environment.

13.5 Mr. Suluimalo observed that Samoa had experienced funding delays and uncertainties for their Wani project and expressed the request that these uncertainties would be resolved. Dr. Dalton affirmed that he was confident that this would be the case. Dr. Dalton thanked the participant and reiterated that IUCN was committed to support the Pacific in their water resources management.

14. DRAFT WORK PLAN AND BUDGET FOR THE GEF PACIFIC IWRM PROJECT 2010-2011

14.1 The Chairperson invited the Regional Project Manager, Mr. Wilson to present the regional work plan and budget for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project for 2010-2011. Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline the anticipated outputs from the project components and for which the project will develop SMART indicators for. He outlined the proposed Work Plan for Component 1 and noted that all project logframes have replication frameworks for which project managers should pay attention to over the coming year. He noted that the lessons learned are continuously being fed into this process, and that the RSC activities have been delivered on as planned. He explained that following discussions with UNEP that it was likely the project's mid-term evaluation would be conducted in the third quarter of 2003.

14.2 Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline the proposed budget to end Quarter 2 2011. He noted that the total end of Quarter 2 expenditure of the UNDP component 1 budget would total US\$3,792,703, which is around 56 percent of the total funds available for national IWRM demonstrations. Mr. Suluimalo noted that Samoa was in support of the setting of targets for performance, and the use of a mechanism for the reallocation of funds. Mr. Kun noted that Nauru supports the mechanism but Implementing Agencies also need to be accountable to it. There was unanimous agreement on the use of the proposed reallocation mechanism but all agreed that should there be any delays on behalf of the Implementing Agencies in disbursing funds then the targets would need to be revisited.

14.3 Mr. Wilson proceeded to outline the anticipated outputs from the UNEP components 2-4 and outlined that the project was well advanced with respect to the delivery of component 2 dealing with the development of a regional indicators framework. He noted that component 3 is implemented by the EU IWRM National Planning programme. With respect to component 4, he explained that the project was focusing on: national and regional skills upgrading; twinning programmes; and effective knowledge management, networking and information sharing. He noted that the twinning arrangements to date represented very healthy sharing of experiences and skills between countries. He noted further that there was also significant awareness material production.

14.4 Mr. Wilson reminded the RSC that, at the first RSC meeting he had presented and they had endorsed a budget in deficit. He noted that he had developed a balanced budget at the request of UNEP, which was made possible due to the savings made at the start of the project.

14.5 Mr. Wilson noted that he had spoken with Dr. Harakunarak during the day and it was agreed that in future meetings, more time could be spent looking at the budgets for the UNDP and UNEP meetings. Dr. Harakunarak thanked the Project Manager and the Project Coordinating Unit, and expressed her view that UNEP is mandated with overseeing the regional components of the project, both technical and financial aspects. Dr. Harakunarak urged the RSC to ensure that greater attention was paid to the administrative and financial aspects of the project before the conduct of country clinics or review country progress.

14.6 Dr. Harakunarak referred to the *Communique of Concern* issued by the RSC in September 2010 and assured the RSC that UNEP was looking into alternative funding arrangements. Dr. Harakunarak suggested that a task force be established to oversee project progress. Mr. Wilson suggested that this would need to be considered by the RSC to see if they wanted to establish an additional group to undertake the same tasks that the RSC is mandated to undertake. Dr. Harakunarak suggested that maybe the IWRM focal points meet themselves to deal with administrative and project management matters. Mr. Wilson noted that the standard procedure would be to establish a small working group of the RSC to deal with such matters at RSC meetings

14.7 Dr. Padilla noted that normally a Task Force is established to deal with urgent critical issues, and once such issues are resolved the Task Force is disbanded. Dr. Padilla suggested that he would agree with Mr. Wilson. Mr. Suluimalo suggested that establishing another group would bring in another level of complexity and that such matters should be dealt with by the RSC in a split session, perhaps involving IWRM focal points. Mr. Wilson echoed Mr. Suluimalo's views that this is a regional project and that to ensure it is kept regional decision making should be kept within the framework of the Terms of Reference of the RSC.

14.8 Ms. Barker-Manase recommended that it may be too premature at this stage to make a decision regarding the arrangements for how such matters will be dealt with. It was suggested that this issue could be explored by the Project Coordinating Unit and considered by the next meeting.

15. LOCATION OF THE NEXT MEETING

15.1 Cook Islands was selected as the location for the Third Regional Steering Committee Meeting which would be convened during the final week of July 2011.

16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

16.1 The Chairperson invited the Rapporteur's Committee to present the draft report of the meeting for consideration, amendment and adoption. Noting that sections of the report had been prepared and amended by the Rapporteur's Committee, and circulated to all participants throughout the meeting for comment, the Committee adopted the report as presented.

17. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

17.1 Following a brief summary of the achievements of the meeting and messages of thanks from participants, the meeting was officially closed on Friday 23rd July.

ANNEX 1**List of Participants****Second Regional Steering Committee Meeting for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project****Cook Islands**

Ratu Keutekarakia Mataroa, IWRM Focal Point
Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning
P.O. Box 102
Arorangi, Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Tel: (682) 20321
Fax: (682) 24321
E-mail: k.mataroa@moip.gov.ck

Mr. Paul Teariki Maoate, Project Manager
Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning
P.O. Box 102
Avarua, Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Tel: (682) 20034
Fax: (682) 21134
E-mail: p.maoate@moip.gov.ck

Federated States of Micronesia

Mr. Leerenson Airens, IWRM Focal Point
Manager, Water Works
Pohnpei Utilities Cooperation (PUC)
P.O. Box C, Kolonia 96941, Pohnpei Islands
Federated States of Micronesia
Tel: (691) 320 2374
Fax: (691) 320 2422
E-mail: leerenson@hotmail.com

Mr. Wendolin Roseo Marquez, Project Manager
Department of Transport Communication and
Infrastructure, FSM National Government
P.O. Box PS-2, Kolonia 96941, Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Tel: (691) 320 2865
Fax: (691) 320 2383
E-mail: roseomarquez@hotmail.com

Mr. Patterson Shed, NGO Representative
Executive Director
Conservation Society of Pohnpei
Public Market Street, P O Box 2461,
Kolonia, Pohnpei 96941, FSM
Tel: + 691 320 8409
Fax: + 691 320 5063
E-mail: cspdirector@mail.fm

Fiji Islands

Mr. Colin Simmons
Land and Water Resource Management Division
Ministry of Primary Industries
P.O. Box 1292, Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 338 3155
Fax: (679) 338 3546
E-mail: csimmons@govnet.gov.fj
Mr. Malakai Finau
Manager Geological Services
Mineral Resources Department
241 Mead Road, Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 338 9454
Fax: (679) 337 0039
Email: mala@mrd.gov.fj

Mr. Vinesh Kumar, Demonstration Project Manager
Land and Water Resource Management Division
Ministry of Primary Industries
P.O. Box 1292, Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 338 3155
Fax: (679) 338 3546
E-mail: vinesh.kumar01@govnet.gov.fj

Marshall Islands

Ms. Deborah Barker-Manase, IWRM Focal Point
General Manager, Environment Protection Authority
P.O. Box 1322, Majuro, Marshall Islands
Tel: (692) 625 3035
Fax: (692) 625 5202
E-mail: deb.manase@gmail.com

Ms. Moriana Phillip, Demonstration Project Manager
Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Authority
P O Box 1322 Majuro, MH. 96960
Tel: (692) 625 3035/5203
Fax: (692) 625 5202
Email: morianaphillips@gmail.com

Nauru

Mr. Russell Kun, IWRM Focal Point
Acting Secretary
Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment
Government Buildings, Yaren District
Republic of Nauru
Tel: (674) 444 3133 ext. 306
Mob: (674) 557 3042
E-mail: russ.kun@naurugov.nr
Mr. Bryan Star, Director – Projects
Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment
Government Buildings, Yaren District
Republic of Nauru
Tel: + 674 444 3133
Email: bryan.star@naurugov.nr

Mr. Haseldon Buraman, Project Manager
Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment
Government Buildings, Yaren District
Republic of Nauru
Tel: (674) 444 3133 ext. 311
Fax: (674) 444 3157
E-mail: haseldon@gmail.com

Palau

Ms. Metiek Kimie Ngirchchol, IWRM Focal Point
Laboratory Supervisor, Water Quality Laboratory
Palau Environment Quality Protection Board
P.O. Box 8086, Bureau of Public Works Building
Medalaih, Koror, Palau, 96940
Tel: (680) 488 3600
Fax: (680) 488 2963
E-mail: eqpb@palaunet.com /mk_ngir@yahoo.com
Ms. Umai Basilius
Director of Policy and Planning
Palau Conservation Society
Koror, Palau 96940
Tel: (680) 488 3993
E-mail: pcs@palaunet.com

Ms. Lynna Thomas
National IWRM Project Manager
Palau Environmental Quality protection Board
P.O. Box 8086, Bureau of Public Works Building
Medalaih, Koror, Palau, 96940
Tel: (680) 488 3600
Fax: (680) 488 2963
E-mail: eqpb@palaunet.com

Papua New Guinea

Mr. Tony Kuman
Focal Point/Project Manager (Interim)
Senior Audits and Enforcement Officer
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 6601, Boroko
National Capital District, Papua New Guinea
Tel: + 675 325 0198
Fax: + 675 325 0182
E-mail: tkuman@dec.gov.pg

Samoa

Mr. Suluimalo Amataga Penaia, IWRM Focal Point
Acting CEO – Water Resources Division
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment
Private Bag, Apia, Samoa
Tel: (685) 23800
Mob: (685) 777 2519
Fax: (685) 23176
E-mail: amataga.penaia@mnre.gov.ws
Ms. Frances Debra Brown
Water Sector Coordinator
Ministry of Finance
Private Bag, Apia, Samoa
Tel: (685) 34316/23800
Fax: (685) 22042/21312
E-mail: frances.reupera@mof.gov.ws

Mr. Sopoaga Sam Semisi
IWRM National Project Manager
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Private Bag, Apia, Samoa
Tel: (685) 23800 Mob: (685) 750 8088
Fax: (685) 23176
E-mail: sam.semisi@mnre.gov.ws
Skype: Sam Semisi

Solomon Islands

Mr. Isaac Lekelalu,
Demonstration Project Manager

Deputy Director Water Resources
 Ministry of Mines, Energy and Rural Electrification
 P O Box G37, Honiara, Solomon Islands
 Tel: (677) 21522
 Fax: (677) 25811
 E-mail: Isaac@mines.gov/i_lekelalu@hotmail.com

Tonga

Mr. Rennie Vaiomo'unga
 Acting Principal Geologist
 Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and
 Environment
 P.O Box 5, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga
 Tel: (676) 25508
 Fax: (676) 23216
 Email: rennie@lands.gov.to

