TERMINAL EVALUATION

GEF/UNDP/SPREP STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (RAS/98/G32)

16 February 2007

Final Report

Fox, A. Tiraa, A. Raaymakers, S.

A cooperative initiative of

the Global Environment Facility, the United Nations Development Program and

the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Program

PREFACE

This constitutes the final report for the Terminal Evaluation of the *Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States* (RAS/98/G32). The project is sponsored by the Global Environmental Facility, implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its regional office in Samoa, and executed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). This report is delivered in accordance with the Terms of Reference for the assignment developed by UNDP. The report is the result of an independent evaluation carried out during May 2006–February 2007. The evaluation included a mission in May–June 2006 to 7 of the 14 IWP pilot countries. The evaluation was initially planned for completion in July 2006. Scheduling conflicts of the evaluation team forced a lengthy extension of the project review period. The draft evaluation report was submitted to UNDP on 23 November, 2006. On January 17–18, 2007, an evaluation review meeting was held at SPREP in Apia, attended by representatives of the participating countries, SPREP and the Evaluation Team Leader. This final report has been revised taking into account the comments received at the evaluation review meeting, and written comments received on the draft report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES:

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
APR	Annual Project/Program Report
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BAT	best available technology
BEP	best environmental practices
CAPAC	Community Assessment and Participation Advisory Committee
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	community-based organizations
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation (PNG)
DRD	Department of Resources and Development (Yap State, FSM)
EA	Executing Agency
EC	European Commission
EPA	Environment Protection Agency
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
EUR	Euro
FAD	fisheries aggregation device
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
FSPI	Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
HoD	Head of Delegation
IA	Implementing Agency
IC	incremental costs (as defined by GEF)
ICARE	Integrated Community Approach for Resources and the Environment
ICWM	integrated coastal and watershed management
IFI	International Financing Institution
ISWMP	Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (Palau)
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IWP	International Waters Program
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LA	Lead Agency
LEARN	Learning Exchange and Resource Network
LF	Logical Framework
LMMA	locally managed marine area
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MAFFM	Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries and Meteorology (Samoa)
MNRE	Ministry of the Natural Resources and the Environment
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	marine protected area
MPR	Multipartite Review
MTE	Mid-term Evaluation
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NC	National Coordinator
NCM	National Coordinator Meeting
NEX	National Execution Procedures (UNDP)
NGO	non-government organization

NTF	National Task Force
OEPPC	Office of Environmental Policy and Project Coordination
OFM	oceanic fisheries management
OP	Operational Program (GEF)
PAC	Project Appraisal Committee (UNDP)
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project
PCU	Project Coordination Unit (SPREP IWP)
PDF-B	Project Development Facility (GEF)
PEC	Priority Environmental Concerns
PICCAP	Pacific Islands Climate Change Adaptation Project
PICs	Pacific Island countries
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PPA	participatory problem analysis
PPER	Project Performance and Evaluation Report
PROCFish	Pacific Regional Oceanic and Coastal Fisheries Management Programme
ProDoc	IWP Project Document
PSA	participatory situation analysis
RAP	remedial action plan
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
RTF	Regional Task Force
SAP	Strategic Action Plan (International Waters)
SAPHE	ADB Sanitation and Public Health Project, Kiribati
SPBCP	South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Project
SIDS	small island developing states
SOPAC	Secretariat of the Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission
SPBCP	South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Project
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSWMP	Tonga Solid Waste Management Project
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDOALOS	UN Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UPNG	University of Papua New Guinea
USD	United States dollar
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Heath Organization
WCCD	World Congress on Communications for Development
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report constitutes the Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States (the International Waters Program, or IWP). It has been carried out in accordance with guidelines established by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and covers the issues set out in the TE Terms of Reference (TOR) developed by the UNDP Mulitcountry Office in Samoa (see Annex B).

2. IWP was an initiative involving 14 independent Pacific Island countries[1] (PICs). It was implemented by UNDP and executed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP). IWP includes two linked, yet independently operated, components: integrated coastal and watershed management (ICWM); and oceanic fisheries management (OFM). The OFM component was subcontracted to the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). Only the ICWM component is covered in this evaluation.

3. The project was conceived in January, 1998 with a draft GEF Project Brief for IWP prepared by SPREP. The Project Document (ProDoc) was signed by UNDP and SPREP in February 2000. An IWP Program Manager was recruited, and in September 2000 IWP implementation commenced. The 14 country programs were launched in 2002 and early 2003. As a consequence of the delayed start-up of country pilot activities, the original scheduled IWP completion date of December 2004 was extended by 26 months to February 2006. This time extension required no additional GEF funding.

Key Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations

4. IWP represents a notable effort to utilize GEF funding in support of community-based natural resource management in the Pacific Islands. The project had a broad scope, connecting integrated coastal waters resources management and ocean fisheries issues across 14 island states spanning 38.5 million km^2 of mostly open sea. Yet the project was also focused, concentrating on ICWM pilot activities undertaken in individual communities.

5. IWP achieved important lessons for small island developing states (SIDS). IWP has demonstrated the effectiveness of using participatory processes and innovative communication strategies to address the root causes of environmental degradation. The project made a lasting contribution in the region by helping to expand public understanding of environmental issues; more importantly, it served to empower community members to become directly involved in environmental protection efforts. The project successfully introduced and expanded the use of social and economic diagnostic tools, enabling participating countries to better understand the root causes of environmental degradation, and their social and economic consequences.

6. The late commencement of community pilot activities made it difficult for the PICs to achieve all their objectives with respect to solid and liquid waste management, coastal fisheries recovery, and water resource protection. Nevertheless, there is cause for optimism as the final months of the project have brought strong signals from many of the PICs that they are committed to folding the lessons and techniques from IWP into their ongoing natural resource protection programs, and using the piloted tools and techniques in other communities. Most of the PICs have succeeded in drafting strategies and legislation for consideration by their cabinets and parliaments.

7. For many of the PICs, the most acute coastal resource problems relate to the improper discharge of wastewater effluent. However, the subject was given less attention by IWP than solid waste and coastal fisheries. Sanitation-related efforts during IWP were essentially limited to a few demonstration projects involving waterless composting toilets. Given that IWP did not include an investment budget and was focused on empowering communities to take direct action on coastal water pollution issues, it is not

[1] The 14 Pacific Island States that qualify for GEF support are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

surprising that the more complex and costly issues associated with wastewater pollution control received less attention. Nevertheless, there is an immediate, urgent need, especially on the atolls, such as Funafuti (Tuvalu), Tarawa (Kiribati) and Majuro (Marshall Islands), to develop cost-effective sanitation strategies. The human health and environmental consequences from polluted ground and surface waters are obvious, and there is an expectation that increasing weather volatility from climate change will further strain existing inadequate systems. PICs anticipate that the upcoming GEF/SOPAC Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) project will help them implement new strategies for addressing water supply and sanitation needs. The IWRM project needs to be linked to one or more investment facilities, however, so that PICs have the financial means to carry out the strategies devised through the project.

8. Private-sector participation was not pronounced in the design and implementation of IWP, but good examples were developed of effective partnerships in solid waste recycling, and in the development of new income sources to offset economic losses from locally-managed marine protected areas.

9. PICs successfully involved community-based organizations (CBOs) in their community efforts; in particular, several of the pilot projects working on waste management issues benefited greatly from the voluntary participation of local women's committees. Non-government organizations (NGOs) working on environmental issues were not heavily involved in project implementation across the region, although most countries included one or more NGOs on their National Task Forces. The project design purposefully established national government management of these community efforts, in order to stimulate wider replication and lead to national policy change. Each of the countries had the choice to involve NGOs for training and other community interventions, but few chose to do so. The fact that NGOs were not significant partners in IWP implementation suggests (i) capacity limitations on the part of local NGOs, (ii) a limited presence in the region by international NGOs, and (iii) limited interest from PIC governments to expand the involvement and competence of NGOs. The lack of NGO capacity and involvement presents both a challenge and an opportunity for future donor assistance projects in the region.

10. IWP was designed to include activities for approaching donors towards the end of the project to discuss new sources of support for IWP interventions. The planned donor conference was not convened. PICs are in real danger of losing momentum on their IWP efforts, unless they work with SPREP now to make donor contacts, develop project pipelines, and take concepts to the project document/feasibility stage.

2 CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

11. As indicated in the TOR, the TE has been commissioned in order to:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes.
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes.
- Critically analyse the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation.
- Assess the sustainability of results achieved.
- Provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success.
- Provide recommendations on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature and, identify, document and disseminate widely the successes, challenges and lessons learned.
- Advise on activities in place for a transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability of IWP initiatives after February 2006.
- Assess the need for possible future GEF assistance and provide guidance for future GEF interventions in the Pacific (including mechanisms, scale and themes).

2.1 Evaluation Methodology and Structure

12. The evaluation is included as a key deliverable within the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities of IWP, consistent with GEF and UNDP standard practices for large multi-year and multi-

country projects. As stipulated in the TOR, the evaluation team utilized a stakeholder interview methodology for the evaluation. SPREP selected nine participating countries for visitation by the evaluation team. The mission to these sites was carried out from May 23 to June 30, 2006. During the mission, travel difficulties precluded a stop in Honiara, Solomon Islands; consequently only eight countries were visited: Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu, Fiji, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Marshall Islands and Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). The evaluation team held interviews with approximately 100 project stakeholders and participants. The mission itinerary, information on field visits and a list of persons interviewed are annexed to this report, along with a list of documents reviewed (Annexes C-E).

13. Prior to the evaluation mission, background documents were reviewed (Annex F), and questionnaires were sent to the national coordinators and key stakeholders, including consultants who had worked on IWP. The questionnaire and a brief review of responses are included in Annex G. In addition to the main text, the draft TE Report also provides a brief report on each of the pilot projects (see Annex A).

3 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

14. IWP is an initiative involving 14 independent PICs.[2] The project was conceived in early August, 1995, when UNDP, SPREP and the Government of Australia co-financed a GEF Pacific Regional training and scoping workshop in Nandi, Fiji. It was agreed at the workshop to prepare a regional proposal to GEF focusing on ICWM. In October of that year, the Draft Regional Proposal was endorsed and GEF funds were procured for a consultation process and preparation of a regional Strategic Action Plan (SAP). By the end of August 1997, the draft regional SAP was finalized. The SAP was then endorsed by Heads of Government at the 28th South Pacific Forum, held in the Cook Islands 15-19 September, 1997.

15. In January, 1998 a draft GEF Project Brief for IWP was prepared by SPREP. The Project Brief was sent to the GEF Secretariat for consideration at the July 1998 GEF Council Meeting. The project was approved in late 1999, and the document was signed by UNDP and SPREP in February 2000. In July 2000, the IWP Program Manager was recruited and in September 2000, the IWP commenced implementation. In January, 2001, a Project Inception Report was developed, and in March of that year, the first Regional Task Force (RTF) meeting was held at SPREP. From April onwards, the Program Manager and other Program Coordination Unit (PCU) staff made visits to all participating countries and prepared MOU documentation and budgets for sign-off. The 14 country programs were launched in 2002 and early 2003. During the course of the project, the IWP Multipartite Review (MPR) — consisting of UNDP, SPREP and the lead agencies — has met annually. A Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the project was carried out mid-year 2003.

16. The originally scheduled IWP completion date of December 2004 was extended twice: initially to December 2006, and then until the end of February 2007. The extensions were approved by UNDP and the members of the IWP MPR, in recognition of the additional time necessary for the countries to carry out local and national program activities. No additional GEF funding was required for these extensions.

17. IWP was managed by the PCU, through SPREP, and based at SPREP headquarters in Apia, Samoa. The country pilot projects were managed at the national level in all but one PIC (for FSM, the pilot project was carried out on the island of Yap, at the state level). Environmental or natural resource ministries and agencies served as the Lead Agency (LA) in each country. Each project was managed on a day-to-day basis by a National Coordinator (NC) and support staff, funded through the IWP.

3.1 Problems the Project Sought to Address

18. The aim of IWP was to strengthen the management and conservation of marine, coastal and freshwater resources in the Pacific Islands region. The IWP Project Document (ProDoc) notes that "…high birth rates, unsustainable commercial practices in regard to natural resource use, increasing dependency on the cash economy, labour migration, and the deterioration of traditional authority and social systems are all

[2] The 14 Pacific Island States that qualify for GEF support are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

having a negative impact on the quality of subsistence living on many of the islands".[3] It goes on to indicate that there are severe environmental threats facing PICs, as exhibited by the significant number of species extinctions in the region.

19. The project builds from the priorities identified through the regional SAP development process. The three "overarching transboundary concerns" are (ProDoc: 41):

- Degradation of the quality of (our) International Waters.
- Degradation of their associated critical habitats.
- Unsustainable use of living and nonliving resources.

20. IWP addressed these overarching concerns primarily at the community level, through pilot projects in each PIC. The pilot approach was selected as a means to test community-based natural resource management techniques and training, which would then serve as models to be replicated nationally and regionally.

21. Recognizing the difficulty in addressing multiple environmental issues simultaneously, the project design enabled PICs to select whether to focus on improved waste management, sanitation, fresh water quality, sustainable fisheries, or marine protected areas (MPAs).

22. During the course of the project, each PIC was expected to elaborate on root causes of the selected focus, including social and economic factors contributing to the problem. They were then to seek national and locally-based solutions, focusing on institutional structures and capacity building. The community pilot activities were supposed to emphasize the importance of building public awareness and support. The activities were to help structure national policies and strategies and link back to regional SAP implementation.

