



SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RTAG.5/1
Date: 28th July 2011
Original: English

Fifth Meeting of the Regional Technical Advisory Group
for the SOPAC/UNDP/UNEP/GEF Project:
*"Implementing Sustainable Water Resources and Wastewater
Management in Pacific Island Countries"*

Rarotonga Island, Cook Islands, 28th July 2011

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA
REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP (RTAG) 5TH MEETING**

1 OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome

1.2 Apologies

2 RTAG MEETING MINUTES

The Provisional minutes of the RTAG's 4th Session were adopted unchanged in the RSC.

3 ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Action	Lead	When	Status
1. Changes would be made to the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to incorporate RTAG comments and any RSC direction for consideration at RTAG5, to enable RSC approval of the framework at RSC3	David Duncan	RTAG5	RTAG Agenda Item
2. PCU would present a draft version of the regional indicator framework to the RSC for consideration, incorporating a review of the framework against GEF and GWP criteria	David Duncan	RSC3	Completed
3. A recommendation would be made to RSC that applicable WUE principles will be incorporated into national IWRM planning strategies rather than as specific separate strategies	David Duncan	RSC3	Completed
4. A recommendation be made to RSC to recognise that WUE strategies need to be developed in the context of improving social, economic and environmental values, which will differ at a local, catchment, island and	David Duncan	RSC3	Completed

national scale			
5. Advice RSC to support an analysis of WUE approaches applicable to the Pacific be undertaken, considering different drivers and needs of atolls with limited water resources and larger islands with more abundant resources, as well as considering both options for WUE in urban centralised systems and at a household level	David Duncan	RSC3	Completed
6. Comments are to be provided on the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and the framework to be presented to RSC for approval	RTAG Members	Thursday AM	None Received

4 PROJECT INDICATOR FRAMEWORK

Changes made to incorporate the comments tabled in the Draft framework presented at RTAG4

Table 1 RTAG Comments on the PMEF

Section	Comment	PCU Recommended Response
General	It might be useful to consider the GEF classification in assessing progress: Highly Satisfactory; S ; Moderately S, Moderately UnS; UnS, Highly UnS. These ratings pertain to overall project but may be adopted to demo site activities and the numerical equivalents could apply. The advantage is that we use these categories when filling in the annual PIR, the upcoming mid-term Evaluation and the Terminal Evaluation. If this is too late to consider, the current rating scheme should be converted into the above.	Worked through the regional indicators
Target "Strategies in place"	May need to qualify this in the legal context of each country. In place may simply mean endorsement by the government or it could mean that it becomes a legal document. In both cases particularly in the latter, political processes would be determining factors but which the project would not have direct influence. We should be careful about what we promise here.	Agree – Is the current combination of wording and targets considered appropriate
Target 1 "National Strategies in place"	National vs local IWRM and WUE strategies. While national level strategies should be strived for, consider local level strategies as interim targets. This would mean also that the other indicator on budget allocation is measured at the local level. This suggestion would have relevance for the bigger SIDS where the demonstration site is relatively a small part of the country and where adoption of strategies and budget allocations are done at the local level.	Seeking RTAG comment given the core nature of this indicator in project outcomes

Section	Comment	PCU Recommended Response
Target 2 Proposed Indicator 3 “Best IWRM and WUE approaches assessed”	<p>It seems to me that this should be done in the context of Target 1 on developing national strategies. The results of the assessment could be inputs in formulating the strategies.</p> <p>In terms of mainstreaming, my understanding is that the IWRM and WUE plans and strategies should be mainstreamed into the broader local (again) and national planning frameworks so it that these would not remain as a sectoral plans/strategies.</p> <p>Suggestion – rephrase the log frame target and the corresponding indicators to mean Mainstreaming of the IWRM and WUE strategies and plans into the broader local, national and regional planning frameworks...</p>	Proposed Indicator 4 deals with this to some extent – is there need for a change or further clarification?
Target 3 Proposed indicator 5 “Increase in land protected and/or rehabilitated over catchment”	<p>Suggest breaking this down into two indicators to provide flexibility:</p> <p>a) Existence of formal policy statement through legislation or other appropriate legal instruments setting aside land for watershed protection and rehabilitation. You might want to refer to the IUCN categories here.</p> <p>b) Extent of protection and rehabilitation done in the area.</p> <p>It is conceivable that the first indicator may be ‘limiting’ considering conflicting interests over use of scarce land. However, even pending such, some rehabilitation/protection may be done and this could be captured in this indicator.</p>	Seeking RTAG thoughts
Target 4 “over eq.~40,000 ha area ”	<p>The specification here is more spatial. At the same time, the target may also interpreted in terms of volume reduction. It may be useful to consider the impact of any intervention in the demo site on the number of people served. Using parameters on per capita waste, the volume reduction could be readily measured. Where interventions are made in heavily populated areas, the impacts would be greater in terms of volume reduction compared to area covered.</p> <p>If measured this way, this could be cross-referenced to Target 6</p>	Seek RTAG thoughts – unfortunately due to original convoluted targets

5 REGIONAL INDICATOR FRAMEWORK

RSC tasked RTAG with developing a reporting format for the Regional Indicator Framework by March 2012.

6 TECHNICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

From the RSC, RTAG is to identify:

- Areas of technical expertise for review of country demonstration project technical outputs
- A process for review of country demonstration project technical outputs

7 TECHNICAL REPLICATION

Participants are invited to consider and discuss options and approve an approach for replicating technical innovation and knowledge in the Pacific region, including the development of a regional replication strategy and options for non-institutional replication and capacity building.

8 WATER USE EFFICIENCY

RSC tasked RTAG with an analysis of WUE approaches applicable to the Pacific be undertaken, considering different drivers and needs of atolls with limited water resources and larger islands with more abundant resources, as well as considering both options for WUE in urban centralised systems and at a household level.

9 REALLOCATION

RSC tasked RTAG with developing criteria for assessing reallocation funding applications

10 CLOSURE OF THE MEETING