Ms. 'Esetelelita Fulivai Lakai,
 Demonstration Project Manager
 Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and
 Environment
 Sailoame, Neiafu, Vavau, Kingdom of Tonga
 Tel: (676) 70999 Fax: (676) 70999
 Email: ese_1983@hotmail.com /
 esefulivailakai@gmail.com
 Skype: kaipeatoa

Mr. Tupou Naipuka Tuilautala
 Tonga National Water Resources Committee
 Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and
 Environment
 P.O Box 5, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga
 Phone: (676) 25508
 Fax: (676) 23216
 Email: poutuilautala@rocketmail.com/
 geology@kalianet.to
 Skype: tnt2480

Tuvalu

Mr. Ampelosa Mawoa Tehulu
 Director of Works
 Public Works Department
 Private Mail Bag
 Vaiaku, Funafuti, Tuvalu
 Tel: (688) 20300
 Fax: (688) 20207
 E-mail: ampextehulu@yahoo.com

Mr. Pisi Seleganiu, Demonstration Project Manager
 Water and Sewage Supervisor
 Ministry of Public Utilities and Industry
 Government Office, Vaiaku, Funafuti, Tuvalu
 Tel: (688) 20304
 E-mail: seleganiu70@gmail.com
 Skype: seleganiu70

Vanuatu

Ms. Rossette Kalmet,
 Demonstration Project Manager
 Department of Geology, Mines & Water Resources
 Private Mail Bag 9001, Port Vila, Vanuatu
 Tel: (678) 37823
 Mobile: (678) 7741648
 E-mail: rkalmat@vanuatu.gov.vu

United Nations Development Programme

Mr Jose Erez Padilla, Ph.D.
Regional Technical Advisor
Marine, Coastal & Island Ecosystems
United Nations Development Programme
3rd Floor, UN Service Building
Raidamern Nok Avenue, Bangkok, Thailand
Tel: (662) 288 2756
Fax: (662) 288 3032

Email: jose.padilla@undp.org

Ms. Sharon Sakuma

Country Development Manager

UN Joint Presence – Palau

UNDP Multi-Country Office

Koror, Palau, 96940

Tel: (680) 488 7270

Fax: (680) 488 7271

E-mail: sharon.sakuma@undp.org

Skype: sharon.sakuma

Mrs Asenaca Ravuvu

Team Leader – Environment

United Nations Development Programme

Level 8, Kadavu House, 414 Victoria Parade

Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands

Tel: (679) 331 2500

Fax: (679) 330 1718

Email: asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org

United Nations Environment Programme

Ms. Ampai Harakunarak, Ph.D.

Task Manager, GEF-International Waters

Asia and the Pacific Region, UNEP/DGEF/ROAP

United Nations Building, 2nd Floor, Block B

Rajdamern Nok Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Tel: (662) 288 1977

Fax: (662) 280 3829

Mob: (668) 1948 9441

E-mail: ampai.harakunarak@unep.org

University of the South Pacific

Ms. Ulukalesi Bale Tamata, Ph.D.

Manager Environment Unit

Institute of Applied Sciences

The University of the South Pacific

Private Mail Bag, Laucala Campus

Suva, Fiji Islands

Tel: (679) 323 2976

Fax: (679) 323 1534

Email: Tamata_b@usp.ac.fj

European Union

Mr. Marius-Adrian Oancea

Delegation of the European Commission

for the Pacific

Infrastructure Section, Level 4, FDB Bank Centre

360 Victoria Parade, Suva, Fiji Islands

Tel: (679) 331 3633 Ext 104

Fax: (679) 330 0370

E-mail: Marius-Adrian.Oancea@ec.europa.eu

Caribbean Environmental Health Institute

Mr. Ronald Charles, Forest Officer

Forest and Wildlife Protection

Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry,

Forestry Division, L. Rose Building,

Windsor Park Drive, Roseau

Commonwealth of Dominica

Tel: + (1) 767-266-5852.

Email: forestofficerprotection@cwdom.dm

International Union for the Conservation of Nature

Ms. Milika Sobey, Ph.D.

Water Program Coordinator

IUCN Regional Office for Oceania

Private mail bag, 5 Ma'afu Street

Suva, Fiji Islands

Tel: (679) 3319 084/3100 126/3100 127

Fax: (679) 3100 128

Email: milika.sobey@iucn.org

Mr. James Dalton, Ph.D.

Water Management Advisor

IUCN Headquarters

Rue Mauverney 28

1196 Gland, Switzerland

Tel: (41) 22 999 0194

Fax: (41) 22 364 9622

E-mail: james.dalton@iucn.org

International Water Centre

Dr. Peter E Oliver

Senior Lecturer (Education & Training)

International Water Centre

Level 16, 333 Ann Street, Brisbane, QLD 4000

P O Box 10907, Adelaide Street, QLD 4000

Australia

Tel: (617) 3123 7766

Fax: (617) 3103 4574

E-mail: p.oliver@watercentre.org

Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)

Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Applied
Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
Private Mail Bag GPO
Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 3381 377
Fax: (679) 3370 040/3384 461
Web: www.sopac.org/www.pacific-iwrm.org

Mr. David Duncan
Environmental Engineer
GEF Pacific IWRM Project
E-mail: d.duncan@sopac.org
Ms. Ruth Urban
Community Assessment and Participation Adviser
GEF Pacific IWRM Project
E-mail: ruth@sopac.org
Ms. Rhonda Robinson
Project Adviser EU IWRM Planning Programme
Mob: (679) 993 4770
E-mail: rhondar@sopac.org

Mr. Tiy Chung
Communications Adviser
HYCOS/IWRM
E-mail: tiy@sopac.org

Mr. Llyod Smith
Project Coordinator
Pacific HYCOS
E-mail: llyod@sopac.org

Mr. Mohammed Irfaq
Project Finance
SOPAC Secretariat
E-mail: irfaq@sopac.org

Mr. Marc Wilson
Regional Project Manager
Private Mail Bag GPO
Suva, Fiji Islands
Mob: (679) 723 5390
E-mail: m.wilson@sopac.org

Mr. Chris Paterson
Mainstreaming and Indicators Adviser
GEF Pacific IWRM Project
E-mail: christopher@sopac.org
Mrs. Verenaisi Bakani
Senior Administration and Travel Officer
GEF Pacific IWRM Project
E-mail: verenaisi@sopac.org
Mr. David Hebblethwaite
IWRM Project Adviser
Email: dave@sopac.org

Ms. Subhashni Raj
IWRM Project Officer
EU IWRM Planning Programme
E-mail: subhashni@sopac.org

Mr. Peter Sinclair
Project Advisor
Pacific HYCOS
E-mail: peter@sopac.org

Figure 1 Group Photograph of the Second Regional Steering Committee Meeting for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

ANNEX 2

List of Documents

Second Regional Steering Committee Meeting for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

Discussion Documents

SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/1	Provisional Agenda
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/2	Provisional Annotated Agenda
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/3	Report of the Meeting (<i>this document</i>)
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/4	Report of the Project Manager on the Status of the GEF Project Entitled " <i>Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific Islands Countries</i> "
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/5	Status Report of the European Union funded IWRM National Planning Programme
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/6	Draft Terms of Reference for a Regional Technical Advisory Group for Pacific IWRM
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/7	Proposed Project Funding Rules for National IWRM Demonstration Projects
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/8	IWRM Demonstration Project Technical and Support Needs
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/9	Pacific Hydrological Cycle Observing System Project Status
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/10	Developing a Pacific Regional Project for Community-led Water Resources Management
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/11	Establishing a Regional Indicator Framework for IWRM and Water Use Efficiency in the Small Island States of the Pacific
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/12	Co-Financing of Project Activities and Mainstreaming IWRM
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/13	Capacity Development for IWRM
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/14	Draft Work Plan and Budget for 2010-2011

Information Documents

SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.1	Provisional List of Participants
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.2	Provisional List of Documents
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.3	Draft Programme
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.4	GEF IWRM Finance and Administration Manual
SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RSC.2/Inf.5	Report of the Inception Workshop and First Regional Steering Committee Meeting

ANNEX 3

Agenda

- 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
 - 1.1 Welcome Address on Behalf of SOPAC
 - 1.2 Opening Prayer
 - 1.3 Traditional Palauan Chant
 - 1.4 Welcome Address on Behalf of the GEF Implementing Agencies
 - 1.5 Welcome Address on Behalf of the European Union
 - 1.6 Welcome Address by the Chair of Palau's Environmental Quality Protection Board
 - 1.7 Official Opening by the President of the Republic of Palau
 - 1.8 Group Photograph
 - 1.9 Introduction of Members
- 2. ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING**
 - 2.1 Election of Officers (Chairperson; Vice-Chairperson; and Rapporteur)
 - 2.2 Documentation Available to the Meeting
 - 2.3 Programme of Work and Arrangements for the Conduct of the Meeting
- 3. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**
- 4. STATUS OF THE REGIONAL PACIFIC IWRM INITIATIVE**
 - 4.1 Status of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project
 - 4.2 Status of the EU IWRM National Planning Programme and Linkages with the GEF Project
 - 4.3 Terms of Reference for a Regional Technical Advisory Group for Pacific IWRM
 - 4.4 Proposed Project Funding Rules for National IWRM Demonstration Projects
- 5. STATUS OF NATIONAL IWRM DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS**
 - 5.1 Country Presentations
 - 5.2 Progress and Financial Reporting
 - 5.3 Scientific and Technical Support Needs
 - 5.4 Community Involvement and Participation
- 6. PACIFIC HYDROLOGICAL CYCLE OBSERVING SYSTEM PROJECT AND NATIONAL IWRM DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: ACHIEVEMENTS, LESSONS, AND FOLLOW-UP**
- 7. ENHANCING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN IWRM IN PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES**
- 8. ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL INDICATOR FRAMEWORK FOR IWRM AND WATER USE EFFICIENCY IN THE SMALL ISLAND STATES OF THE PACIFIC**
- 9. TRACKING CO-FINANCING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND MAINSTREAMING IWRM IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**
- 10. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR IWRM**
- 11. INCORPORATING CLIMATE VARIABILITY AND CHANGE IN IWRM**
- 12. DEVELOPING AN INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY FOR THE PACIFIC IWRM PROGRAMME**
- 13. PARTNERSHIPS AND LINKAGES WITH OTHER PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES**
- 14. DRAFT WORK PLAN AND BUDGET FOR THE GEF PACIFIC IWRM PROJECT 2010-2011**
- 15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 16. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**
- 17. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

ANNEX 4

Terms of Reference for the Regional Technical Advisory Group for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project entitled: *“Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific Island Countries”*

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The goal of the GEF funded, SOPAC executed project entitled *“Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific Island Countries”* (hereafter called the GEF Pacific IWRM Project) is aligned with the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability umbrella programme and will *“contribute to sustainable development in the Pacific Islands Region through improvements in natural resource and environmental management”*. The overall objective is *“to improve water resource and wastewater management and water use efficiency in Pacific Island Countries in order to balance overuse and conflicting uses of scarce freshwater resources through policy and legislative reform and implementation of applicable and effective Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) and Water Use Efficiency (WUE) plans”*.