3.2 Results Expected

23. The ProDoc (§ B3: 21) indicates that by the end of the project, the following results were expected to have been achieved through the ICWM component:

- A series of pilot projects will have demonstrated best practices and appropriate methodologies for sustainable management of freshwater resources, management of MPAs, and sustainable management of coastal zone fisheries.
- The pilot projects will provide an operational framework for targeted proposals prepared as part of the SAP process.
- Sustainability will be ensured by strengthening existing national and regional coordinating mechanisms, which are inter-ministerial in nature.
- The IWP will have assessed options for creating financial and institutional sustainability, undertaken consultations and held a donor conference to secure necessary further investments

4 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Overall Performance and Progress towards Objectives and Outcomes

24. IWP has provided very useful community and national-level interventions, and important lessons for SIDS. While the outputs and achievements of the 14 pilot countries are uneven, there is recognition among the PIC LAs that IWP has enhanced understanding of the root causes of coastal waters degradation, and has demonstrated the effectiveness of taking an integrated and step-wise approach to environmental management. Thanks to IWP, PIC LA management and staff have gained experience with:

- identifying and prioritising environmental problems;
- analyzing root causes and establishing social, economic and environmental baselines;
- selecting pilot sites and testing community-based approaches to natural resource management;

[3] IWP ProDoc: 7, para 5.

- troubleshooting national/local authority issues that impact resource protection,
- developing techniques to effectively communicate with stakeholders and involve community members; and
- developing new national strategies in light of pilot outcomes, including replicating successes and learning lessons.

25. IWP was expected to increase the financial and institutional sustainability of coastal resource protection at the national level. While PICs are still finalizing their sustainability strategies, it is apparent that sustainability at the national level will remain a significant challenge. There are positive signs: for example, by September 2006, seven of the fourteen PICs indicated they would continue IWP activities after project conclusion using national funding. In addition, several countries are reporting donor interest in continuing, expanding and replicating IWP activities. A particular concern is that —despite IWP and related environmental protection efforts — policy development remains a work in progress. Less than half of the PICs have developed and approved new national strategies focused on the IWP areas of concern. In addition, for most PICs, the complexities of existing property laws and the overlapping of traditional, local and national governmental authorities serve as barriers to the effective implementation of national resource protection policies.

26. With respect to regional objectives, the goal was to have IWP accomplishments at the community and national levels drive implementation of the regional SAP. Unfortunately the regional SAP approved by the SPREP member states in 1997 does not set forth joint goals and objectives. This reflects in part the rather tenuous "transboundary" nature of PIC coastal waters, which are in fact separated by more than 38 million km^2 of ocean. The SAP does not compel PICs to do much other than agree on several areas of concern for focusing the GEF contribution under IWP. It is less of a "strategic program", and more of a project concept.

4.1.1 Achievement of Regional and Global Environmental Objectives

27. IWP was designed to align with the GEF Operational Programs (OPs) 8 and 9. Projects within OP 8 are expected to serve a catalytic role by assisting countries to develop comprehensive approaches to sustainable management of international water bodies. The OP 8 strategic objectives are focused on SAP formulation and interventions that can serve as a platform for investments and national program changes. IWP has succeeded in advancing OP 8 objectives.

28. IWP has made a notable contribution to community-based natural resource management, with very good work in many PICs on participatory processes, economic analysis and communications strategies. IWP provides important lessons with respect to institutional arrangements, especially concerning the complexity of resource management issues for traditional societies in transition. One of the concerns going into the final year was the extent to which IWP would succeed in providing a platform for investments and national program changes. Final year results show cause for optimism with respect to national program changes, with more than half the PICs indicating they have new national strategies and laws intended to improve environmental protection pending before their parliaments. There is also evidence of additional investment support from bilateral donors, and an indication from eight PICs that national budgets will be used to sustain IWP activities and/or retain staff.

29. GEF OP 9 focuses on the Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area. The aim for OP 9 is to develop integrated, region-wide approaches to better land and water resource management practices. The SIDS component of OP 9 focuses on integrated freshwater basins and coastal area management. Targeted activities generally include: coastal area management and biodiversity, sustainable management of regional fish stocks, tourism development, protection of water supplies, land- and marine-based sources of pollution, and vulnerability to climate change.

30. IWP linked to OP9 through both the ICWM and fisheries (OFM) components, and in particular through the latter. With respect to ICWM, activities in FSM, Niue and Vanuatu to develop local MPAs are important links to the OP9 focus on coastal area management. It would have been useful if more of the country pilots that focussed on waste management and freshwater catchment management had established a closer connection between their community interventions and the coastal degradation that the projects were designed to help mitigate.

4.1.2 Root Causes and Imminent Threats

31. During the early stages of the project, it was expected that PICs would conduct analyses identifying root causes of coastal degradation. The expectation was that countries would go though a deliberative process that first identified root causes, then selected a priority concern, and subsequently established a pilot site to test community-based methodologies. Nine of the countries conducted root cause analyses, while in the remainder the IWP county offices and National Task Forces (NTFs) acted more summarily in deciding what environmental concern to address. The real value of root cause analysis is in the process of getting decision makers to jointly consider the key reasons for an environmental problem, and then develop strategies to address it, in the process recognizing that in many cases there are social and economic factors beyond the authority or capacity of environmental ministries to solve. When root cause analysis works well, it enables countries to stay focused on the resource in question — in this case, the coastal marine environment — and to build support among multiple stakeholders, and in particular economic development-related ministries and departments. When the process is abbreviated, it is easier to lose sight of objectives, and more difficult to gain the attention and support of other ministries.

32. Some countries developed socioeconomic analyses through IWP, which helped to underscore root cause issues. It is of real significance that several PICs are now replicating their socioeconomic work for health and other government services. IWP is notable in its promotion of social and economic analysis to help define community-based interventions. The PIC NCs in the six countries that conducted analyses found them to be extremely helpful in understanding the drivers of pollution. For example, in the case of Majuro (Marshall Islands), the baseline social assessment of Jenrok showed a seasonally adjusted increase in school age household members during the school year, caused by family members on neighbouring islands sending their children to relatives in Majuro to take advantage of the better educational opportunities offered there. This information has ramifications for water and sanitation loads, as well as school overcrowding, demands on social services and hospitals, and even implications for local businesses.

33. The application of economic valuation tools is especially important. Tonga and Palau for example, were able to consider the economic value of the components in their solid waste streams, enabling a better understanding of the costs and benefits of waste minimization and recycling strategies, and enabling tariff rates for waste collection to be determined both by the ability of residents to pay, and the cost of service delivery, with recycling values taken into account. The findings of the economic evaluation undertaken in the Cook Islands was very useful in putting a nominal value to water resources, and helped attract support from both the community and government officials. In the case of Fiji, economic analyses helped to shape and defend the development of a rural waste management policy.

34. The PCU commissioned four technical reports during the initial stages of project implementation, covering the four focus areas set out in the ProDoc: improved waste management, improved (fresh) water quality, sustainable fisheries, and effective marine protected areas. Two additional reports were developed on economic issues relating to community-based sustainable resource management, and a compilation of lessons learned from community-based resource management projects in the Pacific. The reports provide an excellent set of reference materials on coastal resource protection for PICs. The PCU followed up the development of these and other reports with participatory briefings and workshops for the NCs, to make the report information more accessible and pertinent to the pilot activities they were managing

4.1.3 Impacts on Intended Beneficiaries

35. Skills transfer and knowledge sharing occurred at the national and community levels across each of the pilot projects. Training workshops were held, guidance manuals disseminated, and local and international technical experts hired. .

36. The extent to which LA capacities were expanded (beyond the hiring and training of NCs and staff) is difficult to estimate. The PCU has indicated that seven of the countries will continue IWP activities within their Ministries/Departments after the project concludes, suggesting that some current IWP staff will be retained.

37. Anecdotal evidence from the evaluation mission, and indications from PIC publications, suggest that many of the pilot projects have improved the quality of life and environment in the communities where they were conducted. This is especially true for many of the waste sector projects, and also to some degree

for the coastal fisheries projects. The land crab population in Crab Bay, Vanuatu is reported to be showing signs of recovery as a result of the catch restrictions established and enforced by the Crab Bay communities. Illegal dumpsites, and trash-strewn yards were cleaned up as a result of the community efforts in Nukuhetulu (Tonga), Alapi and Senala (Tuvalu), and Vunisinu and Nalase (Fiji).

4.1.4 Efficiency and Effectiveness

38. The conclusion of IWP comes nearly 10 years after approval of the SAP, and 6 years after project inception. The long lead and development times are unfortunate but not surprising, given the project's geographic scope and its emphasis on community-based approaches.

39. PICs took three years (through 2003) to identify priority environmental concerns, screen and select pilot communities, and hire local staff. Most of the pilot activities, including public awareness campaigns and socioeconomic assessments, commenced from late 2003 onwards. The long lead up to community-level activity made it difficult for PICs to achieve their objectives, an in particular the development and implementation of national plans and activities based on the IWP experiences. In addition, the focus area selected had implications with respect to the required technical competence of the selected NCs, notwithstanding the fact that the NCs were envisioned to serve primarily as facilitators.

40. A determination of effectiveness must take into account a wide spectrum of results from the 14 participating countries. In some cases, PICs were very successful, as they were able to (i) forge strong local support and participation through careful site selection and good team building, (ii) create close linkages within the national government to achieve national policy setting goals, and (iii) link the IWP with other projects and beneficiaries to extend the budget available for IWP activities. As noted in the country by country reviews, other PICs were less successful in achieving their objectives.

41. IWP addressed environmental issues through a mix of capacity building, policy reform and community-based activities. As is usual for UNDP/GEF International Waters projects, IWP did not support environmental investments (e.g. new waste or sanitation facilities, or fish stocking). The absence of direct investment support was confusing to community members involved in IWP pilot projects, who expected that a large well-financed international project should be able to provide financing for capital projects, such as composting toilet construction and recycling services. As with other UNDP/GEF projects, the assumption underlying planning for IWP was that the identification of environmental problems, elaboration of strategies, and articulation of investment needs would set the stage for future investment support from other donors.

42. In a few cases there were effective linkage between the IWP pilot activities and other donor investments. For example, Tonga was fortunate to launch its IWP waste pilot project just as Australia and New Zealand were financing much-needed landfill investments on Tongatapu. The result was an integrated capacity-building and investment approach, enabling implementation of a national waste strategy and creation of a waste authority. A key consideration should be how to develop such linkages in future activities supported by UNDP and GEF in the Pacific.

43. GEF has established some mechanisms to more closely match capacity building and investments by other parties. It has, for instance, funded a Strategic Partnership on Pollution into the Danube and Black Sea, coupling two UNDP-led capacity-building projects with a World Bank (WB) -directed investment vehicle. This linked approach, while adding implementation complexity, can greatly enhance the impact of donor support, especially when dealing with environmental issues that entail high infrastructure costs, such as sanitation. It would be useful for GEF and other donors to establish linked investment vehicles as the SOPAC IWRM project unfolds.

44. One aspect of project efficiency and effectiveness relates to the geographic approach. There has been a long discussion in the Pacific Islands region over the efficacy of taking a region-wide approach when designing natural resource protection projects. Proponents for large region-wide efforts, such as those managed by SPREP (i.e. the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Project [SPBCP] and IWP) and SOPAC (the upcoming IWRM project), suggest that they provide enhanced skills transfer and tighter financial discipline. Critics suggest that the money needed to operate PCUs and pay for consultants to travel around the region could be better spent directly supporting national programs.

45. There are likely to be different answers to what constitutes the best geographic approach, depending

on (i) the subject matter, (ii) the level of engagement (regional, national, or community-based), (iii) the project complexity and (iv) linkages to needed investments. Regional approaches are ideal when the subject matter is truly transboundary in nature and requires agreement among the regional parties, such as is the case for oceanic fisheries, or efforts to reduce the threat of invasive species transfer. When there are common issues, but the impacts are more localized — as is the case with solid waste management — then the decision to adopt a broader regional approach depends on whether there are economic savings and knowledge transfer benefits. The region-wide design of the IWP was appropriate, because it included an OFM component, and anticipated knowledge transfer and cost efficiencies through the ICWM component.

4.1.5 UNDP and SPREP Support to ICWM Implementation

46. UNDP is well suited to managing IWP and other capacity-building projects focused on water resource protection. UNDP brings considerable experience globally to the task of managing transboundary capacity-building projects, and is the Executing Agency with the largest GEF International Waters portfolio. As the lead environmental agency in the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP), SPREP is likewise well suited to implement the project, with the Secretariat's core staff able to provide administrative and technical backstopping to the PCU.

47. A good working relationship was forged between the UNDP regional office in Samoa and other project partners. PCU staff and several country representatives expressed appreciation for the way the UNDP regional office in Samoa stayed engaged without micromanaging SPREP and the PCU. The financial management measures that were established, including quarterly financial reporting and annual financial audits, were resented by PICs due to the time and money they consumed, but enabled the PCU to quickly identify and effectively handle the (mostly minor) financial management and reporting issues that arose in several country programs.. They also provided an early warning of the financial problems in Nauru, culminating in a cessation of project activities there in 2003.

48. The IWP PCU worked largely independently within SPREP. SPREP management engaged in the project during the annual MPRs and for specific issues, such as the Nauru financial matters, but otherwise left daily project management to the PCU. The collaboration between PCU technical experts and SPREP technical experts was informal and sporadic. For example, an informal working group within SPREP was established to share information on experiences with community-based natural resources management. There were also participatory processes established to jointly consider climate change and invasive species programs.

4.2 Project Concept and Design

49. The IWP was conceived in a similar manner to many GEF transboundary projects: commencing with a regional SAP followed by a set of actions for participating countries to implement SAP objectives. Many projects also include a limited set of pilot initiatives at the local level. In the case of the IWP, community-level interventions were made the project focus. This community-level emphasis was appropriate for the region, and the outcomes provide important lessons for project design for other SIDS.