The project consists of four components. Component C1 will use country-driven and designed demonstration activities focusing on sustainable water management to utilise Ridge to Reef IWRM approaches to bring significant environmental stress reduction benefits. Demonstration projects will act as catalysts for replication and scaling-up approaches to improve national water resources management, and regionally to support the Pacific in reducing land based pollutants from entering the ocean. Component C2 will develop an IWRM and WUE Regional Indicator Framework based on improved data collection and indicator feedback and action for improved national and regional sustainable development using water as an entry point. Component C3 will focus on Policy, Legislative, and Institutional Reform for IWRM and WUE through supporting institutional change and re-alignment to enact National IWRM Plans and WUE strategies, including appropriate financing mechanisms and supporting and building further political will to endorse IWRM policies and plans to accelerate and support pre-existing SAP and other Pacific Regional Action Plan work. Component C4 provides a Regional Capacity Building and Sustainability Programme for IWRM and WUE, including Knowledge Exchange and Learning and Replication.

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF A REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

To facilitate the achievement of the goals and objectives outlined above, a Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) for the GEF Pacific IWRM Project was established during the project's Second Regional Steering Committee Meeting with responsibility for: overseeing the scientific and technical elements of the project; ensuring effective implementation of activities undertaken during project execution; providing sound scientific and technical advice to the Regional Project Steering Committee (RSC).

ROLE AND FUNCTION

As the over-riding scientific and technical body for the project the RTAG shall provide sound scientific and technical advice to the Regional Project Steering Committee regarding matters requiring decision and shall provide direction and strategic guidance to the National IWRM Demonstration Projects.

THE REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP SHALL:

Regional Activities

- Review and co-ordinate regional scientific and technical activities of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project, including development of a Regional Indicator Framework;
- Review and evaluate, from a scientific and technical perspective, progress in implementation of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project, and provide guidance for improvement when necessary;
- Provide the Regional Project Steering Committee with recommendations on proposed regional activities, work plans, and budgets;

- Provide the Regional Project Steering Committee with technical guidance and suggestions to improve project activities where necessary, including development of replication and sustainability plans for IWRM;
- Facilitate co-operation with relevant international, regional, and national organisations and projects to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the Pacific IWRM initiative;
- Provide advice to the Regional Project Steering Committee with respect to integrating climate variability and change considerations into IWRM in Pacific Island Countries; and
- Monitor the progress of the project's regional activities and ensure the quality of outputs.

National Activities

- Review and evaluate, from a scientific and technical perspective, progress in implementation of the National IWRM Demonstration Projects, and provide guidance for improvement when necessary;
- Receive, and review reports, data and information from the IWRM Demonstration Projects and oversee the regional syntheses of this information to identify overall needs and priorities for IWRM and improved Water Use Efficiency;
- Receive, review, and comment on drafts of national water policies and/or legislation; and
- Advise the regional Project Coordinating Unit and National IWRM Focal Points and Demonstration Project Managers of the need for public awareness and information materials concerning IWRM and Water Use Efficiency in the Small Island States of the Pacific region.

PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP FOR A REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

The Regional Technical Advisory Group of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project shall consist of:

- the Chairperson of the Regional Project Steering Committee (RSC);
- a CROP Agency representative;
- a GEF Implementing Agency representative;
- selected regional experts;
- representatives from Public Water Utilities/State Owned Enterprises actively engaged in water resource management and sanitation in Pacific Island Countries;
- representatives of NGOs actively engaged in water resource management; and
- the Regional Manager of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project.

The Regional Project Coordinating Unit in consultation with National IWRM Focal Points and IWRM Demonstration Project Managers shall nominate no more than six regional experts to ensure a balance of expertise and specialisation consistent with the mandate of the Committee.

The membership of the RTAG shall be formally established at the first meeting, at which they shall elect a Chairperson and a Vice-Chair from amongst the members. The Vice-Chair shall act as Chairperson of meetings in the absence of the Chairperson.

The Chairperson and Vice-Chair shall participate in the annual meetings of the Regional Project Steering Committee at which they shall present the reports and recommendations of the RTAG.

SECRETARIAT

The Regional Project Co-ordinating Unit shall act as Secretariat to the RTAG and shall ensure that reports of the meetings are circulated to all members of the Regional Project Steering Committee.

MEETINGS OF THE REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

The Regional Project Coordinating Unit in consultation with the Chairperson shall convene meetings of the RTAG according to an agreed schedule, which will form part of the agreed work plan and timetable for the work of the Committee.

The first meeting of the RTAG will be convened in conjunction with the Second Meeting of the Regional Project Steering Committee to: agree on the detailed activities, work plan and timetable for

the twenty-four months leading to the project's mid-term evaluation: and to provide guidance to the project's emerging scientific and technical

CONDUCT OF REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP BUSINESS

1. A majority of the Members shall constitute a quorum.
2. Proposals from any members shall be introduced in writing and submitted prior to the meeting for the Regional Project Coordinating Unit to circulate to the Members.
3. The decisions of the meetings shall be made by consensus.
4. Where consensus cannot be achieved during a meeting, the Regional Project Coordinating Unit in consultation with the Chairperson shall facilitate negotiations to seek resolution during the subsequent inter-sessional period. The Regional Project Coordinating Unit shall report the results of the negotiations to the Members.
5. The Regional Project Steering Committee may adjourn the discussion of any issue on which a consensus cannot be reached and refer it to a working group of that Committee. The working group shall be charged with resolving the issue and be required to report the outcome of their work to the Regional Project Steering Committee when the discussion resumes.
6. The record of the meeting, including all the decisions made, shall be kept by the Regional Project Coordinating Unit which shall circulate the record to the Members in the form of a draft report before the closure of the meeting. Any Member who disagrees with any part of the report may propose an amendment for consideration by all members during the adoption of the report.
7. The Regional Project Coordinating Unit shall distribute the final version of the report to the Members within one month following the closure of the meeting.
8. Between meetings, any proposal for a decision falling within the competence of the Regional Project Coordinating Unit shall be circulated in writing by the Regional Project Coordinating Unit to the Members with a specified deadline for reply. On the basis of the responses the Regional Project Coordinating Unit will inform members in writing of the views expressed and the consensus position.

PARTICIPATION OF OBSERVERS IN REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETINGS

1. The Regional Technical Advisory Group may invite observers to participate in its meetings;
2. Upon the invitation of the Chairperson, observers may participate in the discussion of issues within their competence or scope of activities, without the right to participate in decision-making; and
3. Observers may, upon invitation of the Chairperson, submit written statements that shall be circulated by the Project Coordinating Unit to the members of the Regional Technical Advisory Group.

AMENDMENTS AND SUSPENSION OF ABOVE

Any Rules contained in this document may be amended or suspended by the Regional Project Steering Committee.

ANNEX 5

Community Engagement Report Card Prepared by Dr. Ruth Urban

Task 1: Community Engagement Project Self-Assessment

1. Use a 6 point scale (the GEF scale) with 6 as the top/best score.
2. Please assess and score your project progress in terms community engagement.
3. Please give 4 reasons for assigning the project that score, based on your assessment of what the project has achieved, and what it has not achieved.
4. Please indicate what would need to be happening, or what you would need to be seeing, for you to give the project (almost) full marks (5/6, 6/6)
5. Please use the final row if you wish.

Community engagement		1. Score maximum 6 or 12 <i>Circle as appropriate</i>	Score
2	Reasons		
1	Reason 1 for score		
2	Reason 2 for score		
3	Reason 3 for score		
4	Reason 4 for score		
3	What would need to be happening in terms of community engagement for you to be able to give the project (almost) full marks? Identify 4 changes or improvements that you would need to be seeing. <i>[Be specific – not just 'more participation'; 'more members present'; but e.g. 'all households present'; 'over half of participants actively contributing' etc]</i>		
1	Change / Improvement 1		
2	Change / Improvement 2		
3	Change / Improvement 3		
4	Change / Improvement 4		
4	What support would you need (if any) to facilitate these changes		

Task 2: Gender Mainstreaming Project Self-Assessment

Definitions

Gender: The different roles, rights and responsibilities of men and women and the relations between them, as determined by society and culture. **Or:** The societal meaning assigned to male and female.

"Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. [United Nations. "Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997". A/52/3.18 Sept. 1997]

Please repeat exactly the same process as for the Task 1 Community engagement format, to assess your project progress in terms of gender mainstreaming.

Countries that have not yet completed the 2009 Q4 Gender Mainstreaming Assessment Sheet 1d (p 5) should do so to help them complete Task 2.

1. Use a 6 point scale (the GEF scale) with 6 as the top/best score.
2. Please assess and score your project progress in terms gender mainstreaming.
3. Please give 4 reasons for assigning the project that score, based on your assessment of what the project has achieved, in your view, and what it has not achieved,
4. Please indicate what would need to be happening, or what you would need to be seeing, for you to give the project (almost) full marks (5/6, 6/6 or 11/12, 12/12).
5. Please use the final row if you wish.

	Gender mainstreaming	1. Score out of (6) <i>Circle as appropriate</i>	Score
2	Reasons		
1	Reason 1 for score		
2	Reason 2 for score		
3	Reason 3 for score		
4	Reason 4 for score		
3	What would need to be happening in terms of community engagement for you to be able to give the project (almost) full marks? Identify 4 changes or improvements that you would need to be seeing. <i>[Be specific – not just 'more participation of women' but e.g. 'equal participation of women and men'; 'men and women actively engaged in improving water management'; 'project indicators gender specific']</i>		
1	Change / Improvement 1		
2	Change / Improvement 2		
3	Change / Improvement 3		
4	Change / Improvement 4		
4	What support would your project need (if any) for you to be able to achieve this?		

1 d Gender mainstreaming assessment [From 2009, Q4]**1 sheet per project**

The Inception Workshop highlighted that:

- one of the founding principles of the IWRM approach is the recognition of the role of women in water resources management and use;
- IWRM in the Pacific has social equity as a guiding principle;
- UNDP and UNEP support gender mainstreaming; GEF supports UNDP/UNEP gender policies;
- the UNDP definition of gender mainstreaming is “the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes in all areas and at all levels”

PMUs (PCU) would do well to consider what you could be doing to strengthen the process of social equity and gender mainstreaming of your demonstration projects. That is, be alert to the needs of the different social groups in the community and aim to maximise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts on each group. As a start, you could apply the first 3 phases of the Gender mainstreaming checklist that Dr. Anna Tengburg (UNDP) presented at the Inception Workshop (modified to include ‘other vulnerable groups’ for social equity).