50. Combining the ICWM and OFM components under one project was obviously done to meet GEF financial considerations, as the two areas were budgeted and managed separately. From the standpoint of government and community awareness and support, the combining these two divergent objectives was less than ideal. Confusion was expressed by some stakeholders, especially when the ICWM component of IWP became associated with solid waste management and recycling initiatives in eight of the fourteen countries.

4.2.1 Logical Framework, Risk Assumptions & Performance Indicators

51. There have been several iterations of the Logical Framework (LF), including a revision in September 2003, and a further revision in July 2004 (approved at the July MPR). Each of the iterations improved on its predecessor. The final LF revision indicates an overall goal of: "Integrated sustainable development and management of international waters"; which frames a general objective to: "address the root causes of degradation of International Waters in the Pacific Islands Region". The above four objectives were

reworked into a series of six project outcomes, (with Outcome 4 specific to the OFM component):

1) establish effective project implementation support;

2) enhanced transboundary mechanisms;

3) strengthened processes supporting conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources;

4) support the establishment of new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary fish stocks and associated national capacities;

5) maximize regional benefits of lessons learned from management of coastal and watershed resources; and

6) catalyze donor support for the conservation and sustainable use of coastal resources.

52. The revisions to the LF have helped to better articulate expected outcomes and are in keeping with an adaptive management strategy The LF provides a general set of outcomes and outputs, and includes general, mostly process indicators. The LF does not include a direct link to the project budget, and does not clearly delineate the sequence or timing of planned activities. These are rather left to the annual work plans and budgets developed by the PCU, and the country M&E plans.

53. The IWP LF does not include deadlines for the completion of outputs, and there are no directions on how the project should impact on policies of the participating national governments. The countries are expected to carry out community-based pilot projects, and it is merely indicated that "national policy or institutional arrangements (will be) refined on the basis of project supported initiatives" (July 2004 LF, Output 3, Outcome 7). Beyond this rather vague expectation, no verifiable indicators are listed for assessment of expected changes or improvements in the participating countries. The results identified in the Project Document (e.g. options will be assessed, best practices will be demonstrated, national and regional coordinating mechanisms will be strengthened) reinforce the lack of ambitious outcomes expectations. Among the missing elements are (i) any reference to effective implementation of the regional SAP; (ii) an expectation of widespread implementation by the participating countries of best practices that produce verifiable improvements in coastal water quality and coastal fisheries recovery; and (iii) the expectation that countries will adopt and implement national strategies for recycling and waster reduction, set up MPAs, and/or establish river basin management plans.

54. Based on the mission interviews that were conducted, it is evident that the LF was not utilized as an ongoing project management tool by either the PCU or PICs. Instead, country and community-level activities were driven by M&E plans established for each of the participating countries. The M&E plans included expected activities and their budgets, and indicators to gauge achievement. The format for the M&E plans was established by the PCU; NCs were provided consulting assistance to develop their plans. While the use and fulfilment of the M&E plans was variable across the countries, their establishment was an important, positive activity, providing a common annual planning and budgeting format across the 14 pilot countries.

55. The M&E plans developed for each pilot were largely based on process indicators, such as reports completed, strategies in place, and persons trained. Environmental stress reduction indicators were also included (e.g. increase in the number of households recycling their waste, illegal dumps cleared, cattle restricted from stream beds, and composting toilets built). Environmental status indicators were not included. There is some evidence of status improvement at many of the pilot sites. Unfortunately there was insufficient attention to the establishment of environmental baselines prior to pilot project implementation, and haphazard collection of environmental monitoring data in many of the pilot projects.

56. The IWP LF includes a discussion of risks and assumptions, building on the ProDoc. The listed assumptions and risks have evolved with the several LF revisions, and are well conceived. The following are a few of particular note in light of achievements:

- In relation to the overall project goal, an important risk included was that "Changes in economic, political and social conditions may detract from country commitment to, and feasibility of, pilot projects and regional collaboration". During the IWP years, there were political upheavals in Solomon Islands, Fiji and Tonga. These disruptions inevitably hampered project activities for a

time, but the NCs adapted and work continued. More seriously, the financial difficulties faced by Nauru in the period 2002–2003 had a clear and significant impact on the project and led to the suspension of IWP activity there in 2003.

- In terms of the achievement of Outcome 1, "Establish effective project implementation support", the LF noted the assumption of recruitment of competent staff. Competent staff were recruited at the PCU and in many of the countries, but it is clear that project management capacity was uneven across the region, and the selection and training process carried out in some countries should have placed more emphasis on project management skills.
- In reference to the communications activities in Outcome 3, an assumption in the LF states: "Communication strategies are effective in engaging principle stakeholders". This proved an apt statement of what transpired and frames the excellent communications work done across the region.
- With respect to Outcome 6, concerning donor support and replication, the assumptions include that "other agencies identify benefits by replicating Project strategies", and "replication strategy appropriately distributed". In hindsight, it is clear that the major risks to completion of this set of outcomes include early phase project delays, which made it difficult to complete pilot projects and develop replication strategies. Also, it proved difficult for the NCs and their implementing agencies, working through the NTFs, to conceptualise a replication strategy building from the pilot projects, and expanding to include other agencies and other donors.

4.2.2 Project Management Arrangements

57. Outcome 1 of the 2004 LF lists the outputs for internal coordination of the IWP. In general, the expectations set out in the ProDoc were met. The PCU was made operational with offices at SPREP headquarters in Apia. Administrative arrangements at the PCU and among the 14 pilot countries were established. Technical advisory and backstopping services were established and monitoring and evaluation of project implementation occurred. As noted below in the timing discussion, while the internal coordination activities were all carried out, the extended time required made it difficult to complete the project within the expected time frame, and two extensions totalling 26 months were sought and approved.

58. The project included a Program Manager plus three international technical experts based at the PCU in Apia. These persons were well qualified to provide advice on social assessment and community-based natural resource management, natural resource economics and communications. Interestingly, a decision was made not to include technical experts in the four selected issue areas: solid waste, sanitation, freshwater management and coastal fisheries. Technical expertise was instead obtained through external consultants. This decision can be justified by the project structure, which allowed countries to select their thematic area during, rather than prior to, project implementation. If the selection of themes had instead occurred during the PDF-B project formulation period — and it had been obvious at that time that eight of the countries would focus on waste management issues — the selection of experts for the PCU would logically have been revised to include a technical expert on waste.

Project timing

59. In December 2002, half-way through the expected project duration, a request was made by the PCU, and endorsed by the participating countries, to extend the IWP by two years (i.e., until December 2006. The project was subsequently extended until end February 2007). The reasons given for the extension included:

- protracted periods for the establishment of logistical and administrative arrangements at both the regional and national levels;
- inadequate foundation on which to base GEF/SAP implementation, particularly in relation to national and regional elements of the ICWM component;
- heightened priorities associated with participating country involvement with the establishment of new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of regional migratory fish stocks and subsequent implications for national activities; and
- unrealistic assumptions in the original project design relating to consultative arrangements, institutional frameworks, timeframes, national capacity, administrative processes, scope of work,

and national acceptance of a pilot approach to explore issues associated with community-based initiatives.

60. The extension, including the consequent recalculation of the budget to accommodate two additional years of project activity and PCU staffing, was reasonable and justified. It is clear from this and many other large regional GEF projects that the time frames are often insufficient to complete expected activities, and extensions are common. In this case, even with the two-year extension, it was difficult for many of the PICs to implement their pilot projects, and some did not commence until 2003. Three years is a short period to motivate communities, train people, fine tune national strategies, implement communications strategies, replicate these in other communities, and generate donor support for investments. It is especially difficult to consider such an ambitious agenda with IWP country programs staffed by two persons, and with limited backstopping support in their ministries. .

61. The PCU was criticized by some NCs for delays in remitting funds to country projects, and for the low frequency of PCU staff visits to help in implementing national project activities. A number of factors contributed to the delay in disbursement and receipt of funds by country projects, including:

- late submission of PCU reports to UNDP, due to the late receipt of quarterly reports produced by national coordinators (PCU reports are largely based on NC reports);
- provision of incorrect project account details for funds transfers; and
- ineffective local arrangements for transfer of funds from national treasuries to lead agencies or project locations.

62. Similar factors are common to many projects implemented in the Pacific region, regardless of the responsible organization, and including bilateral projects. This underscore the fact that the capacity of PICs to manage projects in an efficient and effective way, as desired by the donors and funding organizations, is a critical project management issue.

63. With regards to the frequency of PCU staff visits to the participating countries, it was noted by the PCU that their role was to facilitate and coordinate implementation of pilot project activities, which would be undertaken by the countries themselves. Where there was a lack of capacity in a country to implement particular activities, there were budgetary provisions to enable the projects to source consultant assistance. Unfortunately, many NCs preferred to have PCU staff come to their assistance rather than going through the process of identifying and hiring consultants, writing terms of reference and managing consultant inputs. The ability of country offices to manage the work of hired consultants is a key issue for future projects in the region.

PCU-Pilot Coordination

64. The PCU staff encountered early resistance from PICs with respect to the extent of PCU oversight of country activities. This issue of the proper span of control, coordination and support from PCUs is often an issue in transboundary projects. The PCU has a fiduciary responsibility to control spending, yet PICs are sovereign nations that have agreed to participate as partners with UNDP and SPREP. The PCU spent considerable time in the early stages developing MOUs with PICs on project implementation, but this did not solve the span of control issue. The matter was raised during the MTE, and recommendations were made to allow greater flexibility. The resulting post-MTE agreements struck a reasonable balance, enabling greater flexibility in programming country activities, yet retaining PCU control on financial reporting and accountability.

65. PCU availability to provide expert assistance, and the frequency of PCU staff travel across the region, were matters of concern to some NCs, and the extent of concern generally increased with distance from SPREP. Not surprisingly, the PCU staff made fewer visits to pilot projects located farther from Apia. Nevertheless, the PCU staff travel schedules, and the frequency of workshops and periodic NC meetings, suggest there were ample opportunities for the PCU and NCs to interact.

PIC Inter-regional Cooperation

66. The project intended to facilitate cooperation, networking, and exchange of information and lessons learned among the NCs, and informal sharing was accomplished through the NC meetings and workshops;

some specific cross-fertilization of ideas also occurred early in the project (e.g. between Niue and Tonga). Nevertheless, most of the NCs indicted they would have welcomed more opportunities to learn firsthand from the experiences of their neighbours. With eight of the countries working on waste issues, and with SPREP concurrently developing a regional Waste Management Strategy, more could have been done in the waste sector to share common IWP experiences and work on mutual solutions.

PIC Capacity and Skills Development

67. It has been a challenge for many NCs to effectively plan project activities to yield expected outcomes within the project timeframes. The previous Program Manager, in his terminal report in late 2005, indicated that considerable effort had been expended to better develop the NCs' project management skills, but the PCU was limited by its size and the project's vast geographic scope, across 14 PICs.

68. Regional workshops, PCU-generated guidelines, and skills transfer (when consultants were employed) all contributed to an upgrading of NC skills, some members of the NTF, and some community-based participants. In particular, the IWP's strong emphasis on communications has enabled a transfer of media skills to IWP participants in PICs. Skills development was also pronounced in the areas of community participation and facilitation.

69. The IWP initially used performance appraisals for PCU staff and NCs, as part of a performance assessments and capacity-building strategy developed with the assistance of the SPREP Human Resources Development Officer. The aim was to provide NCs with feedback on their activities and performance and to aid in identifying training and human resource development assistance as needed. The performance management/capacity building plans were abandoned in 2003, due to strong NC resistance.

Scholarships

70. A scholarship program was carried out through the IWP, involving 14 students, sponsored by the Cook Islands (1), Fiji (1), Kiribati (1), Palau (1), PNG (4), Solomon Islands (2) Tonga (2), Tuvalu (1) and Vanuatu (1). The scholarship program was a small but well-intentioned effort to build up technical capacity and keep skilled persons in-country and involved in environmental protection efforts. The funding given per student was helpful, but not so high as to attract large numbers of interested students (PIC annual budgets indicate the range of spending for scholarships to be between USD 6,500 and USD 9,800 in any one fiscal year). While some of the scholarship efforts synchronised with country goals (e.g. in Vanuatu), other students selected topics that did not focus on areas relating to the IWP objectives. The IWP PCU indicated in its 3rd Quarter 2006 Progress Report that three scholarship programs had been completed by September 2006, three scholarships had been terminated prior to completion, and the remaining eight students were soon to complete their studies. This can be considered a moderately successful set of outcomes.

71. In general, UNDP does not fund scholarship programs, and there are other initiatives in the region focusing on environmental training, at USP and through other institutions. Consequently, while the scholarship program was very much appreciated by the scholars involved, it did not have much of an impact with respect to improved capacity. The following lessons and recommendations may inform future donor-assisted training programs:

- Utilize scholarships as part of broader environmental sciences programs in PICs, which is also aimed at young people in grade and high school.
- Increase the size of the scholarship effort, establish a competitive selection process, and increase individual amounts, so to increases the program's prominence, and attract greater interest and participation.
- Establish a contract arrangement between the scholar and sponsoring country that makes financial support contingent on work for the government during and after study completion. This would help to ensure real capacity building for the ministries, and also ensure a closer alignment between study topics and government needs. It would also serve as an extra inducement to students to successfully complete their studies.

PIC Turnover

72. Personnel changes among the country programs was generally in line with expectations. Most of the country projects had one or two NCs during the five-year effort. In some cases, NCs were called to different assignments (e.g. in Kiribati), while in others the lead agency changed, and with it the national coordinator (in RMI). In countries that experienced high turnover in both LAs and NCs (FSM in particular), it was difficult to maintain momentum and achieve objectives.