Project Cycle Phase	1 d Gender Mainstreaming Checklist	Yes	No	Comment Action planned
1. Identification	Has a gender sensitive stakeholder / situation analysis been conducted?			
	Have the needs of men and women been assessed?			
	Has an ‘other vulnerable group’ sensitive stakeholder / situation analysis been conducted?			
	Have the needs of ‘other vulnerable groups’ been assessed?			
2. Preparation and Formulation	Are stakeholder consultations during preparation meetings ensuring the representation of:			
	Women and men?			
	‘Other vulnerable groups’?			
	Are the project objectives and anticipated results			
	Gender sensitive?			
	‘Other vulnerable group’ sensitive?			
	Is the logframe gender sensitive?			
	Is the logframe ‘other vulnerable group’ sensitive?			
	Will the project have any impact on resource access and resource control by			
	Men?			
	Women?			
‘Other vulnerable groups’?				
Is there a budget for gender?				
3. Review and Approval	Does the demonstration project document adequately incorporate gender considerations?			
	Does the demonstration project document adequately incorporate other vulnerable group considerations?			
4. Implementation	Will the initiative increase the unpaid workload of men / women / boys / girls?			
	Will monitoring data be disaggregated by gender?			
	Will monitoring data be disaggregated by ‘other vulnerable groups’?			

ANNEX 6

Co-Financing of Project Activities

1. INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT CO-FINANCING

Co-financing is a key principle underlying Global Environment Facility (GEF) efforts to have a significant positive impact on the global environment. GEF grants are intended to be “*incremental*”, i.e., adding value in terms of global environmental benefits to national/local investment in environmental projects. Co-finance for GEF projects is important because:

- a) With limited financial resources, increased capacity, and a growing demand for assistance, it is essential for the GEF to mobilise additional resources for the global environment. Co-financing expands the *resources* available to finance environmental objectives;
- b) Co-financing is an important indicator of the strength of the *commitment* of the counterparts, beneficiaries, and Implementing and Executing Agencies to those projects; and
- c) Co-financing helps ensure the *success* and local acceptance of those projects by linking them to sustainable development, and thereby maximises and sustains their *impacts*.

Co-financing Definition

Co-financing is defined as “***the project resources that are committed by the GEF agency itself or by other non-GEF sources and which are essential for meeting the GEF project objectives***”¹. In considering this definition it is important to note the following GEF rules:

- a) Finance for baseline activities is included in the definition only when such activities are essential for achieving the GEF objectives, as shown in the project logical framework within the project document;
- b) Finance for activities that are not essential for achieving the GEF objectives, but which are processed for transactional convenience in the same loan or technical assistance package of the GEF Agency, are excluded from the definition of “*co-finance*”; and
- c) Resources that are not committed as part of the essential financing package at the outset but which are mobilised subsequently are not included as “*co-finance*”. Such leveraged resources are nevertheless important and will also be tracked.

Sources of Co-finance

Sources of co-financing in GEF projects include:

- a) The agency's own co-financing (i.e., from the GEF implementing agencies e.g. UNDP, UNEP)
- b) Government co-financing (counterpart commitments) e.g., for baseline or foundational activities upon which the project would build or without which the project could not be implemented;
- c) Contributions mobilised for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

Related Financing

In terms of GEF projects, cofinancing does not include either “*associated financing*” or “*leveraged resources*”, which are defined as follows:

- a) ***Associated financing***. This is finance for other activities that are related to the project or to similar commitments but which not essential for the project's successful implementation. Associated financing may be reported for information but commitments are not required and the financing is not monitored.
- b) ***Leveraged resources***. Leveraged resources are the additional resources beyond those committed to the project itself that are mobilised later as a direct result of the project, e.g., for

¹ GEF/C.20/6/Rev.1

further replication or through programmatic influence. As such, leveraged resources do not form part of the committed financing plan at the outset and so they are not defined as “co-finance”. Leverage is nevertheless a very important indicator of GEF’s catalytic effect.

2. MONITORING AND REPORTING ON CO-FINANCING, ASSOCIATED FINANCING, AND LEVERAGED RESOURCES

It is a requirement of the project donor, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) that co-financing be reported and monitored by source, by type, and by the stage of the Project Cycle. The Project Implementing Agencies and Executing Agency are required to inform the GEF Secretariat whenever there is a potentially substantive co-financing change (i.e., one affecting the project objectives, scale, scope, strategic priority, conformity with GEF criteria, likelihood or project success, or outcome of the project). As such it is important for projects to develop a user-friendly system for tracking and reporting on co-financing.

The co-finance estimates for Component 1 associated with the UNDP national demonstration projects is summarised by source in Table 1. Tables 2-14 provide detailed information relating to sources and types of co-financing for specific demonstration project activities in each country.

Due to delays in final endorsement of the project it is likely that some sources of co-financing may not currently be available or require reprogramming by government Ministries and Departments, donor organisations, and other partners. A preliminary review undertaken by the Regional Project Co-ordinating Unit identified some co-financing commitments that may not be essential for meeting the GEF project objectives. Rather these commitments appear to relate to “associated financing”, i.e., funds for activities that are related to the project or to similar commitments but which not essential for the project’s successful implementation. Therefore, there is a need for each Lead Agency and Project Management Unit to undertake a critical review of the commitments and to derive updated estimates that can be used as targets for a co-financing monitoring and reporting systems.

Table 1 Summary of anticipated co-financing by source for National Demonstration Projects of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

Country	Government	SOPAC			Other	Total
		EU-IWRM	EU-HYCOS	SOPAC Other		
Cook Islands	386,418	141,888	56,754	369,374	700,000	1,654,434
FSM	87,396	50,000	76,400	20,000	8,620,000 ^a	8,853,796
Fiji	2,924,810	200,000	220,177	-	1,200,000	4,544,987
Nauru	2,236,190	50,000	68,791	80,000	300,000	2,734,981
Niue	294,000	75,000	60,000	100,000	1,610,000 ^b	2,139,000
Palau	946,500	60,000	303,000	-	590,000	1,899,500
PNG	292,832	11,000	150,000	273,500	32,434,553 ^c	33,161,885
RMI	1,109,125	165,000	66,833	1,166,625	795,000	3,302,583
Samoa	120,000	?	100,000	?	?	2,037,000
Solomon I.	941,046	215,000	233,440	380,000	174,311	1,943,797
Tonga	8,588,000	50,000	79,000	1,000,000	3,000	9,720,000
Tuvalu	967,200	50,000	50,000	850,000	1,200,000	3,117,200
Vanuatu	184,740	-	28,796	89,989	7,385,836	7,689,361 ^d
	19,078,257	1,067,888	1,493,191	4,329,488	55,012,700	82,798,524

(a) US\$7,550,000 Asian Development Bank; (b) US\$1,000,000 UNDP TRAC; (c) US\$31,920,825 Eda Ranu Infrastructure; (d) US\$7,100,000 JICA Infrastructure Project

Monitoring Co-Financing from Supporting Organisations

A significant proportion of the anticipated project co-financing relates to planned activities of bilateral and multilateral projects and programmes. As these activities have largely been designed to directly complement the GEF project and are essential for meeting the GEF project objectives, there is a critical need for these inputs to be monitored and reported on. It is a requirement of the Memoranda of Agreement between SOPAC and the Lead Agencies that National Demonstration Projects submit financial and progress reports to the Regional Project Co-ordinating Unit on a quarterly basis, including detailed information on co-financing realised from supporting organisations.

In considering a method for tracking inputs from supporting organisations, the true value of the outputs produced and outcomes achieved by organisations in the execution of supporting activities is perhaps impossible to determine². This would require information about the time spent by staff of partner organisations on project activities, level of technical and administrative support provided, and some estimate of the value of the partners own network of supporting organisations that contributed to the successful of tasks. It is suggested by the Regional Project Co-ordinating Unit that, as this type of co-financing is included in individual project budgets against on-the-ground activities and deliverables, successful completion of the identified tasks and production of outputs should deem the co-financing commitment to have been met or “realised”.

Such an approach will require effective in-country communication between Project Management Units and the in-country staff or focal points for the projects and programmes of supporting and partner organisations. This will be necessary for the timely reporting of information regarding the conduct and completion of supporting/complementary activities in quarterly demonstration project progress reports.

Monitoring In-Kind Co-Financing from Governments, Communities, and other Stakeholders

Experience of other GEF projects suggests that significant in-kind co-financing is contributed to projects directly by individuals either through: participation in meetings³; organisation of project activities and networking with other projects and programmes; additional unpaid work required to get the job done; technical backstopping; and provision of specialised knowledge and information, particularly when working with communities in evening consultations and on weekends. As very few organisations or individuals maintain detailed timesheets, verifying such in-kind contributions is difficult if not impossible.

Elements of such in-kind co-financing that are amenable to independent verification in the GEF Pacific IWRM Project include:

- Costs of individual’s time in meetings of Demonstration Project Coordinating Committee
- Costs of individual’s time in expert and community consultations
- Costs of individual’s time in meetings of the Regional Project Steering Committee and project working groups
- Costs of individuals (non Project Manager Assistant) involvement in project technical and field activities (e.g. technical staff made available by partners)

Estimating the value of time spent by individuals on project activities is complicated by factors including the seniority or actual salaries of individuals and different economic conditions in the participating countries (i.e. an individual’s time in one country may be valued much higher or lower than an individual in a neighbouring country).

The problem of how to value time of individuals has been addressed by other projects in the Asia-Pacific region, namely the UNEP/GEF South China Sea Project and UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project. The approach adopted in these instances has been to establish a regional standard co-efficient as a value of 1 person day. The co-efficient agreed was an inclusive costing of salary and benefits, plus office support costs that was applied to all individuals, from all countries, regardless of their individual level of seniority or actual salary. The co-efficient or regional standard “daily rate” was agreed through consideration of:

- The government salary scales of the participating countries,
- Supporting costs in the participating countries, including social benefits, office and office facilities, and supporting systems of the institutions; and
- Average salary of staff of the project executing agencies.

² Valuing outputs or outcomes would most likely be counter-productive as it is likely to result in extensive debate concerning the merits or otherwise of the outputs

³ Time of individuals spent in meetings is not paid for in the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

An example of the approach used to the value the in-kind co-financing in terms of the time of 50 individuals spent in a 2 day community stakeholder workshop at a regional standard rate of US\$140 is as follows:

- **1 (workshop) x 2 (days) x 50 (persons) x US\$140 (co-efficient)/person/day = US\$14,000**

The use of a co-efficient obviously undervalues the real co-financing in some countries and over-values it in others, but obviates the necessity for maintaining detailed records in national currencies, all of which float on the international currency exchange market. Developing such a co-efficient or standard daily rate for use in the GEF Pacific IWRM Project would require information regarding government salary scales from each participating country and agreement of the committee on a suitable rate.