73. The following table identifies the number of country national coordinators that served in each country.

NCs	
Cook Islands	2[4]
FSM	4[5]
Fiji	1
Kiribati	2
Nauru	1
Niue	1
PNG	1
Palau	1
Samoa	2
Solomon Islands	2
Tonga	1
Tuvalu	1
Vanuatu	1

National Task Forces

74. NTFs and community level committees were established in each of the countries. The experience with IWP NTFs is decidedly mixed. Most NCs indicated during the evaluation mission that their NTFs had been difficult to manage. There was a substantial turnover in participants in many of the PICs, and in many cases the activities under IWP were not well integrated into other national environmental activities.

75. There was considerably more success with the community level committees involved in the day-to-day management of the pilot projects. The issue of overlap between national level NTF responsibilities and local committee responsibilities (with both trying to provide direction to the pilot project efforts) was frequent raised.

76. The table below sets out key features of the NTF and community committee structures in each PIC. The experience of the IWP countries suggests the following general findings:

- NTFs worked well and stayed active when they were subsumed within a committee that also focused on broad national issues. Thus a waste management task force, working to establish a national waste management strategy, could take on supervision of an IWP project in the waste sector as one of a number of assignments.
- NTFs were greatly aided when actively chaired by a senior ministry official.
- NTF's were viewed as relevant by participants when they involved national issues, such as national strategy development, the identification of priority environmental concerns, and the selection of pilot communities.
- NTF member interest subsided when the project focus moved to local community implementation issues. Then, interest naturally shifted to the community committees.

Country	• ***National Task Force***
Cook Islands	• Developed a Community Working Committee for drafting the pilot community

[4] The first NC for IWP-Cook Islands was promoted within the lead agency.
[5] The first NC was on temporary assignment from Pohnpei to assist in preliminary stages. Second coordinator was subsequently replaced by the Executing Agency. Third coordinator resigned. Project now overseen by manager.

	management plan. • The NTF had multiple and significant oversight roles. It selected the focal area and pilot site, approved the IWP budget and periodically reviewed its membership – adding 2 new members in 2004. • In addition to being a decision-making body, the respective NTF members from the CI-IWP supported and sustained most of the community pilot activities.
Federated States of Micronesia	• The project was managed at the state/provincial level (Yap). • The Task Force was initially inactive during the period of EPA management, but was reconstructed and became active in the IWP management with switch of the project from EPA to Department of Resources and Development.
Fiji	• The Fiji NTF was convened once a month during the initial project formulation and community screening phase. Later the NTF was convened once every 2 months and during 2005/2006 once every quarter. • The NTF had broad-based membership, including NGOs, other CROP agencies, researchers and community representatives. .It was chaired by the Minister of Environment. • Some of the NTF reps will now sit on the National Environmental Council – which is working on national Environmental Act implementation.
Kiribati	• The NTF convened early in the project and was then merged into a National Waste Management Committee. • A local community committee was established.
Marshall Islands	• NTF efforts were impeded by interagency rivalries, and the changeover of IWP responsibility from the EPA to the Office of Environmental Policy and Project Coordination. • The main achievement of the IWP on Majuro has been to increase community and government awareness about solid waste management issues. In addition, the IWP has set the stage for improved national environmental planning in RMI, through its efforts to determine underlying socioeconomic aspects of waste management at the community level. • It is clear that the major human health and environmental priority on Majuro is sewage and wastewater management. Urgent attention is needed by the RMI national and local governments to address sanitation problems. The upcoming GEF-SOPAC IWRM regional project provides an excellent opportunity to develop and implement new water and sanitation strategies.
Nauru	• The NTF was launched, but financial issues suspended the Nauru project in 2003.
Niue	• NTF formed. • Village Fisheries Management Committees established for Makefu and Alofi North. • There is concern at the conclusion of the project on how to keep the village fisheries committees going without IWP financial support. Niue is considering incentives and income generating options as a means for retaining committee member interest and participation.
Palau	• NTF formed as a subcommittee of the National Environmental Protection Council (NEPC). • The NEPC includes a wide range of stakeholders, including NGOs and the Chamber of Commerce. • IWP subcommittee did not meet on a regular basis and was not involved much in project oversight and implementation.

Papua New Guinea	• NTF had difficulties with participation and member interest. • It was very difficult to get other government representatives (Health for example) to take an interest in the community pilot effort. • No NGO representation, due to the absence of an umbrella NGO group and desire to avoid a hint of favouritism. • The NTF was replaced by a Solid Waste Management Task Force, convened to formulate a National Solid waste Management Strategy and Action Plan
Samoa	• There was a broad spectrum of NTF members, but their varied expertise was not utilised. • The NTF will be dissolved at the end of the project because of a lack of funding. • The Water Resource Division is now developing an EU-funded project, which will establish its own working group, with most of the IWP NTF participants joining this working group.
Solomon Islands	• Established the NTF and technical advisory committees. • There was a low level of participation in IWP activities from the NTF, including by Ministry representatives.
Tonga	• There was poor participation in the NTF. The inability to provide "sitting fees" was indicated as a key reason for the lack of NTF member interest in regular participation. • A technical subcommittee was formed to delve into detailed community issues, leaving the NTF to address broader issues. • The NTF will continue after IWP completion, becoming the solid waste task force under the newly developed Solid Waste Authority.
Tuvalu	• Many of the NTF members actively participated in the project, with the Tuvalu Association of NGOs (TANGO) utilized to facilitate community consultations. • The Kaupule (town council) in the pilot community indicated to the evaluation team that it did not participate in the NTF, yet it is listed as a member. • Communication with the town council was hampered by changes in council membership and a view that the IWP was impinging on Kaupule authority over waste collection issues.
Vanuatu	• The NTF was part of a broader task force, convened by the Ministry of Natural Resources, focused on a variety of water and coastal resources issues. The Task Force had high-level ministry participation and has remained very involved in project implementation.

Financial Management

77. Indications are that the project financial aspects were handled appropriately The IWP budget is comprised of USD 12 million in GEF financing coupled with USD 8.118 million in co-financing from SPREP, FFA, SPC and UNDP. The ICWM component, managed by SPREP, has a USD 8.5 million GEF budget, and USD 10 million total budget. The bulk of co-financing, USD 7.438 million, was directed to the OFM component.

78. In 2002, agreement was reached to extend the IWP project deadline by two years, to December 2006. This necessitated a revision to the budget, as the project had finance another two years of PCU administrative costs. The extension raised PCU personnel costs, including travel, to USD 2.05 million, representing 25% of the total ICWM budget. There was a corresponding drop in national activities from 70% to 61% (USD 5.04 million) of the total budget.

79. The Project has operated using a seven-year Work Plan and Budget, within MS Project. Annual work plans were prepared guiding PCU and country program implementation. The PCU included on its payroll an accounts manager.

80. Financial administration of the project was carried out in accordance with UNDP National Execution (NEX) Procedures. Quarterly progress and financial reports, and annual audited reports, were submitted to the executing agency (SPREP) which in turn reviewed and submitted them to UNDP. Project

disbursements were released from UNDP to SPREP, set against the receipt of financial reports from the previous quarter, and sent via bank check. SPREP then required the full collection of quarterly reports from the countries prior to disbursement. The MTE suggested that a more streamlined process of disbursement should have been considered during the second half of the project, as the delays in processing disbursements made it difficult for the country pilot efforts. At the time of the final evaluation, the delayed disbursement of funds was mentioned as a continuing problem, but PICs managed to overcome the inconvenience by utilizing national funds while awaiting UNDP/SPREP disbursements.

81. The requirement for annual audits of each IWP country program was an important and positive management decision, enabling the achievement of good financial accountability and providing assurances that each country team was administering funds in accordance with GEF financial requirements. The auditing procedures enabled project managers at the PCU and UNDP to quickly identify and confront financial irregularities in Nauru, which ultimately led to the suspension of the Nauru pilot project in 2003. Annual audits otherwise indicated proper financial management, with only minor financial irregularities in several countries, which were subsequently rectified.[6]

82. While the project commenced with 14 pilot countries, Nauru ceased to be active in 2003. The PCU has catalogued the process during 2002 and 2003 through which Nauru was informed that financial irregularities would imperil its participation. With the full support of SPREP and UNDP, project funding was curtailed in 2003. The process that was taken was appropriate, including numerous correspondence and face to face meetings designed to bring the country back into the IWP.

83. The MTE noted a number of misunderstanding relating to what could be purchased by the country pilot projects with IWP funds; in particular, the purchase of vehicles to commute to pilot sites was a source of friction. The MTE suggested simple and clear guidelines be developed by the Implementing Agency (IA), the EA and LAs, to clarify flexibility on expenditures, based against regulations and policies. These issues remained contentious throughout the project.

84. The following data is taken from the 4th Quarter 2006 PCU report, showing PIC expenditures to December, 2006.

[6] There remains only a qualified audit opinion for a minor financial irregularity in the Solomon Islands (2004) that has not been adequately addressed.

Disbursements to Participating Countries January 2000 to December 2006.

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006 4th Qtr	Total	Regional costs	Total country disbursement	remaining
COI	0	0	24,421	48,358	82,145	117,758	84,480	357,162	22,168	379,330	18,206*
FSM	0	0	48,787	6,412	126,586	9,887	50,396	242,068	22,168	264,236	96,889
FIJ	0	7,029	42,163	46,175	76,895	64,440	95,907	332,609	22,168	354,777	6,348
KIR	0	0	62,531	49,636	70,092	103,274	144,403	429,936	22,168	452,104	90,979*
RMI	0	1,000	27,556	65,305	33,727	72,827	49,153	249,568	22,168	271,736	89,389
NAR	0	0	59,830	14,253	2,626	1,710	0	78,419		78,419	-
NIU	0	12,726	81,470	85,196	143,601	38,754	42,588	404,335	22,168	426,503	65,378*
PAL	0	0	35,027	74,053	104,549	32,250	128,365	374,244	22,168	396,412	35,287*
PNG	0	0	37,387	112,539	155,332	45,300	52,723	403,281	22,168	425,449	64,325*
SAM	0	1,000	36,158	54,174	48,773	36,783	110,637	287,525	22,168	309,692	51,438
SOI	0	0	40,349	63,823	81,010	71,125	54,388	310,695	22,168	332,863	28,261
TON	0	2,245	43,019	47,877	99,121	80,777	77,051	350,090	22,168	372,258	11,133*
TUV	0	0	34,610	55,778	58,461	69,426	76,584	294,860	22,168	317,028	44,097
VAN	0	0	32,448	80,820	62,209	40,546	88,658	304,681	22,168	326,849	34,275
TOTAL	0	24,001	605,757	804,397	1,145,127	784,858	1,055,333	4,419,472	288,183	4707,655	65,382

In the last column, the figures with a * have exceeded the country allotment, based on an expected USD 361,124.42 disbursement per country (excepting Nauru). Others did not use all available funds. As of the end of 2006, USD 65,382 in country funding was still available.

Adaptive Management

85. The PCU was fully staffed through most of its six-year history, with a strong team of international experts. Major personnel changes occurred in the PCU during the final 18 months of the project, with the manager, economist, communications expert and social assessment/participation expert leaving for other assignments. A series of well-considered exit notes were provided by outgoing PCU staff, relating to completion of assignments and recommendations for completion of IWP activities.

86. The following table identifies PCU personnel changes during the project:

	#
PCU	
Project Manager	**2**[7]
Community Assessment and Participation Specialist (CAPS)	**2**[8]
Communications Specialist (CCS)	**3**[9]
Natural Resource Economist (NRE)	**1**[10]

87. The PCU during its final year of operation has been managed through Pacific Environmental Consultants Ltd, a Samoa-based consulting company, with three senior consultants alternating in the manager position. Meanwhile, the three technical expert positions of the PCU were left vacant. Given the timeframes for project wrap-up, set against the timeframes for hiring new personnel, these PCU management and staffing decisions, while unusual, are defensible. The management team that was hired has extensive experience with GEF/UNDP/SPREP projects and has technical competence on the IWP issues. The new management team has continued working from the existing project concept and logical framework. They have devoted considerable attention to assisting the countries to complete their lessons learned, replication and sustainability strategies, and have made a major effort during the final six months to complete and publish technical reports.

88. Annual work plans and budgets, approved by the NTFs, were developed in consultation with SPREP for each of the pilot countries. As the project was implemented, it became clear that a longer planning horizon for the pilot projects would enable closer monitoring of progress, so "M&E plans" were developed beginning in 2004. The M&E plans include community-based and national outcomes and outputs. The M&E plans were clearly a management improvement, enabling the countries and the PCU to track completion of activities over time, and suggesting a sequential plan of implementation. As noted in the country report evaluations in Annex A, many of the plans confuse objectives, outcomes and outputs, suggesting that additional training and guidance would have been helpful in the M&E development phase.

89. During the final 18 months of the project, the NCs urged the PCU to be more flexible on financing, and to allow limited investment support into the community pilots, for items like composting toilets in Nukuhetulu (Tonga), street lighting in Jenrok (RMI), and stream fencing in Lema (Samoa). The sense was that this would send a positive message to communities that have grown accustomed to donors providing tangible support, and who were confused why a well-financed international project provided mostly advice and training.