The Regional Project Coordinating Unit has developed a framework for reporting on in-kind contributions of individuals' time to project activities as part of the quarterly progress report. Project Management Units are required to include in each quarterly report a listing of all meetings convened in the framework of the demonstration projects, their duration and location, agenda, report, and a list of participants. Similarly participation of support staff in the execution of technical and field activities will be reported in quarterly progress reports. Cash co-financing of meetings and activities will also be recorded on a quarterly basis.

Table 2 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in the Cook Islands

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Cook Islands	Government	51,642	Cash	Cash co-financing for energy costs
Cook Islands	Government	37,615	Cash	Cash co-financing for communications
Cook Islands	Government	3,762	Cash	Cash co-financing for Inter Agency IWRM Meetings
Cook Islands	Government	94,790	Cash	Mainstreaming policy support as part of policy and legislative review
Cook Islands	Government	18,808	Cash	Awareness activities as part of communications strategy
Cook Islands	Government	22,569	In-kind	In-kind co-financing for vehicles
Cook Islands	Government	67,707	In-kind	In-kind co-financing for GIS Mapping – field survey, data capture, download
Cook Islands	Government	36,111	In-kind	In-kind co-financing for drilling borehole transects
Cook Islands	Government	40,624	In-kind	Mainstreaming policy support as part of policy and legislative review
Cook Islands	Government	3,762	In-kind	IWRM training workshops
Cook Islands	Government	9,028	In-kind	Water quality monitoring
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	Cash co-financing for Project Manager
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	47,019	Cash	Cash co-financing for Project Assistant
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	21,623	Cash	Resource support for policy and legislative review
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	21,623	Cash	Inter-agency consultation process as part of policy and legislative review
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	31,623	Cash	Public consultation as part of policy and legislative review
Cook Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	56,754	Cash	Groundwater pumping and testing
Cook Islands	NZAID-SOPAC WQM	75,230	Cash	Programme set up (lab assessment etc)
Cook Islands	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	30,010	Cash	Computer tool for knowledge transfer between agencies
Cook Islands	SOPAC Water Safety	207,341	Cash	Strategy development as part of communications strategy
Cook Islands	SOPAC Reducing Vulnerabilities	56,793	Cash	Build on existing server to cater for capacity
Cook Islands	ADB	700,000	Cash	Groundwork policy as part of policy and legislative review
		1,654,434		

Table 3 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in the Federated States of Micronesia

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
FSM	Government	20,000	In-kind	Community engagement for pollution assessment
FSM	Government	20,000	In-kind	Community consultation and demonstration projects for mitigating pollution
FSM	Government	17,396	In-kind	Construction of dry litter pens for pig management
FSM	Government	10,000	In-kind	Water quality analysis equipment and training
FSM	Government	20,000	In-kind	Establish committee and plan/Harbour Water Quality and Management Plan
FSM	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Policy support review teams
FSM	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Nested State IWRM and ICZM
FSM	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Capacity building in IWRM
FSM	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	IWRM planning
FSM	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	10,000	Cash	Community engagement using "Ridge to Reef"
FSM	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	10,000	Cash	Support to CSP for extension of reserve and develop ecosystem service payment concepts
FSM	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	6,400	Cash	Establishing watershed protection project in Chuuk
FSM	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	50,000	In-kind	Establish inspection for operation and maintenance of sewage treatment facilities
FSM	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	20,000	Cash	Hydrological monitoring for water quality improvements in Nanpil River
FSM	CSP	30,000	Cash	Hydrological monitoring for water quality improvements in Nanpil River
FSM	CSP	30,000	In-kind	Community engagement using "Ridge to Reef"
FSM	CSP	30,000	In-kind	Support to CSP for extension of reserve and develop ecosystem service payment concepts
FSM	ADB	1,050,000	Cash	Community engagement and training/trial new toilets
FSM	ADB	380,000	Cash	Stakeholder engagement, water safety planning
FSM	ADB	30,000	Cash	Support to water quality lab and monitoring
FSM	ADB	6,500,000	Cash	Establish inspection for operation and maintenance of sewage treatment facilities
FSM	ADB	200,000	Cash	Establish committee and plan/Harbour Water Quality and Management Plan
FSM	ADB	30,000	Cash	Policy support review teams
FSM	ADB	50,000	In-kind	PM and PA salary
FSM	ADB	25,000	In-kind	Office space
FSM	ADB	10,000	In-kind	Office equipment
FSM	ADB	145,000	In-kind	Community engagement and training/trial new toilets
FSM	ADB	25,000	In-kind	Biogas consultations, construction, and demonstrations
FSM	ADB	85,000	In-kind	Stakeholder engagement, water safety planning
		8,853,796		

Table 4 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Fiji

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Fiji	Government	501,000	Cash	Training
Fiji	Government	20,000	Cash	Infrastructure and current plan assessment
Fiji	Government	500,000	Cash	Recommendations for future activities
Fiji	Government	20,000	Cash	Asset maintenance plan development
Fiji	Government	376,380	Cash	Develop GIS mapping for riparian zones
Fiji	Government	25,900	Cash	Socio-economic assessment on benefits of flood warnings
Fiji	Government	1,000,000	Cash	Construct warning system, include telecommunications, siren warnings
Fiji	Government	350,000	Cash	Draft basin flood management plan
Fiji	Government	5,000	In-kind	Project Manager and Assistant
Fiji	Government	20,000	In-kind	Office rental, communications, utilities
Fiji	Government	4,000	In-kind	Redesign of project design
Fiji	Government	3,950	In-kind	Salaries for PM and PA
Fiji	Government	98,580	In-kind	Infrastructure, ecological and channel geometry survey
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	50,000	Cash	Communications and awareness strategy for flood warning system
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	50,000	Cash	Development of flood preparedness and response plans
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	50,000	Cash	Determine most appropriate institutional setting
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	25,000	Cash	Drafting ToR for the Nadi Basin Catchment Committee
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	5,000	Cash	Map institutional setup and location of Nadi Basin Catchment Committee
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	5,000	Cash	Identify options for sustainable financing of Basin Catchment Committee
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	5,000	Cash	Develop 5, 10, and 15 year Nadi Basin Catchment Committee duties
Fiji	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Open plan contents through BCC to wider stakeholder consultation
Fiji	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	20,177	Cash	Assessment of equipment needs to upgrade hydro-climate monitoring network
Fiji	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	100,000	Cash	Equipment sourcing and procurement for upgrade hydro-climate monitoring network
Fiji	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	100,000	Cash	Installation and training for hydro-climate monitoring network
Fiji	IUCN	10,000	Cash	Establish Nadi Basin Basin Catchment Committee
Fiji	IUCN	10,000	In-kind	Draft contents of basin flood management plan
Fiji	Live and Learn	26,250	Cash	Stakeholder engagement and consultation/awareness raising
Fiji	Live and Learn	26,250	Cash	Stakeholder workshops
Fiji	Live and Learn	26,250	Cash	Guidelines development and drafting
Fiji	Live and Learn	26,250	Cash	Stakeholder workshops and consultations on the draft guidelines
Fiji	USP	90,000	Cash	Data source and capture
Fiji	USP	90,000	Cash	Model development and integration
Fiji	USP	550,000	Cash	Use of local farms to pilot approaches
Fiji	USP	115,000	Cash	Awareness raising for the Nadi basin catchment committee
Fiji	USP	115,000	Cash	Stakeholder consultation for the Nadi basin catchment committee
Fiji	USP	115,000	Cash	Basin tours for BCC
		4,544,987		

Table 5 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Nauru

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Nauru	Government	50,000	In-kind	Not included
Nauru	Government	1,539,190	Cash	Not included
Nauru	Government	600,000	-	UNFAO RPFS Expansion Phase - construction of water reservoirs
Nauru	Government	12,000	In-kind	Office rental @ US\$200/month
Nauru	Government	1,200	In-kind	Telephone @ US\$20/month
Nauru	Government	9,000	In-kind	Utilities @ US\$150/month
Nauru	Government	1,200	In-kind	Fuel @ 30 litres/week
Nauru	Government	3,500	In-kind	Publishing and printing
Nauru	Government	9,000	In-kind	Technical support and materials for installation of chambers
Nauru	Government	2,000	In-kind	Scientific investigation on sewage pipelines
Nauru	Government	2,000	In-kind	Investigation of borehole treatment of wells
Nauru	Government	3,000	In-kind	Technical and legal support for water sanitation and hygiene policy and planning
Nauru	Government	1,500	In-kind	Technical and legal support for drafting of a national plan
Nauru	Government	2,000	In-kind	Training for 2 officers re installation of twin chambers
Nauru	Government	600	In-kind	Meetings and workshops (15 meetings @US\$1000/workshop)
Nauru	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	Technical and legal support for water sanitation and hygiene policy and planning
Nauru	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	Technical and legal support for drafting of a national plan
Nauru	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Training for 2 officers re installation of twin chambers
Nauru	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	68,791	Cash	Technical support and materials for installation of chambers
Nauru	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	60,000	Cash	Technical support and materials for installation of chambers
Nauru	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	20,000	Cash	Scientific investigation on sewage pipelines
Nauru	FAO	300,000	Cash	Investigation of borehole treatment of wells
		2,734,981		

Table 6 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Niue

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Niue	Government	96,000	Cash	Project Manager \$2000/month
Niue	Government	48,000	Cash	Office rental 48 months @ \$1000/month
Niue	Government	4,800	Cash	Communications @ \$100/month
Niue	Government	7,200	Cash	Utilities @ \$150/month
Niue	Government	8,000	Cash	Workshop/meeting costs (8 SC meetings @ \$1000 per meeting)
Niue	Government	4,000	Cash	Office equipment (computers and equipment)
Niue	Government	4,000	Cash	Software and licences
Niue	Government	1,500	Cash	Data processing
Niue	Government	10,000	Cash	4-wheel drive vehicle
Niue	Government	2,000	Cash	Computer maintenance
Niue	Government	2,000	Cash	Camera equipment maintenance
Niue	Government	10,500	Cash	Vehicle fuel and servicing
Niue	Government	19,000	In-kind	Groundwater and coastal water quality analysis equipment
Niue	Government	10,000	In-kind	Piggery fencing, effluent treatment beds, solid waste composting facility at landfill for piggery effluent management
Niue	Government	5,000	In-kind	Oil interceptors, curbing, drains and pipework for road run-off management (oil interceptors)
Niue	Government	3,000	In-kind	7 water storage tanks to reduce peak demand abstraction rates
Niue	Government	15,000	In-kind	Leakage reduction surveys, repairs, bulk meter usage as part of leakage reduction programme
Niue	Government	5,000	In-kind	Community engagement activities/Conservation and awareness campaign
Niue	Government	20,000	In-kind	Bore tests and analysis
Niue	Government	3,000	In-kind	Land and marine monitoring, surveys and analysis
Niue	Government	2,000	In-kind	Fencing, sheds, cement plinths, flages etc for Borehold Headworks Protection
Niue	Government	2,000	In-kind	Technical and legal support to review and update relevant national legislation
Niue	Government	2,000	In-kind	Technical and legal support to enforce environmental protection regulations
Niue	Government	4,000	In-kind	Technical and legal support to introduce land use planning and groundwater protection zones
Niue	Government	5,000	In-kind	Technical and legal support to implement abstraction licensing and water rights
Niue	Government	1,000	In-kind	Technical and community support for education and community awareness
Niue	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	Technical and legal support to enforce environmental protection regulations
Niue	EU-SOPAC IWRM	20,000	Cash	Technical and legal support to introduce land use planning and groundwater protection zones
Niue	EU-SOPAC IWRM	30,000	Cash	Technical and legal support to implement abstraction licensing and water rights
Niue	EU-SOPAC IWRM	5,000	Cash	Technical and community support for education and community awareness
Niue	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	20,000	Cash	Groundwater and coastal water quality analysis equipment
Niue	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	20,000	Cash	Observation borehole drilling and analysis

Table 6 (cont.) Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Niue

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Niue	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	20,000	Cash	Bore tests and analysis
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WQM	5,000	Cash	Groundwater and coastal water quality analysis equipment
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WQM	25,000	Cash	Land and marine monitoring, surveys and analysis
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	5,000	Cash	Computer modelling equipment and software
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	30,000	Cash	Data loggers, transducers, listening sticks, flow meters for leakage detection
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	5,000	Cash	Publishing and printing
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	25,000	Cash	Leakage reduction surveys, repairs, bulk meter usage as part of leakage reduction programme
Niue	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	5,000	Cash	Community engagement activities/Conservation and awareness campaign
Niue	NZAID	150,000	Cash	Oil interceptors, curbing, drains and pipework for road run-off management (oil interceptors)
Niue	NZAID	100,000	Cash	6 water storage tanks to reduce peak demand abstraction rates
Niue	UNDP TRAC	100,000	Cash	New tanks, effluent treatment for septic tank improvements
Niue	UNDP TRAC	50,000	Cash	Collection bins, composting for solid waste improvements
Niue	UNDP TRAC	1,000,000	Cash	Cement bunds, tanks, pads for fuel oil storage improvements
Niue	UNDP TRAC	5,000	Cash	Waste separation and security for hazardous waste improvements
Niue	UNESCO	15,000	Cash	Technical and legal support to review and update relevant national legislation
Niue	FAO	50,000	Cash	Cement bunds, tanks, sheds, stores, applications, disposal as part of agro-chemical storage and usage
Niue	FAO	25,000	Cash	Piggery fencing, effluent treatment beds, solid waste composting facility at landfill for piggery effluent management
Niue	FAO	25,000	Cash	Irrigation efficiency systems and crop trials
Niue	Government of Venezuela	25,000	Cash	Piggery fencing, effluent treatment beds, solid waste composting facility at landfill for piggery effluent management
Niue	Government of Venezuela	25,000	Cash	Composting and leaching trials, crop quality studies as part of fish processing facility effluent waste usage
Niue	Government of Venezuela	40,000	Cash	Irrigation efficiency systems and crop trials
		2,139,000		

Table 7 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Palau

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Palau	Government	30,000	Cash	Communications
Palau	Government	30,000	Cash	Utilities
Palau	Government	15,000	Cash	Office supplies
Palau	Government	129,600	Cash	25% of full-time salary of water quality lab staff
Palau	Government	30,000	Cash	10% of full-time salary for administrative support staff
Palau	Government	100,000	Cash	10% of full-time salary for intake support staff
Palau	Government	25,000	Cash	Monitoring and travel for pollutant surveys
Palau	Government	5,000	Cash	Chemical survey of river water
Palau	Government	140,400	Cash	Monthly water quality monitoring
Palau	Government	120,000	In-kind	Rental of office space @\$2000/month
Palau	Government	5,000	In-kind	Equipment
Palau	Government	30,000	In-kind	Monitoring and travel for pollutant surveys
Palau	Government	281,500	In-kind	Monthly water quality monitoring
Palau	Government	5,000	In-kind	Mapping and modelling of ecosystem health
Palau	EU-SOPAC IWRM	50,000	Cash	Legislation for watershed protection
Palau	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Water safety plan
Palau	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	298,000	Cash	Development of a water quality monitoring programme
Palau	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	5,000	In-kind	Development of a water quality monitoring programme
Palau	US Forestry Service	280,000	Cash	Connections between forests and rivers
Palau	Palau National Museum	50,000	Cash	Bioindicators and monitoring ecosystem health
Palau	Palau National Museum	100,000	In-kind	Bioindicators and monitoring ecosystem health
Palau	Palau Conservation Society	35,000	Cash	Awareness raising materials, community workshops
Palau	Palau Conservation Society	125,000	In-kind	Awareness raising materials, community workshops
		1,899,500		

Table 8 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Papua New Guinea

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
PNG	Government	200	Cash	Stationary
PNG	Government	2,000	Cash	Airfares and DSA for stakeholders
PNG	Government	1,000	Cash	One-off stakeholder meeting
PNG	Government	2,000	Cash	Fuel
PNG	Government	2,000	Cash	Sensitise local community and stakeholders on ongoing water resources assessment and management activities; public awareness
PNG	Government	2,000	Cash	Socio-economic survey
PNG	Government	3,000	Cash	Identification of locations for additional hydrometric network in the catchment
PNG	Government	30,000	In-kind	Officers from each agency as and when needed
PNG	Government	60,000	In-kind	Office set up and rental
PNG	Government	1,000	In-kind	Tables, chairs, and cabinets
PNG	Government	42,000	In-kind	Utilities at \$700/month
PNG	Government	500	In-kind	Binding machine, photocopier
PNG	Government	500	In-kind	Camping advance; field allowance
PNG	Government	5,000	In-kind	Hydro-geological survey, baseline foundation surveys
PNG	Government	5,000	In-kind	Biodiversity (flora and fauna) surveys
PNG	Government	20,000	In-kind	Identification of locations for additional hydrometric sites in the catchment
PNG	Government	2,000	In-kind	Development of hydrological model for the catchment
PNG	Government	98,400	Cash	Implementation of appropriate methods and technologies for disposal of various waste types
PNG	Government	6,232	Cash	Review all agricultural and industrial land use practices
PNG	Government	10,000	In-kind	Develop a land use plan
PNG	EU-SOPAC IWRM	5,000	Cash	Review of all relevant policies and legislation and make necessary adjustments
PNG	EU-SOPAC IWRM	6,000	Cash	Development of a water use and waste disposal policy
PNG	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	150,000	Cash	Establish stations and collection of data, also train local data collectors
PNG	EU Eda Ranu Rehabilitation Project	20,000	Cash	Data collection and evaluation of the station's operations
PNG	Eda Ranu Water Supply Project	98,270	Cash	Installation of five priority village water supply
PNG	Eda Ranu	272,680	Cash	Development and implementation of a water quality monitoring program
PNG	Eda Ranu	31,920,825	Cash	Upgrade the existing intake structure, water treatment plan and pipeline
PNG	Eda Ranu	112,778	Cash	Upgrade Koiari rural water supply
PNG	Eda Ranu	10,000	In-kind	Development and implementation of a water quality monitoring program
PNG	EU-SOPAC Reducing Vulnerabilities	257,500	In-kind	In-situ testing and surveying; field reconnaissance
PNG	EU-SOPAC Reducing Vulnerabilities	16,000	In-kind	In-situ water quality testing and sampling
		33,161,885		

Table 9 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in the Republic of Marshall Islands

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
RMI	Government	9,000	Cash	Workshop costs and DSA
RMI	Government	628,125	Cash	Install additional toilets, construction of toilets and water catchments
RMI	Government	34,250	Cash	Regular water tests of the underground lens
RMI	Government	188,750	Cash	Construction materials, etc as part of Sewage Disposal Septic Tanks
RMI	Government	45,000	In-kind	Project manager salary
RMI	Government	30,000	In-kind	Project assistant
RMI	Government	50,000	In-kind	Office rental (\$1,000/month)
RMI	Government	18,000	In-kind	Communications (\$300/month)
RMI	Government	12,000	In-kind	Utilities (\$200/month)
RMI	Government	20,000	In-kind	Computers and peripherals
RMI	Government	20,000	In-kind	Truck, bins, solid waste equipment
RMI	Government	10,000	In-kind	Reports to Steering Committee
RMI	Government	5,000	In-kind	Sensitise local, tourist and policy makers
RMI	Government	20,000	In-kind	Workshops, Radio and Journal Advertisements
RMI	Government	10,000	In-kind	Pesticides practices review
RMI	Government	9,000	Cash	Workshop costs and DSA
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Full Laura Water Lens Management Plan
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	80,000	Cash	Study and recommendations, Policy and Regulations Review
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	25,000	Cash	Study and recommendations, Monitoring and Compliance Mechanisms
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	25,000	Cash	Identification of long-term funding, Financial Sustainability Mechanisms
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	10,000	Cash	Community awareness meetings, Public Awareness
RMI	EU-SOPAC IWRM	15,000	In-kind	Full Laura Water Lens Management Plan
RMI	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	56,833	Cash	Hydro-geological survey as part of baseline surveys of site
RMI	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	10,000	Cash	Natural resource and ecosystem survey as part of baseline surveys of site
RMI	NZAID-SOPAC WQM	76,000	Cash	Regular water tests of the underground lens
RMI	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	32,000	Cash	Water Demand Project, inspection of pipes and survey
RMI	SOPAC WHO	30,000	Cash	Plan to detect sources of pollution and provide response as part of Water Safety Plans
RMI	EU-SOPAC Red. Vuln.	1,028,625	Cash	Household tanks
RMI	M.A. Waste Company	300,000	Cash	Trailer etc, solid waste equipment
RMI	M.A. Waste Company	40,000	In-kind	Trailer etc, solid waste equipment
RMI	M.A. Waste Company	20,000	In-kind	Design and planning for solid waste management
RMI	M.A. Waste Company	20,000	In-kind	Options for recovery and recycling, separation of wastes plan
RMI	M.I. Visitors Authority	5,000	In-kind	Sensitise local, tourist and policy makers
RMI	M.I. Visitors Authority	20,000	In-kind	Workshops, Radio and Journal Advertisements
RMI	US Dep. of Agriculture	300,000		Install additional toilets, construction of toilets and water catchments
RMI	US Dep. of Agriculture	40,000		Equipment and tools for leak repair
RMI	US Dep. of Agriculture	50,000		Design and planning consultations for septic tank plan