IWP Monitoring and Evaluation

90. IWP monitoring and reporting was carried out as planned and at acceptable standards. The MTE was completed in July, 2003. The MTE recommendations focused in particular on two areas:

[7] The original project manager participated in the IWP from 2000 to 2005. From Aug 2005 to October 2005 SPREP was responsible for overall day to day management. From November, 2005, management was subsequently taken over by Pacific Environmental Consultants Ltd. (PECL).
[8] First CAPS 2001-2005; second CAPS resigned in April 2006 and was not replaced.
[9] First CCS – 2002; Second CCS 2002-2004; third CCS resigned in April 2006 and was not replaced.
[10] The NRE resigned in February 2006 and was not replaced

- pushing PICs to take greater ownership and responsibility for pilot project management (with corresponding greater management flexibility from the PCU); and
- significantly increasing the project focus and linkage to the regional SAP, including efforts to get countries to establish national SAPs.

91. The MTE recommendations were carefully reviewed and decisions were made at the following MPR. As a result of the MTE, greater flexibility was provided to PICs for carrying out their pilot activities. In addition, the project LF was revised and improved; for example, a specific outcome related to transboundary mechanisms was developed.

92. Monitoring of projects was aided by quarterly reports, annual meetings and audits, and frequent workshops. The annual MPRs provided the requisite project oversight.

4.2.3 Stakeholder Participation – regional, national and community-based

93. Outcome 2 of the revised IWP ProDoc focuses on regional transboundary mechanisms. Regional coordination was a feature of the initial SAP development. The first regional task force that was convened to develop the regional SAP included SPC, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), WB and two NGOs: World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the Nature Conservancy (TNC). The Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) also participated.

94. Once IWP was underway, there were successful collaborations with many other CROP agencies, including:

- SPC and FFA jointly implemented IWP's OFM component.
- SPC was involved in Niue's local MPA project.
- There was collaboration with SPC's EU-funded reef fisheries program,[11] including joint production of a manual, and joint workshops on the socioeconomics of fisheries assessment.
- PIFS provided technical expertise to prepare economic valuation reports.
- CROP agencies participated in the IWP Technical Advisory Group (TAG).
- SOPAC, FFA, AusAID and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) participated at an IWP Lessons Learned Workshop.
- The University of Adelaide produced four regional assessment reports for IWP.
- IWP-Fiji worked closely with SOPAC and UNEP GPA and on wastewater management issues at the national level, including development of the National Liquid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan.

95. These examples suggest a generally satisfactory working relationship amongst the CROP agencies during IWP implementation. Coordination with SOPAC on water resource and sanitation pilot activities could have been stronger, and would have helped them set the stage for a smooth knowledge transfer to the GEF-SOPAC IWRM project now under development.

PIC Stakeholder Partnerships

96. The ProDoc did not indicate specific linkages to projects and organizations at the country level. These were left to be detailed by the participating countries in their stakeholder assessments, after they had selected a focal area and demonstration site. During the project, mixed results were observed among the PICs with respect to coordination and cooperation with other interventions in the sector. Some of pilot projects did successfully link with related investment and capacity building projects, e.g. Palau (with JICA support), Kiribati (Koaki Mangi), and Tonga (Australia and New Zealand).

97. The level of local NGO participation has been uneven across PICs, with a high level of interaction with community-based organizations, but limited participation from national and international NGOs. PNG indicated that with no umbrella group for NGOs in place, a decision was made to exclude all NGO

[11] The Pacific Regional Oceanic and Coastal Fisheries Management (PROCFish) Programme.

representation in the NTF to avoid any hint of favouritism. In Fiji, NGOs were involved in the pilot selection process and participated in the NTF.

98. The stakeholder sector that received the least amount of attention during IWP was the private sector. There was minimal effort expended to attract private sector support for IWP. This is not really surprising, as pilot community efforts tend to be small scale and therefore uneconomical for private sector involvement. Kiribati had the greatest private sector involvement, as their deposit/return program for cans, plastic bottles and car batteries is managed by a private import/export company, and another importer was providing assistance (under contract) to bring in and distribute recycling bags. Fiji and PNG have also involved private collectors for their recycling and solid waste initiatives. On Yap, the local dive shops paid user fees to the Riken community for the right to take divers to the community's local MPA.

99. In the past some environmental protection projects have viewed the private sector as an adversary, but this should be supplanted by the idea of public/private partnerships. Such an approach does not imply turning a blind eye to polluters — on the contrary, the law needs to be fully and fairly enforced — but instead aims to demonstrate to private interests that they can profit from being environmental champions. There are many ways that the private sector can be involved as a partner, including by:

- running environmental services (waste management and recycling in particular have the potential to be profitable);
- identifying income generating activities, such as composting, where business opportunities exist that also promote environmental protection;
- helping to promote environmental events through banners, radio spots, etc;
- getting markets to help underwrite the cost of recyclable trash bags and bins; and
- recognizing the value to their businesses of keeping coastal areas clean, and helping to fund beach cleanups, assisting with local-managed MPAs, and protecting mangrove swamps..

100. Country LAs comprised a key group of project stakeholders, and were responsible for managing the country programs and developing national plans, laws and strategies. The evaluation mission interviews demonstrated a generally high level of engagement amongst the IWP LAs, with management very much aware of the work being carried out by the IWP country offices; they were convinced that IWP was an important part of their program. In some cases, the NC's role as project manager and LA employee became blurred, and it was evident that some NCs were engaged in a significant number of non-IWP activities. Yet the close connection of many NCs to other departmental activities also kept IWP in the forefront, and enabled useful linkages to other department/ministry activities.

101. IWP has shown the need for LAs to better anticipate project closure and actively plan for transition, rather than being reactive and waiting for another donor-funded project. LAs need to consider (as much as two years in advance) how they can build further financial support to carry on current efforts.

102. The important role played by other government agencies (other than LAs) needs to be acknowledged. In the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, fisheries agencies headed project activities, although these agencies were not the LAs. The same is true in Samoa, where the Samoa Water Authority and the Meteorological Division were key players in project implementation.

103. Guidelines were established for carrying out stakeholder inventories and participation plans in each of the pilot countries. Each NC, in conjunction with the PCU, completed a basic stakeholder analysis and participation strategy, determining which stakeholders would be kept informed, consulted, and/or involved in decision making. The perception among NCs was that the exercise was helpful in developing their NTFs. The intention was for NCs to update the stakeholder matrices periodically, although this was done only by a few countries. Stakeholder identification and outreach continued with the development of communications strategies.

104. A definitive list of stakeholders was not produced regionally, but several project deliverables (in particular the IWP Communication Strategy of March 2002) identify the types of organizations and individuals who should be contacted and kept informed as the community pilot programs are carried out. Each PIC was to develop stakeholder assessments, which were essentially lists of key groups and persons. Specific strategies for engaging different stakeholders were not established. Stakeholders identified included pilot community members, community leaders, regional and national decision makers responsible

for coastal waters management and environmental organizations.

105. The following stakeholders list (from the Vanuatu Communications Strategy, October 23, 2005) is typical:

Local partners:	*National partners:*
Crab collectors Crab Bay Tabu Committee Crab Bay Facilitators Malampa Provincial Authority Fisheries Extension Officer Church Leaders Coastal fisheries resource users Wider Crab Bay community	Environment Unit Department of Fisheries Ministry of Land and Natural Resources Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Quarantine Services Department of Provincial Authority NCSA & NBSAP Project Officers (other) National Task Force Members Wan Smol Bag (Theatre company) Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) Network Wantok Association Vanuatu Cultural Centre Peace Corps Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) FSPI (Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific

106. The extent of participation by different stakeholders in the community pilot projects, and success in achieving stakeholder buy-in, varied across the countries, and depended on many factors, including existing community relations and harmony, support of village elders for the pilot project, and the facilitation and conflict resolution skills of the site coordinators and trainers.

4.3 Achievement of Objectives and Outputs, Results and Impacts

107. The main deliverables for IWP are identified under LF Outcome 3: Strengthened processes supporting conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources. This outcome included a series of expected outputs, including:

- Synopses of information relating to focal areas and focal areas selected.
- Generic guidelines for the design, implementation and monitoring of project-related community-based pilot activities.
- National and regional project-related communication strategies.
- Project-related social assessment and community participation strategy.
- Economic strategy for project-related resource management and conservation initiatives.
- Community-based pilots addressing SAP focal issue environmental concerns.
- National and regional project-related pilots.
- Strengthened national capacity to address priority environmental concerns and trans-boundary environmental issues.
- Sub-regional waste recycling feasibility report.

4.3.1 IWP Focal Areas

108. Each of the participating countries was expected to take a participatory and deliberative approach to selecting a critical environmental issue to pilot, consistent with the regional SAP, and taken from the identified four high-priority issues identified in the ProDoc: improved waste management, improved (fresh) water quality, sustainable fisheries, or effective marine protected areas.

109. Several of the countries implemented integrated approaches, tying IW planning efforts together with other national priorities. Niue meshed this exercise with its preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and Palau linked its efforts with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). At the other end of the spectrum, some countries merely selected a focal area and

project site, without tying the effort to an analysis of key ICWM concerns and root causes.

110. While the Pro Doc envisioned an even spread of pilot activities across the four high priority areas, the country screening and selection process resulted in particularly strong attention to waste management (8 countries), with another four countries focused on coastal resources/fisheries. Two countries targeted freshwater resources. The breakdown of pilot focal areas is as follows:

Country	***Focal Area***	***Pilot Location***
Cook Islands	Freshwater resources	Takuvaine Water Catchment
Federated States of Micronesia	Coastal fisheries/marine protected areas	Riken; Yap Island, Yap State
Fiji	Waste and wastewater management	Vunisinu and Nalase
Kiribati	Waste management	Bikenibeu West, Tarawa
Marshall Islands	Waste management	Jenrok Village, Majuro
Nauru	Waste management	Bauda
Niue	Coastal fisheries	Makefu and Alofi North
Palau	Waste management	Madalaii and Ngarchelong
Papua New Guinea	Waste management & coastal fisheries	Barakau Village; Central Province
Samoa	Freshwater resources	Apolima Tai and Lepa
Solomon Islands	Coastal fisheries	Mbili Passage and Chea
Tonga	Waste management	Nukuhetulu Village
Tuvalu	Waste and wastewater management	Alapi and Senala, Funafuti
Vanuatu	Coastal fisheries	Crab Bay

111. On many of the islands, while solid waste and coastal fisheries became the pilot focal area, government officials were quick to point out that their greatest problems involved sanitation. Given the community-level orientation of the project and the lack of linked investment funding, it was logical that waste and coastal fisheries were deemed more suitable, recognizing the high cost and complexity of sanitation, especially in urban and peri-urban areas. It is expected that the upcoming GEF/SOPAC project will further investigate water and sanitation strategies among the countries. This is important as there is an immediate, urgent need to devise and implement strategies for addressing sanitation needs, particularly on densely populated atolls such as Funafuti (Tuvalu), Tarawa (Kiribati) and Majuro (Marshall Islands),.

112. Annex A includes a review of each of the country projects, based on observations during the evaluation mission and a review of project reports. The following are brief summaries of the conclusions reached:

IWP Pilot	**Summary of Conclusions:**
Cook Islands	• Useful studies have been undertaken that would not have been carried without IWP financial assistance. • IWP provided an opportunity to undertake an economic valuation of the impact of water pollution in Cook Islands for the first time. • The IWP communication strategy was the first formal and systematic approach to dealing with environmental outreach to the communities and nation, and is being considered for replication by other agencies. • The Takuvaine Catchment Management Plan has now been legally adopted, and is the first to be developed under the Cook Islands National Environment Act • The IWP National Steering Committee is becoming the Water Safety Plan (WSP) National Steering Committee, which currently works with the Ministry of Works and the Ministry of Health to develop Water Safety Plans, with assistance provided by WHO and SOPAC under AusAID funding.

Federated States of Micronesia	• While slow to get started, the Yap IWP has demonstrated success in establishing and managing an MPA, and has been instrumental in building interest from other communities to replicate locally managed MPAs at other sites. • The Yap State Goverment. has demonstrated its commitment to the sustainability of project outputs, and has been able to build stakeholder involvement and support, including with the private sector (i.e. dive tourism operators). • Yap was the only pilot managed at the state/provincial, rather than national, level. The national government had only minimal involvement, outside of transferring project money between UNDP and the LA..
Fiji	• IWP has been successfully incorporated into the Fiji Government structure. Sustainability will be increased as a result of government commitment to the project. • The project has successfully undertaken a range of activities at both the community and national levels. The excellent teamwork has been a huge benefit, and demonstrates that the government is capable of executing such projects if partnerships are maintained and meaningful engagement of the partners is included • Fiji is planning to tap the GEF Small Grants program for continued community work and replication, based on work under IWP. • The Liquid Waste Strategy developed through IWP has been well coordinated with the national water policy and strategy under the EU-funded Programme for Water Governance implemented by SOPAC. It is expected that the institutional arrangements set out in the Strategy will provide a basis for continued progress under the SOPAC IWRM project.
Kiribati	• IWP's main achievement on Tarawa has been to greatly enhance community and government awareness of waste management issues, and to link with, benefit from and assist other, pre-existing and successful waste management programs. While IWP and other waste management projects on Tarawa have achieved considerable success in addressing some aspects of the solid waste issue, the objectives and outcomes relating to liquid waste, human waste and pig waste were only partially addressed. • Kiribati has completed its sustainability plan (to be submitted to cabinet in the 1st Quarter of 2007. A first reading of new legislation on pollution control and waste management occurred at the end of 2006. Kiribati also finalised its economic assessment, and completed the communication plan. and an Integrated Waste Management Strategy. Plastics-free legislation has also been drafted. • The IWP staff and activities have been integrated into the government's pollution control unit, and another village was added and will be replicating the 1st pilot project. • Thanks to collaboration with the Tuvalu NC, attendance of Kiribati stakeholders was secured to their on-site sanitation training, funded through SOPAC's EU-funded Island Vulnerability project. As a result of their participation, the Environment Division and the Ministry of Health have requested a similar training in Tarawa (as a pilot), to apply the strategy to Kiribati conditions. This will be conducted in late February, 2007. • It is clear that the major human-health and environmental priority on Tarawa is sewage and wastewater management. It is strongly recommended that the SOPAC IWRM project focus urgent attention on addressing this major problem in a strategic, integrated manner.