Table 10 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Samoa

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Samoa	Not indicated	15,000	Cash	Administration
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	Cash	Equipment
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	Cash	Develop a land use plan
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	Cash	Review of the watershed management plan (Vaisigano and Fuluasou)
Samoa	Not indicated	20,000	Cash	Develop watershed conservation Policy and Plan
Samoa	Not indicated	40,000	Cash	Develop a water safety plan for underground and surface water
Samoa	Not indicated	20,000	Cash	Review National Water Resources Policy and finalise national water service policy
Samoa	Not indicated	30,000	Cash	Data collection and update of National Water Resources Information Management System
Samoa	Not indicated	60,000	Cash	Assess impacts of land use (including agricultural, infrastructural developments) on water, soil and biodiversity quality
Samoa	ADB Sanitation Proj.	1,500,000	Cash	Implementation of pilot priority mitigation measures
Samoa	Not indicated	40,000	Cash	Soil, water, and land use monitoring programme
Samoa	Not indicated	100,000	Cash	Development of appropriate eco-tourism activities
Samoa	Not indicated	50,000	Cash	Water demand management
Samoa	Not indicated	30,000	Cash	Awareness, education and capacity development towards watershed users
Samoa	Not indicated	25,000	In-kind	Salaries/Allowances
Samoa	Not indicated	37,000	In-kind	Administration
Samoa	Not indicated	6,000	In-kind	Equipment
Samoa	Not indicated	4,000	In-kind	Review National Water Resources Policy and finalise national water service policy
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	In-kind	Data collection and update of National Water Resources Information Management System
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	In-kind	Assess impacts of land use (including agricultural, infrastructural developments) on water, soil and biodiversity quality
Samoa	Not indicated	10,000	In-kind	Implementation of pilot priority mitigation measures
		2,037,000		

Government = 120,000; EU = 235,000; ADB = 1,500,000; JICA = 100,000; HYCOS = 100,000

Table 11 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in the Solomon Islands

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Solomon Islands	Government	15,960	Cash	Office space rental
Solomon Islands	Government	7,980	Cash	Communications
Solomon Islands	Government	10,000	Cash	Quarterly stakeholder meetings
Solomon Islands	Government	11,970	Cash	Utilities
Solomon Islands	Government	25,000	Cash	Water quality equipment, analysis
Solomon Islands	Government	10,000	Cash	4 wheel drive vehicle
Solomon Islands	Government	12,500	Cash	Fuel and servicing
Solomon Islands	Government	10,000	Cash	Natural resource and ecosystem survey
Solomon Islands	Government	10,000	Cash	Honiara waste disposal
Solomon Islands	Government	10,000	Cash	Sewage disposal
Solomon Islands	Government	45,000	Cash	Design and planning consultations for preliminary plans
Solomon Islands	Government	60,000	Cash	Adoption of Protected Zones
Solomon Islands	Government	165,000	Cash	Adoption of Honiara watershed/aquifer management plan
Solomon Islands	Government	115,000	Cash	Policy and legislative review
Solomon Islands	Government	220,000	Cash	Monitoring and compliance mechanisms
Solomon Islands	Government	60,000	Cash	Reports and guidelines
Solomon Islands	Government	152,636	Cash	Not indicated
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	85,000	Cash	Review Water Safety Plan for Honiara City
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC IWRM	130,000	Cash	Develop Water Safety Plan for Honiara and Solomon Islands
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	25,000	Cash	Computers, software, office equipment and backup services
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	25,000	Cash	Water level, rain-gauge, flow and pressure loggers
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	50,000	Cash	Hydrogeological survey
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	75,000	Cash	Kongulai catchment studies
Solomon Islands	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	58,440	Cash	Water balance study
Solomon Islands	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	220,000	Cash	Wastage and leakage detection survey
Solomon Islands	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	160,000	Cash	Develop Water Use Efficiency Plan for Honiara
Solomon Islands	Australian Water Research Facility	50,000	In-kind	Design and planning consultations for preliminary plans
Solomon Islands	Australian Water Research Facility	50,000	In-kind	Policy and legislative review
Solomon Islands	Australian Water Research Facility	50,000	In-kind	Reports and guidelines
Solomon Islands	Australian Water Research Facility	24,311	In-kind	Awareness and education
		1,943,797		

Table 12 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Tonga

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Tonga	Government	19,440	Cash	Project manager salary
Tonga	Government	7,560	Cash	Project assistant salary
Tonga	Government	30,000	Cash	Office rental
Tonga	Government	900	Cash	Utilities
Tonga	Government	12,000	Cash	Laptop, printer, desktop
Tonga	Government	1,000	Cash	Software and licenses
Tonga	Government	3,600	Cash	Stationary
Tonga	Government	4,500	Cash	Maintenance of computers etc
Tonga	Government	8,000	Cash	PMU travel
Tonga	Government	1,000	Cash	Travel to meetings
Tonga	Government	2,500,000	In-kind	Not indicated
Tonga	Government	6,000,000	Cash	Not indicated
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	15,000	Cash	Establish and implement resource management legislation and Neiafu Water Management Plan
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	3,000	Cash	Develop effective enforcement system
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	12,000	Cash	Identification of long-term funding/financial sustainability mechanism
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	12,000	Cash	Financial and sustainability training for all water communities
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	6,000	Cash	Monitoring and evaluation undertaken by stakeholders within the project
Tonga	EU-SOPAC IWRM	2,000	Cash	Monitoring and evaluation of project activities
Tonga	Not indicated	3,000	Cash	Agricultural practices review
Tonga	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	79000	Cash	Not indicated
Tonga	EU-SOPAC Red. Vul.	1,000,000	Cash	Not indicated
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	Wastewater practices review
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	Identification of leakages, survey water wastage and leaks,
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	On-site demonstrations to minimise impacts of sewage and liquid waste practices
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	Literature review and set-up database of information/health statistics
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	Participatory ecological and socio-economic surveys
Tonga	Not indicated		Cash	Community consultations
		9,720,000		

Table 13 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Tuvalu

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Tuvalu	Government	67,200	In-kind	Office rental and utilities
Tuvalu	Government	400,000	Not clear	Not clear
Tuvalu	Government	500,000	Not clear	Not clear
Tuvalu	EU-SOPAC IWRM	50,000	Cash	
Tuvalu	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	50,000	Cash	
Tuvalu	EU-SOPAC Reducing Vulnerabilities	850,000		
Tuvalu	AusAID	585,000	Cash	Construction and installation of household rainwater tanks
Tuvalu	AusAID	415,000	Cash	Implementation of Tuvalu's Water and Sanitation Strategy
Tuvalu	Alofa Tuvalu Association	200,000	In-kind	Training centre support
		3,117,200		

Table 14 Summary of co-financing identified for the National IWRM Demonstration Project in Vanuatu

Country	Source	Amount (USD)	Cash or In-kind	Description
Vanuatu	Government	63,050	Cash	Repair pipes, leak detection to be actioned
Vanuatu	Government	2,400	Cash	Gazette and implement water protection zones
Vanuatu	Government	8,639	In-kind	Office rental at 15000vt/month
Vanuatu	Government	31,820	In-kind	Salaries
Vanuatu	Government	11,749	In-kind	Subsistence allowance
Vanuatu	Government	5,759	In-kind	Office rental
Vanuatu	Government	622	In-kind	Communications
Vanuatu	Government	58,589	In-kind	Vehicle in Santo
Vanuatu	Government	192	In-kind	Data processing and preparation of report
Vanuatu	Government	960	In-kind	Data processing and preparation of maps
Vanuatu	Government	192	In-kind	Planning strategies and mechanisms
Vanuatu	Government	480	In-kind	Identify policies and plans
Vanuatu	Government	288	In-kind	Identify monitoring, evaluation, reflection and learning strategies
Vanuatu	EU-SOPAC HYCOS	28,796	Cash	Equipment, installation, monitoring, travel for upgrade telemetric monitoring system
Vanuatu	NZAID-SOPAC WQM	17,998	Cash	Water quality monitoring capacity building for PICs
Vanuatu	NZAID-SOPAC WDM	71,991	Cash	Training given by DGMWR during development and installation of all water supplies
Vanuatu	NZAID	33,025	Cash	Establish and implement legislation and Sarakata watershed management plan
Vanuatu	NZAID	33,025	Cash	Compensation policy and delivery
Vanuatu	NZAID	33,025	Cash	Local resource use policy and plans
Vanuatu	NZAID	33,025	Cash	Develop effective enforcement system
Vanuatu	AusAID	29,099	Cash	Train the trainer workshops
Vanuatu	JICA	7,100,000	Cash	Installing third turbine to provide for sustainable hydro power
Vanuatu	Live and Learn	5,790	Cash	Regional education and awareness program as part of river care awareness
Vanuatu	Live and Learn	13,330	Cash	Regional education and awareness program to improve safety of water supply
Vanuatu	Live and Learn	47,400	Cash	Community education for building sustainable futures
Vanuatu	Live and Learn	36,000	In-kind	Regional education and awareness program as part of river care awareness
Vanuatu	Live and Learn	2,470	In-kind	Regional education and awareness program to improve safety of water supply
Vanuatu	Not indicated	4,912	Cash	Train communities - sustainable farming practices, soil erosion control, organic fertiliser
Vanuatu	Not indicated	9,823	Cash	Deforestation for cattle ranching, reforestation awareness
Vanuatu	Not indicated	4,912	Cash	Finding new land uses eg water intensive taro, promoting land uses that reduce impact on water quality, ecology and biodiversity
		7,689,361		

ANNEX 7

Table 1 Detailed budget for the UNDP component of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project

Activity Description from AWP with Duration	Coding for UNDP	Actual (up to 30/06/10)	Balance (as at 30/06/10)	Quarter 3, 2010	Quarter 4, 2010	Half Yr 2010	Quarter 1, 2011	Quarter 2, 2011	Quarter 3, 2011	Quarter 4, 2011	Full Yr 2011	Cumulative End 2011
International Consultants	71200											
International Consultants - Short term - Technical	71205	8,515	519,419	55,953	83,929	139,882	49,549	69,368	39,639	39,639	198,195	346,591
International Consultants - Short term - Support	71210	268	97,376	5,311	7,966	13,276	9,225	12,915	7,380	7,380	36,900	50,444
Local Consultants	71300											
Local Consultants - Short term - Technical	71305	68,605	1,247,407	135,439	203,158	338,597	109,647	153,506	87,717	87,717	438,587	845,789
Local Consultants - Short term - Support	71310	57,713	163,413	10,625	15,938	26,563	11,638	16,293	9,310	9,310	46,550	130,826
Contractual Services - Individuals	71400											
Service Contracts - Individuals	71405	260,743	1,031,626	69,486	104,230	173,716	73,003	102,204	58,402	58,402	292,010	726,469
Travel	71600											
Travel Tickets - International	71605	28,603	60,434	4,014	6,021	10,034	3,950	5,530	3,160	3,160	15,800	54,437
Travel Tickets - Local	71610	3,116	63,677	11,313	16,970	28,284	1,699	2,379	1,360	1,360	6,798	38,197
Daily Subsistence Allowance - International	71615	10,585	21,880	1,795	2,693	4,488	2,033	2,846	1,626	1,626	8,131	23,204
Daily Subsistence Allowance - Local	71620	3,524	15,933	3,122	4,683	7,805	389	544	311	311	1,555	12,884
Daily Subsistence Allowance - Meeting Participants	71625	9,928	1,450	-160	-240	-400	363	508	290	290	1,450	10,977
Shipment	71630	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Travel - Other	71635	11,220	47,884	6,599	9,899	16,498	3,667	5,134	2,934	2,934	14,668	42,387
General Operating Expenses	72000											
Contractual Services - Companies	72100											
Svc Co - Natural Resources & Environmental Services	72115	78,865	543,707	46,335	69,502	115,837	45,205	63,287	36,164	36,164	180,820	375,522
Svc Co - Trade and Business Services	72120	46,770	28,664	4,165	6,248	10,414	2,375	3,325	1,900	1,900	9,500	66,684
Svc Co - Studies and Research Services	72125	9,000	54,600	11,200	16,800	28,000	6,400	8,960	5,120	5,120	25,600	62,600
Svc Co - Transportation Services	72130	3,309	14,619	5,848	8,771	14,619	0	0	0	0	0	17,928
Svc Co - Communications Services	72135	6,071	29,820	2,690	4,035	6,725	2,013	2,819	1,611	1,611	8,054	20,850
Svc Co - Information Technology Svcs	72140	9,780	19,853	1,941	2,912	4,853	1,250	1,750	1,000	1,000	5,000	19,633
Svc Co - Training and Education Services	72145	16,417	90,141	9,056	13,585	22,641	5,375	7,525	4,300	4,300	21,500	60,558
Equipment and Furniture	72200											
Office Equipment	72205	47,792	32,087	9,955	14,932	24,887	600	840	480	480	2,400	75,079

Activity Description from AWP with Duration	Coding for UNDP	Actual (up to 30/06/10)	Balance (as at 30/06/10)	Quarter 3, 2010	Quarter 4, 2010	Half Yr 2010	Quarter 1, 2011	Quarter 2, 2011	Quarter 3, 2011	Quarter 4, 2011	Full Yr 2011	Cumulative End 2011
Audio Visual Productions	74205	4,041	6,825	750	1,125	1,875	413	578	330	330	1,650	7,566
Printing and Publications	74210	2,436	266,564	40,193	60,290	100,483	18,959	26,542	15,167	15,167	75,834	178,753
Promotional Materials and distribution	74215	17,548	153,581	18,902	28,354	47,256	10,841	15,177	8,673	8,673	43,364	108,168
Translation Costs	74220	378	-0	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	378
Other Media Costs	74225	9,741	-0	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	9,741
Miscellaneous Expenses	74500											
Insurance	74505	0	4,550	830	1,245	2,075	206	289	165	165	825	2,900
Bank charges	74510	737	351	21	31	51	25	35	20	20	100	888
Storage	74520	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sundry	74525	32,591	56,742	9,260	13,890	23,150	3,039	4,255	2,431	2,431	12,157	67,898
Total		1,043,786	5,684,105	642,924	964,386	1,607,310	450,305	630,427	360,244	360,244	1,801,219	4,452,315

Table 2 Five-year budget including co-financing for the UNEP components of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project (2009-2013)

OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE		EXPENDITURE BY YEAR (PROJECT FUNDS)						CO-FINANCING BY COMPONENT				GRAND TOTAL		
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total	Project Component			Total	Funds	Co-fin.	Total
		US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	2	3	4	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$
PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT														
1100	Project Personnel w/m													
1101	Project Coordinator (60 w/m)	119,573	120,000	125,000	130,000	130,000	624,573		0		0	624,573	0	624,573
1102	Environmental Engineer/Manager (36 w/m)*	27,995	50,000	109,200	54,600	0	241,795	0	72800	0	72,800	241,795	72,800	314,595
1103	Community Assessment and Participation (36 w/m)**	42,428	48,000	50,600		0	141,028	0	163800	0	163,800	141,028	163,800	304,828
1104	Mainstreaming and Indicator Adviser (36 w/m)*	7,007	50,000	54,600	40,950	0	152,557	0	163800	0	163,800	152,557	163,800	316,357
1199	Total	197,002	268,000	339,400	225,550	130,000	1,159,952	0	400,400	0	400,400	1,159,952	400,400	1,560,352
1200	Providers													
1201	IWRM Planning Adviser						0		211,141		211,141	0	211,141	211,141
1202	IWRM Country Planning Specialist						0		180,000		180,000	0	180,000	180,000
1203	Training Specialists	0	10,000	10,000			20,000		120,000		120,000	20,000	120,000	140,000
1204	Communications Adviser						0		120,000		120,000	0	120,000	120,000
1205	Pollution Specialist						0				0	0	0	0
1206	Policy Support Specialists						0	28,000	191,557		219,557	0	219,557	219,557
1207	Hydrologists						0	241,000	38,256	329,744	609,000	0	609,000	609,000
1208	Hydrogeologists						0	82,000		133,314	215,314	0	215,314	215,314
1209	Water Quality Specialists						0	101,309		240,463	341,772	0	341,772	341,772
1210	Water Demand Mgmt Specialists						0	132,709	100,000	99,063	331,772	0	331,772	331,772
1211	Water Safety planners/Health Specialists						0	439,280	239,280	200,000	878,560	0	878,560	878,560
1212	Legal Specialist						0	15,000	125,000		140,000	0	140,000	140,000
1213	Partnership Facilitators						0	35,000	38,000		73,000	0	73,000	73,000
1214	National Plan Advisers						0	24,000	67,000		91,000	0	91,000	91,000
1215	Resource Economists						0	62,000	14,114		76,114	0	76,114	76,114
1216	National IWRM Support coordinators (x14)						0		893,001		893,001	0	893,001	893,001
1299	Total	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	20,000	1,160,298	2,337,349	1,002,584	4,500,231	20,000	4,500,231	4,520,231
1300	Administrative support w/m													
1301	Senior Administration and Travel Officer (60 w/m)	11,625	22,222	22,222	22,222	22,222	100,513				0	100,513	0	100,513
1399	Total	11,625	22,222	22,222	22,222	22,222	100,513	0	0	0	0	100,513	0	100,513
1400	Volunteers w/m													
1401														
1499	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1600	Travel on official business (above staff)													
1601														
1602	International Travel	24,121	54,000	50,000	40,000	40,000	208,121	41,000	477,500		518,500	208,121	518,500	726,621
1699	Total	24,121	54,000	50,000	40,000	40,000	208,121	41,000	477,500	0	518,500	208,121	518,500	726,621
1999	Component Total	232,748	354,222	421,622	287,772	192,222	1,488,586	1,201,298	3,215,249	1,002,584	5,419,131	1,488,586	5,419,131	6,907,717

Table 2(cont.)

Five-year budget including co-financing for the UNEP components of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project (2009-2013)

OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE		EXPENDITURE BY YEAR (PROJECT FUNDS)					CO-FINANCING BY COMPONENT				GRAND TOTAL			
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total	Project Component			Total	Funds	Co-fin.	Total
		US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	2	3	4	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$
SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT														
2100	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for UN agencies)													
2101														
2199	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2200	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for non-profit organisations)													
2201														
2299	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	Sub-contracts (commercial purposes)													
2301	HELP Consultants Catchment Mgmt								250,000		250,000	0	250,000	250,000
2399	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250,000	0	250,000	0	250,000	250,000
2999	Component Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250,000	0	250,000	0	250,000	250,000
TRAINING COMPONENT														
3100	Fellowships (total stipend/fees, travel costs)													
3101														
3199	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3200	Group training (study tours, workshops etc)													
3201	Monitoring and Evaluation	0	2,500	2,500			5,000		20,008			5,000	0	5,000
3202	Awareness and Communications	764	10,000	15,000			25,764					25,764	0	25,764
3203	Twinning and Learning	0	10,000	17,500	15,000		42,500		21,701			42,500	0	42,500
3204	Indicator Training, Data Handling, Baseline Devt'	721	0	0	0	0	721	80,000			80,000	721	80,000	80,721
3205	Community Mgmt Workshops	558	7,500	7,500			15,558					15,558	0	15,558
3206	CPD Training Programme	0	6,000	6,000		0	12,000	18,000	24,957		42,957	12,000	42,957	54,957
3299	Total	2,043	36,000	48,500	15,000	0	101,543	98,000	66,666	0	164,666	101,543	164,666	266,209
3300	Meetings/conferences													
3301	Steering Committee Meetings	46,707	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	266,707		27,600		27,600	266,707	27,600	294,307
3302	Support to Regional TAG Meetings	0	15,000		15,000		30,000		21,000		21,000	30,000	21,000	51,000
3303	Management Missions	3,293	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	22,293					22,293	0	22,293
3304	Attendance at Global Meetings	7,044	4,000	4,000	5,000	4,000	24,044					24,044	0	24,044
3399	Total	57,044	78,000	64,000	80,000	64,000	343,044	0	48,600	0	48,600	343,044	48,600	391,644
3999	Component Total	59,087	114,000	112,500	95,000	64,000	444,587	98,000	115,266	0	213,266	444,587	213,266	657,853
EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT														
4100	Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500)													
4101	Office supplies	3,526	4,000	4,000	3,000	3,000	17,526		14,400		14,400	17,526	14,400	31,926
4102	Awareness/Education Materials	0	4,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	10,000					10,000	0	10,000
4199	Total	3,526	8,000	6,000	5,000	5,000	27,526	0	14,400	0	14,400	27,526	14,400	41,926
4200	Non-expendable equipment													
4201	Office equipment	18,370	4,000	4,000	4,000		30,370		26,000		26,000	30,370	26,000	56,370
4202	Office Equipment Maintenance	0	800	500	500	500	2,300					2,300	0	2,300
4203	Database Equipment	0	0				0			40,000	40,000	0	40,000	40,000
4204	Field work equipment	0	0				0	145,000	49,400	1,923,399	2,117,799	0	2,117,799	2,117,799
4299	Total	18,370	4,800	4,500	4,500	500	32,670	145,000	75,400	1,963,399	2,183,799	32,670	2,183,799	2,216,469