Marshall Islands	• IWP's main achievement on Majuro has been to increase community and government awareness of solid waste management issues. In addition, IWP has set the stage for improved national environmental planning in RMI, through its efforts to determine underlying socioeconomic aspects of waste management at the community level. It is clear that the major human health and environmental priority on Majuro is sewage and wastewater management. It is strongly recommended that future projects give urgent attention to addressing this major problem in a strategic, integrated manner. • The IWP social economic assessment was deemed to be highly successful and is being replicated across other communities, through national financing. • A waste corporation was developed in 2006, to be launched in 2008. • SOPAC is preparing interventions to address the highest priority water resource protection problem on Majuro: protection of the Laura Water Lens (which is feeding the DUD water supply), with EU funding. The Laura area is also expected to be the main focus area under the IWRM project.
Nauru	• Financial mismanagement caused the pilot to be discontinued in 2003, prior to the achievement of anticipated outcomes at the community level.
Niue	• The project has a strong community focus. However, the level of community participation proposed was not matched by available local capacity. • The project has undertaken many interesting social assessment studies that have now been applied in other programs. A Fisheries Management Plan was developed. • The low population of Niue is an important factor in its achievements and challenges during IWP. While there was greater coverage of the pilot project, and ability to pre-test methods, because of a small population, there was also a lack of capacity to carry out activities. • In February 2006, IWP activities were transferred to other departments.
Palau	• Palau was effective in using the IWP to further its national solid waste management aims, but less successful in getting on the ground improvements in the pilot community.
Papua New Guinea	• The IWP may be considered to have been moderately successful with regard to addressing waste management in Barakau and largely unsuccessful in addressing the coastal fisheries component. • Two highly significant outcomes that have been greatly assisted by the IWP in PNG are the moves to ban the use of plastic shopping bags in PNG and the initiation of the development of a National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan. • The IWP at its conclusion has been fully integrated into the government departments in all aspects. An additional coordinator is now on staff. Substantial national funding has been set aside for continuing the effort

Samoa	• The IWP efforts in Samoa initially suffered from a lack of planning, a lack of transparency in pilot selection, significant changes in government and involved stakeholders. As a result, up until the final 6 months of the project, results were limited. • With SPREP and the IWP PCU both based in Apia, there should have been opportunities to work with the lead agency to place the Samoan pilot on a more consistent and successful track. • Community buy-in was difficult for stream-bed protection efforts in Lema, with no GEF resources provided during the first several years for constructing fences and other on-the-ground incentives. Towards the end of the project, greater spending flexibility allowed for stream fencing. • The whole country concept changed when the sustainability strategy was completed and implemented in the final six months of 2006. In the pilot areas water intakes were upgraded and storage tanks were constructed to improve water quantity and quality. • Water reserve zones were fenced to prevent animals (cows and pigs) from reaching the main water source. Awareness and extension materials were finalized (with dissemination to the public still pending). An MOU had been signed between the community and national government to secure community commitment. • Basic baseline data on quality and quantity have been amassed and analyzed.
Solomon Islands	• There was a very low level of participation in IWP-SI by members of the NTF, particularly on the part of government side. • Most of the activities are still in the relatively early stages and require additional support before they come to fruition, so it is difficult as yet to identify far reaching positive effects. • WWF is taking on some financing support for continuation and replication activities.
Tonga	• The project has been designed and implemented in a strategic and successful manner and shows great promise for sustainability. The Tonga IWP management has recognized that not all activities will be completed within the IWP time frame and they are looking beyond IWP to obtain funding assistance. Activities have been identified that will be continued beyond 2006, such as enforcement of village regulations, ongoing rubbish collection, education/awareness efforts, etc. Although, the project has shown excellent progress towards achieving its goal, the impacts will not be realized immediately. The continued progress towards the goal will largely depend on the commitment of key stakeholders to satisfactoryly see it through to its conclusion. • The success of the project to date owes very much to the excellent work of the NC, which shows the importance of recruiting the right people for such positions. • Many administrative changes have taken place, and the department is moving back to the Ministry of Lands. The national waste strategy is being finalized. There are delays in completion due to government turmoil. and of 5 externally funded projects in the department, four are ending, so there are critical funding and staff issue to address.
Tuvalu	• The Tuvalu IWP focused on one of the key environmental issues facing the island (solid and liquid waste management) and raised awareness of the direct link between groundwater contamination and the threats to human health. • The project suffered from a lack of the necessary legal/regulatory foundation for addressing household waste and sanitation problems. • Tuvalu has been developing a proposal to the EU to address the borrow-pit issue linked to improving their access to water and sanitation within an integrated water/wastewater framework.
Vanuatu	• The IWP in Vanuatu can be considered a success, with all community-level objectives and outcomes being achieved, good progress being made towards the national level objectives and outcomes, apparently good prospects for sustainability and replication without further GEF intervention, and many benefits having been realized beyond the initial scope of the project. • A Community Development Fund was launched during the 3rd Quarter of 2006, designed to help replicate the Crab Bay success, to support resource substitution and income generation.

4.3.2 Knowledge Management and Communications

113. The regional communications strategy and its implementation across many of the participating countries and pilot communities were project high points. In many of the PICs there was a creative use of media and communication techniques, and heightened awareness of the issues. Anecdotal evidence from the pilot communities suggests a high level of awareness about the IWP was attained through the creative use of print, radio, and printed materials (e.g. calendars, posters). Several of the communications strategies utilized non-traditional communications tools, such as community theatre (Vanuatu) and popular music (Kiribati). Staff in several of the pilot projects significantly raised their skills, and produced high quality video presentations. Recognition of the successful communication program comes not only at the community level but also from international sources. Five of the IWP countries submitted papers that were subsequently approved for presentation at the World Congress on Communications for Development (WCCD – Rome 25–27 October 2006).

114. The ProDoc focused on sharing technical information. The PCU and many NCs were able to shift this traditional approach to one more focused on empowerment: taking community action on environmental issues and promoting individual responsibility. The IWP communications effort used a variety of communications techniques and formats. A regional communications strategy was developed, national communications strategies were then developed (with public relations, social marketing and education components). A web site was created, and the country offices developed newsletters, educational materials and media events. A conscious effort was made to reach people in the pilot communities with information that was relevant to them, and in formats they were likely to be receptive to.

115. The IWP website is informative, and has averaged around 400 hits a day during much of 2006. Unfortunately, in the later project stages the site has not stayed current on pilot activities and accomplishments.

116. A key issue during the final project months concerned the backlog of NC and consultant reports yet to be finalized, set in standardized IWP formats, and published. The PCU contracted an editor to review, edit, and prepare for publication the more than 60 reports in the pipeline, some of which were over two years old. The effort continued through the end of the project in February 2007, and ultimately a total of 57 technical reports were published, 40 of them in the final six months. All will be made available through SPREP's website.

117. There were good interactions between IWP and the GEF IW Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW: LEARN). The communications activities carried out within IWP have received wide notice and praise internationally thanks to IW: LEARN. IWP, at the urging of IW: LEARN, put together large (1 × 2 metre) story panels with photos and caption text illustrating key messages and community-based activities from the IWP water resource management communications campaigns in Kiribati, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Samoa, and Fiji. The IWP panels were prominently featured within an IW: LEARN exposition entitled: Gender-Water-Climate "Unity in Diversity", which has been displayed at the following venues worldwide:

- Development & Adaptation Days, COP-11, Montreal, Canada, December 2005
- Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts & Islands, UNESCO lobby, Paris, January 2006
- 4th World Water Forum "Local Actions" display area, Mexico City, March 2006
- 3rd GEF Assembly, Cape Town, August 2006
- Climate Change & Disaster Preparedness workshops with Caribbean National Red Cross Societies of Bahamas, Cayman Islands, St. Kitts and Nevis, Antigua and Barbuda, January 2007

118. IWP had ample opportunities to contribute to SPREP knowledge management initiatives. A review of the SPREP IWP website suggests that opportunities were missed. For example, the SPREP publications list includes waste characterization studies for Tonga, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, PNG, Tuvalu, Kiribati, and Samoa. Unfortunately, none of the waste characterization studies done in the eight IWP PICs that focused on waste have been included. The waste characterizations are also from the SPREP Solid Waste Management project in 2000. At the time of writing the SPREP site included 17 IWP reports, with the remainder to be posted upon publication (in late 2006/early 2007).

4.3.3 Social Assessment and Community Participation

119. An IWP Social Assessment and Participation Strategy (2002) was developed as guidance to NCs, PCU staff and associated participants. The aim was to assist NCs in developing work plans and carrying out social assessment activities. While the Strategy was never finalized, the draft strategy provided a useful working frame for IWP country pilot activities.

120. A Gender Policy was developed by the PCU in 2002, but never completed. Reflecting on UNDP Gender Policies (see UNDP Guidance Note on Gender Mainstreaming, 1997), it can be stated that the IWP was generally managed in a gender-sensitive manner. For instance, UNDP policy on Gender Balance in Management includes the requirement for equal (50:50) participation in decision-making bodies. The PCU, through most of IWP implementation, included two male and two female senior staff. In addition, female NCs were selected (by PIC governments) in Fiji, Niue, Kiribati, Vanuatu and Cook Islands.

121. Gender issues arose in a number of the community pilots. One of the most challenging circumstances arose in Fiji, where a young female NC of Indian background had to work with a strongly patriarchal local Fijian community leadership. That this project was successfully carried out of is a testament to the NC's diplomatic skills.

122. An initial training workshop on community facilitation and participatory project planning was held in Niue in September 2002, and the results used to formulate a series of four sub-regional "train the trainers" workshops in 2003. Attended by representatives from all 14 pilot projects, the workshops trained approximately 60 participants including NCs, and NGO and national government agency representatives, on aspects of facilitation, stakeholder analysis, participatory problem analysis, socioeconomic surveys, solution trees, participatory impact assessments and project mapping. National-level training workshops supporting local IWP facilitators were subsequently held in Vanuatu, Fiji, and Kiribati.

123. A SPREP Resource Kit for Facilitators of Participatory National Resource Management in the Pacific grew out of the 2003 sub-regional workshops. The tool kit includes 6 modules: introduction; engaging stakeholders; learning abut NRM problems and stakeholders; learning about the socioeconomic context; planning for change; and planning for action. Indications are that the tool kit is attracting interest beyond the IWP with inquires from SPC, FAO WWF and others, and potential modification and use for the SPREP Invasive Species program. It is available on the IWP webpage.

124. The participatory training efforts have been of benefit beyond the IWP pilot projects. For example, persons trained in Niue through IWP were subsequently involved in the SPC fisheries project, and some communities members in Fiji went on to assist other communities.

4.3.4 Economic Analysis

125. The IWP Pro Doc did not specify the nature of economic inputs, except to make provision for the "recruitment and hiring of the necessary expertise to assure the requisite level of resource economics" to "determine the economic viability of demonstrations" (ProDoc 1999: 24). There was no discussion of economic incentives, or economic valuations, or elaboration of the economic consequences of national-level environmental strategies and legislation. The vague framework for economic activity was then fleshed out in a PCU-developed Economic Strategy in 2002. The strategy was developed in draft form, posted on the net and revised several times during the project.

126. The following economic analyses were carried out during the project.[12] It is important to note that out of 14 pilots, 8 undertook some economic assessment and valuation work.

Country	*Activity*	*Date*
Cook Islands	• Economic valuation of watershed problems	2004
Palau	• Economic valuation of problems caused by waste	2005
Kiribati	• Assessment of the green bag scheme	2005

[12] Detailed documentation of the natural resource economics activities was developed by the PCU natural resource economist in the report "Economics and the IWP: a summary of activities, issues and lessons for the Pacific." In addition, each of the economic assessments is being published through the IWP-Pacific Technical Reports series, and will be made available on SPREP's website.

Kiribati	• Assessment of the impact of the green bag scheme	underway
Tonga	• Economic analysis of waste	2006
Fiji	• Economic analysis of waste	underway
Tuvalu	• Benefit cost analysis of alternative sanitation systems	underway

127. While most of the focus of the economic effort was at the country and community level, one regional activity was carried out under the economics section, delivering a Train: Seacoast course on economics for community based environment and development projects in the Pacific. Funding came from the UN Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea (UNDOALOS).

4.3.5 Legislative and Policy Reforms

128. One of the most challenging aspects of IWP has been the effort to link community activity with national policy development. Each of the countries was expected to consider national strategies for addressing the priority environmental concern in tandem with community-based pilot activities. The pilots were not to be an end in themselves, but rather a proving ground, from which the national governments could test approaches, find useful solutions and role them into national strategies. As articulated by the PCU communications specialist in his comments for the WCCD Forum: “Perhaps the greatest barrier to effective communications was the lack of clear objectives for institutional strengthening and the integration of project lessons into lead agencies at the national and regional levels’.

129. Legislative reforms should naturally emanate from the national resource management plans that were expected deliverables in the IWP country programs. While many of the IWP country programs reviewed current legislation, identified gaps, and proposed new legislation, the achievement of legislative reforms is unfinished business for the IWP countries. Results were as follows:

- Several of the PIC programs, including Tonga, Kiribati and Marshall Islands, provided input to new national waste strategies and/or the creation of a National Waste Authority. In Niue, legislation was developed for community based fisheries.
- In Niue, by-laws were developed, although legislation has not been passed.
- As a result of the IWP, a draft water resource bill to establish a Water Authority is now with the Department of Water Works in the Cook Islands, which has responsibility for further action.
- In Vanuatu, national fisheries legislation has been amended to include principles of traditional management into their M&E plans. Yap undertook an institutional review related to coastal fisheries. ADB conducted institutional and legislative reviews on behalf of the Cook Islands IWP. Also, legislative reviews were conducted in Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga.
- IWP Fiji managed and coordinated the formulation of a National Liquid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan and a new Wastewater Standard.

4.3.6 Sector-specific issues:

Waste Management

130. The SPREP member states have recently approved (2005) a regional waste strategy. The PCU provided information on the IWP waste characterization efforts to SPREP during development of the Strategy. The Strategy serves as a useful review of waste problems and remedies for the PICs. It notes that many PICs lack the necessary national legislation to enable effective programs for waste minimization and recycling. It further notes that impediments to private waste industry development remain in most PICs. Additional support to SPREP from the PCU on waste includes a waste kit, with waste minimization techniques, which IWP helped finance.

131. Within the IWP waste management pilot projects, communities developed recycling and composting methods to reduce waste loading into landfill sites and to maintain cleaner neighbourhoods. Several PICs have made significant progress on the development of their national waste management programs.

- Kiribati has made dramatic improvement in terms of recycling. Neighbourhoods on Tarawa are remarkably free of cans and bottles, as they now have value as a recycled commodity, thanks to a privately-managed recycling concession. The deposit/return program being implemented on

Tarawa is focused on plastic and aluminium cans. Car batteries can also be returned for a USD 10 fee.

- Tonga is well on its way to developing an integrated waste management system, having deftly combined IWP community-based knowledge with bilateral donor investments.

132. Efforts to reduce pollution from pig waste were not very successful, as community members felt little compulsion to restrict free ranging pigs, and real reluctance to combine with others to create communal pig farms. The pig waste problem was further stymied by a lack of available funding for new piggeries. The following problems were observed:

- Social and economic considerations, including land ownership, made the proposed solutions (typically development of communal piggeries) difficult for pilot community members to accept.
- Some literature was made available to communities regarding the design of more environmentally-friendly family-plot piggeries, which may hold out greater promise for acceptance than communal piggeries, but no real effort was put into demonstrating and obtaining financial support for this option.
- A previous effort in Tuvalu to include a biowaste digester with a communal piggery was observed during the evaluation mission. The AusAID-funded digester was broken and the sty was unused. Biowaste energy production requires a much larger sty population than was present in this demonstration design and spare parts were hard to obtain; the community was not eager to adopt this communal piggery approach.

Sub-Regional Waste Oil Study

133. A sub-regional waste oil study was mentioned in the ProDoc. The study was not completed, and in fact fitted poorly with the rest of the project. The PCU turned to the SPREP waste team for work on this activity, and some preliminary research was carried out in 2002 to consider a waste oil recycling facility in Micronesia. The research did not progress very far, and the PCU took the remaining USD 20,000 funding and folded it into the budget for country pilot projects. This was an understandable decision by the PCU, although with the SPREP regional waste strategy under development simultaneously, it should have been possible to make progress in this area.

134. In the future, as the recycling programs of Kiribati, RMI and other PICs continue to develop, recycling of used oil should be considered. A feasibility study is merited, focused on a specific country. Of the several PICs visited during the valuation mission, Kiribati appears best positioned to pilot used oil recycling.

Coastal Fisheries

135. IWP demonstrated that strategies such as demarcation of protected areas, restrictions on harvesting, and utilization of revenue substitution methods (e.g. different ways for families to earn an income – such as through tourism) can be effective in addressing root causes. Measures were successfully implemented at the community level, and are being replicated elsewhere, despite minimal financial investments from IWP. Challenges remain with respect to:

- monitoring sites to gauge species recovery;
- ensuring accuracy and scientific rigor;
- pinpointing the most effective size and location for locally-managed MPAs; and
- tying these local initiatives into country-wide coastal resources management programs.

136. The pilot projects in Vanuatu, Niue and Yap helped to restrict resource overexploitation and build a sense of community responsibility. Many of the islands have community authority and/or responsibility structures that are well suited to coastal fisheries protection, as village chiefs and elders can institute fishing tabus and maintain compliance.

Sanitation

137. IWP made some progress in developing remedies for PIC sanitation problems, especially on densely

crowded atolls, but serious issues remain. In Tuvalu, groundwater pollution, resulting from poor sanitation, is a problem impacting both human health and the environment, and the social/economic assessment that was developed provides clear evidence of this link. Unfortunately, IWP-Tuvalu only scratched the surface with respect to remedies.

138. In several countries IWP championed the construction of composting toilets. Efforts to convince local communities of the merits of using composting toilets were uneven, with support understandably higher when financial support to build the toilets was available, and when national and local governments were supportive. Interest also logically dissipated as population densities increased in more urban communities. In the rural Tongan community of Nukuhetulu, each of the ten households will soon have a composting toilet, funded by IWP, CanadaAid and local sources. In the more urban and congested community pilot projects on Funafutu, in Tuvalu, two demonstration toilets were built, but the effort has not expanded, and there was a noticeable lack of interest in this approach from some community members.

139. In Fiji there were conflicting government messages. For example, the Department of Health financed a new flush toilet and septic system for the pilot community at the same time as IWP was making efforts to introduce composting toilets. While composting toilets are a reasonable solution for rural areas, it is unrealistic to expect that densely populated communities facing septic system-generated pollution problems will revert to composting toilets. The response from community members in Funafuti bore this out. In particular, there was no support from the local government (kaupale) to force people to build composting toilets rather than continue using their flush toilets.

140. IWP viewed its role to be one of changing attitudes — at the community level — about environmental protection in general, and specifically regarding the advantages of replacing (faulty) septic systems with environmentally more appropriate composting toilets. After initial scepticism, and confusion over why IWP was not funding the construction of toilets for each community household, the community projects in Tonga, Tuvalu, and Fiji were successful in building interest and support, aided by a few "demonstration" toilets in the communities. Tonga has now progressed even further, with donor and government funding arranged to construct toilets for all ten households in Nukuhetulu. Securing funding for community-wide efforts in villages larger than Nukhetulu represents an investment challenge for each PIC.

141. Beyond the financing issues, the shortcoming to this small-scale sanitation effort was that it limited communities to consideration of just one option — standalone composting toilets — without providing a more robust consideration of the variety of sanitation options, their cost and the environmental implications. Reticulated sewage systems offer the greatest convenience but at high installation and running cost. Constructed wetlands offer excellent treatment at lower cost than traditional waste water treatment facilities but need a large amount of space. Septic systems are less costly but have high environmental impact if not operated properly. Low flush and dry toilets can reduce the loading into sewage and septic systems, but usually entail higher purchasing costs (for low flush) and more "hands on" maintenance (dry toilets). The composting toilet outhouses being recommended in several IWP pilot projects offer low construction costs and the lowest pollution-related impacts (assuming proper construction and maintenance), but with less privacy and convenience. Changing attitudes is fine, but community members deserve to know the options, and a decision to convert to composting toilets will be all the more powerful if communities understand these to be the best available alternative.

Water Resource Protection

142. Reports from the pilot efforts in Lema, Samoa, suggest that some communities are now restricting livestock access to watersheds, and are recognizing the importance of tree cover for soil retention and reduced silting.

143. In the Cook Islands, the Takuvaine Catchment Management Plan is now a legal document, and work is underway to prepare for its implementation. Of particular note, traditional leaders on Rarotonga have expressed interest in expanding the work carried out by IWP, for protection of both biodiversity and the freshwater resources within the catchments.

4.4 Sustainability of Results

144. During the final project months much emphasis was placed on sustainability and replication, with several workshops and IWP meetings, and PCU members travelling to the countries to review and help plan their post-IWP strategies. This emphasis is well-considered, and should result in the continuation of many national ICWM activities.

145. Because many of the sustainability strategies were not finalized until late 2006, their utility for the purposes of end-of-project planning was limited. Most provide a good snapshot of what was accomplished. Unfortunately, what happens in 2007 and beyond is only briefly considered and relates primarily to the fate of the IWP office and staff, and expectations of strategies to be completed. Tonga included a planned 2007 budget (USD 84,000), a list of donors to solicit for funding support, identified the need for consulting assistance to complement its integrated waste management strategy, and noted preliminary discussions for assistance from the SPREP Pacific Waste Project. The Fiji strategy indicated that the government expected to absorb IWP-Fiji staff, and to work with the Ministry of Fijian Affairs to replicate the IWP waste management activities in other communities.

146. Kiribati's strategy, drafted in July 2006, noted that the 2007 budget of USD 72,000 is unsecured. Kiribati also lists some donors to contact for additional support. Kiribati indicated that it would be developing its integrated waste management strategy in late 2006 and early 2007. The Solomon Islands sustainability strategy focused mostly on 2006 project completion activities, but also defined a suggested work plan for 2007, with 18 activities at the local and national level, including establishment of a Coastal Fisheries Unit in the national government, expansion of local seaweed farming in the pilot site, and further aquaculture training. As with many of the sustainability strategies, the consultant-written Solomon Islands strategy provides a set of recommendations rather than a government approved strategy document.

147. The Cook Islands strategy took the novel approach of including a table analyzing strengths, weaknesses, solutions and opportunities; however, the opportunities needed further refinement (for example, from p. 14: "provide physical presence of what the project can do and build up the confidence of the people in the project area and build up support for the project").

148. The sustainability strategy exercise was useful, in that it helped focus NCs on the work still needed to successfully complete IWP. The effort was inadequate, however, as a tool for Ministry planning to achieve the broader project objectives of improving coastal water quality and protecting coastal resources. For example, the success of a locally-managed MPA should shape recommendations for a network of protected areas, and restoration of specific coastal marine species. A waste pilot project should provide lessons for island-wide recycling and composting programs. A watershed focussed pilot project should set the stage for catchment basin planning across the country, including how to tackle difficult issues involving land ownership rights. A sanitation-related pilot project should crystallize ideas for investment projects to fix overloaded septic systems, support the construction of composting toilets, and consider the feasibility of different types of wastewater treatment systems.

149. Sustainability will be a challenge in the IWP countries, due in part to financial requirements, and also to the incomplete transition from community pilot activities to the adoption of national strategies and regulations. Recognizing the delays in launching pilots, it is not surprising that the project end has come too soon for replication and national policy implementation to be achieved. The participating PICs, assisted by SPREP, are urged to continue their sustainability efforts.

4.4.1 Potential for Replication

150. With 14 pilot projects, IWP is by definition designed for replication. Each of the 14 demonstration projects were supposed to be selected in part based upon their potential for replication (ProDoc: 56). The expectation at IWP conclusion is that the community-based and national level outputs can provide models for other communities, and national governments, within the region and among other SIDS.

151. A draft replication strategy for IWP was developed during 2004–2005 to provide a framework for countries and regional agencies as they consider lessons learned from IWP and the extension of pilot projects in the region. The pilot countries are now engaged in developing replication strategies, as a subset of their sustainability strategies, and most are expecting to complete and get national government approval of their sustainability plans during the final months of 2006.

152. Based on the mission interviews and subsequent IWP quarterly reports, some of the country

programs are likely to show replication success, including:

- On Majuro (Marshall Islands) the social/economic baseline analyses from the pilot area were well received and used as a vehicle for social/economic assessments across the country. Assessments are now being applied on 12 other RMI islands, funded through ADB.
- On Yap, four of the five villages that were interested in hosting the coastal fisheries/protected areas effort have indicated an interest to replicate the IWP experience and two have already demarcated protected areas.
- On Vanuatu, both the Environment and Fisheries departments reported that efforts were underway to utilise the community-based resource management regime developed for the IWP pilot site at Crab Bay at other sites throughout the country. In addition, continuing efforts in Crab Bay are planned, with the Fisheries Department supporting a trochus reseeding program, and Japan (through JICA) providing support to replicate some of the Crab Bay initiative components (especially the social assessment) in other communities.
- The Ministry of Fijian Affairs has agreed to replicate best practices in waste management in other parts of Fiji.

4.4.2 Future Donor Support

153. The project document and logical framework (Outcome 6) envisioned that donors would be approached towards the end of the project to discuss ways to continue supporting IWP interventions. The planned donor conference did not materialize. Nevertheless, the PCU has indicated that the countries are having success in generating both national and international support for the continuation of IWP activities. In its 3rd Quarter Report, the PCU noted that 7 of the 14 pilots have confirmed their government's intention to roll IWP activities into ongoing Ministry programs.

- The IWP effort in Tonga linked with the Australia and New Zealand-financed landfill projects on Tongatapu, with joint effort on new waste legislation for a waste authority. Interestingly, the IWP's successful work with community women's groups spurred the idea to enlist these groups for fee collection services. Also in Tonga, the Canada Fund will reportedly provide 60% of the budget for composting toilets in the IWP pilot community Nukuhetulu, with IWP and the 10 households providing the remainder.
- ADB is funding socioeconomic assessments across the island of Majuro, based on the IWP model from the Jenrok community.
- Kiribati was able to utilize ADB funding for its waste recycling deposit/return program development.
- Palau is looking to JICA for landfill redevelopment work.
- Fiji has secured funding from UNEP/GPA to build capacity on animal waste management, including a study tour to Xiamen China for a small group of Fijians.

154. The pilot countries are now shifting their attention to new project opportunities. It should be noted there are a number of GEF support mechanisms available that can sustain IWP-related activities:

- The GEF/UNDP/SOPAC Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) project now under development.
- The UNDP/GEF Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) project under development.
- The GEF Small Grants program, which is expanding in the region.
- The GEF Development Marketplace annually selects innovative projects to receive support in the USD 50,000 to USD 200,000 range, using an expedited competition format. There are 105 finalists for the 2007 allotment and 16 in the East Asia/Pacific region, (unfortunately none from PICs).

5 LESSONS LEARNED

155. Outcome 5 of the LF seeks to "maximize regional benefits of lessons learned from management of oceanic and coastal and watershed resources". The expected outputs are lessons and best practices for

community-based, national-level and regional conservation and resource management initiatives.

156. Significant time and resources from the PCU and PICs has been put into identifying lessons learned. The PCU held two workshops with NCs in 2005/2006 to discuss lessons learned, and the outcomes reports from both workshops point to many useful lessons.

National Program Management

157. The IWP countries went through extensive reviews to identify their priority area of concern early in IWP but the national strategy context was subsequently lost as activity shifted to the community level. The lesson here is that community-based natural resource pilots that are nationally managed need to be strategically oriented. Recycling programs, deposit/return programs, composting initiatives, etc. are useful for national governments to pilot if they are then used to motivate public support and test operational strategies for a national waste management strategy. Locally-managed marine protected areas are useful to pilot to test approaches for national integrated coastal resources strategies. The key is having a national policy context driving the pilot effort.

158. The problems faced by PICs in completing the remainder of their activities prior to project conclusion suggest that long term plans of action are needed for country programs to avoid drift and to reduce delays. While adaptive management and flexibility are important, they can only work if there is a plan in place setting out a sequence of activities that leads from assessments and communications strategies to implementation and monitoring.

159. The distance between the country capitals and the pilot sites, and the work load from national strategy efforts and reporting responsibilities made it difficult for many of the NCs to focus enough attention on keeping the community pilot activities moving. Future projects, when managed by national governments, need to budget for an on-the-scene manager, ideally with facilitation and conflict management skills.

NTF Engagement

160. The IWP experience with NTFs was varied, with some working well and others barely functioning. Several related lessons arise from this experience:

- Many of the best performing NTFs, for instance in Vanuatu, were subsumed into committees with larger (sector–wide) agendas, and included sub-task forces to handle IWP- specific activities.
- NTF members, if expected to address community pilot issues, should travel to and meet persons in the pilot community, so they understand community issues before making decisions.
- NGOs and private sector representatives should be included in NTFs for their expertise and support.
- NTFs at the national level are fine for the overall management of national components, but village level coordinating committees should be established to oversee local projects. This is especially the case in the many PICs where traditional village authority structures remain strong.
- Compensation for attendance in NTF meetings was an issue in several countries, and had a significant impact on NTF participation and effectiveness. Payment for out-of-pocket travel costs and to cover meals is permissible for NTF participants, but sitting fees must be avoided.

Communication and Public Awareness

161. Communicating ideas and presenting facts are different activities. Publishing a report that no one understands or bothers to read is not communicating. The key to communication — especially at the community level — is to deliver a message in a way that the targeted audience understands, through a medium they pay attention to. The IWP communications strategy evolved from a factual presentation mode (in the ProDoc design) to a community-based communications approach, using theatre, music, TV, radio and printed media. IWP successfully raised awareness of the importance of individual and community actions to protect and cleanup their environment. While citizens may not have learned that the IWP was implementing a SAP, they did come to understand that biodegradable “green bags” were

available at their local grocery store on Tarawa, and were better for the environment.

Country Ownership, Initiative and Leadership

162. The sustainability strategies being completed by the NCs and their staff are expected to be approved at the national government level. This government approval is critical to build ownership and national support for continued IWP activities.

163. Yap was the only project managed at the provincial level, and encountered difficulties in getting the attention of the FSM national government to consider strategies, policies and legislation building from the IWP pilot effort. A direct link to national government is required for IWP experiences to influence national policy setting, so provincial level projects require that there also be an active LA at the national government level.

Community Participation

164. Some of the IWP community pilot projects suffered initially from perception problems, especially as it became apparent that country project funding was mostly earmarked for project staff, consultants and workshops, and not direct community investments. The experience from Fiji provides an interesting lesson on the importance of not overselling the "rewards" of being a pilot community. Initial advertisements there led communities to believe that USD 400,000 would be directed to the selected pilot community. Community members in the selected community were then understandably confused when it became clear that very little actual investment would be forthcoming. Such IWP experiences reinforce the need for clarity on pilot community selection criteria and what communities will receive.

165. Issues of land ownership and natural resource management can be contentious in many PICs, where increasing populations, limited resources, and traditional social hierarchies all impact on even minor land use decisions. Lessons from IWP show that inclusiveness, open dialogue, and good information are keys to achieving success. Cattle owners in the Lepa water basin pilot in Samoa, for instance, agreed to restrict the access of their animals to the streambed after meetings were held to discuss the impact of such practices on water quality, and after the project agreed to provide fencing material for the area. .

Regional and Inter-governmental Cooperation

166. All projects face a balancing act of how best to coordinate with other organizations working in the same sector or region to avoid duplication of effort, and to build on synergies, while keeping the coordination efforts from becoming too time consuming and a drag on efficiency. IWP took a common sense approach to cooperation and coordination with the other CROP agencies, by identifying and hiring experts from these agencies to use their technical expertise for the IWP effort. In so doing, knowledge was shared and regional cooperation expanded without excess workshops, Memorandums of Agreement and other potentially burdensome integrating activities.

167. The coordination between SPREP and SOPAC during IWP, and now in planning for the SOPAC IWRM, could have been closer and more successful. The two organizations have overlapping mandates and competencies in the water and waste sectors, and provide services to many of the same agencies and officials in the member states. While each has advisory group status (for the IWP and IWRM projects), there should be consideration given to direct involvement and partnership when it is clear each organization has something to contribute. The OFM portion of the IWP successfully identified a direct role for other CROP organizations. Future water and waste projects in the region would benefit from linkages that exploit the combined talents and resources of SPREP and SOPAC.

Use of International and Local Consultants

168. The use of one or more national or international consultants to assist several pilots can help to build cross-regional synergies and capitalize on lessons learned. The work on waste management strategies and the development of deposit./return recycling programs for Kiribati and RMI is a good example of replicating success across countries with similar needs.

169. Results from the pilot community participatory workshops point strongly to the need for competent

facilitators that can deftly lead communities towards action. This represents a major challenge in many communities where animosities, clan loyalties, or opposition from an influential participant, can stymie progress.

Application of Lessons Learned - Biodiversity Conservation Program

170. The TOR for the evaluation included an expectation that the IWP achievements be considered against the lessons from the terminal evaluation of the 2002 GEF/UNDP/SPREP SPBCP.

171. The SPBCP TE mentioned that one of the shortcomings of the project was the "little" use of NGOs as partners in implementing the Program, despite their suitability. This criticism could be considered for IWP as well, because it was a implemented by national governments, and the community pilot projects were managed by coordinators working for national ministries. The issue should be further clarified, however. When discussing NGOs it is important to differentiate between community-based organizations (CBOs), including village community committees, and the more formally organized non-governmental organizations, which may be national or international in scale and orientation. Both of the SPBCP and IWP worked extensively with CBOs. The IWP pilot projects especially had great success working with community women's committees. The availability, and competence, of NGOs in the Pacific region is a point of contention, with many NCs indicating that their options were limited in finding NGOs that had the required expertise for working on IWP. If this is indeed the case, than it represents an opportunity, across the region, to consider mechanisms to improve the capacity of NGOs, as well as to more fully take advantage of scientific, engineering and management talent available through academic institutions and the private sector.

172. The SPBCP TE commented on the problem of taking a regional delivery approach across such a wide area, notwithstanding the expectation of national level execution of the community-based projects. It suggested that national and local approaches should be preferred, except in cases where sub-regional approaches would help with skills transfer and technical support. This evaluation has also considered the issue of geographic scope. As note previously, the IWP efficiency problems were more related to project delays as a result of the project start up design, and to project management skills issues at the country offices. Especially given IWP's OFM component, and the intended region-wide synergies and knowledge sharing in the IWRM component, the regional approach for IWP was reasonable

173. The SPBCP TE noted that in the project, SPREP took a "go it alone" approach and did not utilize opportunities to build from the community rural development experience of other CROP agencies, in particular SPC. For the IWP, SPREP was more successful in interacting with other regional entities. The OFM component was subcontracted to the FFA and SPC. In addition, PIFS was significantly involved in the economic analysis aspects of the ICWM component, with their natural resources economist playing a key consulting role.

174. The SPBCP TE indicated concerns about the risk identification and management measures included in the Project Document. The third iteration of the IWP Log frame (2004) includes a good, albeit brief discussion of risks, including at the community level.

175. As with SPBCP, IWP was extended (by slightly over two years rather than five); neither project document was revised as a result. However, the IWP LF was revised after the MTE, in light of the MTE recommendations and the two-year extension.

176. The multi-level financial and administrative reporting scheme adopted for the SPBCP was essentially retained for IWP. It appears that similar tensions between program management and the country projects were experienced over reporting and cash flow in each project. In future regional projects, SPREP and UNDP should consider the lessons from these two projects, and make arrangements for:

- NC project management training, and web-based support tools.
- Project planning, scheduling and finance tracking templates with guidance manuals for managing country projects.
- Agreements with countries at project start up on what the contract payment arrangements will be, including country flexibility to "carry" staff salary payments if there are payment delays due to reporting delays.

- Decoupling country payments, so that the majority of countries who report on time are not held hostage to the minority that have not.

177. A noticeable difference and improvement from the SPBCP arrangements and focus was seen in the area of community engagement. Recognizing that the two projects had different objectives, the IWP efforts on participatory processes, on local capacity building, and communications were strong positive moves forward.

178. The SPBCP received support in the TE for its work on income generating activities. IWP also included several pilots where income generating activities were emphasized (Tonga, Vanuatu, and Yap). Future regional projects should place even more focus on deriving economic benefit from environmental protection, recognizing that waste has value, a clean environment can stimulate tourism, clean water and good sanitation reduce health costs, and sustainable fisheries bring more income than depleted ones.

179. The SPBCP TE (Overview: 11) suggested that "More time and care need to be spent on program preparation and design. The starting point must be a comprehensive analysis of the problem to be tackled". IWP was designed to provide this additional time, enabling the countries to dig deeper into root causes within a comprehensive analysis of their environmental concerns. The problem was that this time was taken during a prolonged inception phase. Future projects need to get the initial analysis, topic and site selection procedures taken care of during the PDF-B planning stage, so that pilot activities can commence quickly.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Sustaining and Replicating the IWP

PIC and SPREP Actions

180. The rush to complete and implement sustainability strategies during the final six months of the project suggest that this effort should have started earlier in the process, and been included as an integral part of the M&E plans from the beginning of country implementation. While the specific activities to be sustained will evolve during projects, the mechanisms that governments need to use — including cabinet and parliamentary approvals of laws and policies, and feasibility studies for future investments — can be anticipated early on, and planned for accordingly.

181. The IWP emphasis during the final year on deriving lessons learned and formulating sustainability strategies was important and time well spent, as long as the lessons are really learned, and the strategies implemented. As noted in the earlier discussion on sustainability, the strategy design and content were more focused on near-term project ending efforts, and did not get to the point of discussing longer-term sustainability, which is a conversation that should take place with senior ministry officials, not NCs and their consultants. Future regional projects should continue to include sustainability strategies, but with a pre-agreed government commitment that it is the responsibility of the National Task Forces to commission, agree on, and implement these strategies.

182. IWP has generated a great many reports of regional, national and community scope, which have application not only in the Pacific but in other regions as well. Once the PCU and SPREP complete their editing efforts, the reports, project briefs and communications information, including PIC-produced videos, should all be posted onto the SPREP web site and lodged in the reports database. There is strong interest among the IWP countries for SPREP to facilitate continued information exchange on IWP issues (e.g. solid waste management, river basin management, coastal fisheries and sanitation).

183. SPREP should now work with the GEF IW: LEARN staff to identify a subsection of reports and communications materials that should be posted to the IW: LEARN site, choose and produce a select number of project summaries and briefs for IW: LEARN to feature, and brainstorm additional mechanisms for sharing the IWP lessons, especially with other SIDS.

184. SPREP should assist PICs in linking the pilot project experiences and country lessons back to SAP implementation. 2007 will mark the 10th anniversary of the regional SAP. SPREP should carry out an appraisal of the SAP, in light of the passing 10 years, and the IWP experience. The results of the appraisal

should be taken up at the annual meeting of SPREP focal points in 2007. In particular, it would be useful to consider significant revisions to the SAP to make it a more useful document, including objectives and milestones that member states can negotiate and then agree to achieve.

185. In the aftermath of IWP, SPREP can provide an important service to each of the participating countries by working directly with them to devise projects and feasibility studies that address the IWP topics nationally.

186. One common problem at the end of capacity-building projects is the difficulty to really gauge sustainability. For future regional efforts, UNDP should consider how to include in the monitoring and evaluation program a "one-year later" assessment that follows up with participating countries to see how they have continued to build on the skills and lessons from the project. If possible, SPREP should discuss with UNDP whether a small follow-on exercise early in 2008 could be supported to consider the IWP legacy.

187. IWP demonstrated the value of including an economic focus to natural resource protection and environmental management projects. Natural resources protection yields both intrinsic and monetary value to a society. Pollution and resource depletion have many costs, such as increased health care needs, reduced tourism potential, the need for new food sources, etc. While the push from the PCU for countries to include economic assessments in their country pilot programs was viewed with some scepticism, the results have been very important to national strategy development. To sustain and build on the economic assessment efforts from IWP, SPREP should consider retaining a natural resources economist as part of its core staff.

6.2 Design Modifications to Increase the Likelihood of Success

Project Timing

188. A common refrain heard from each of the IWP NCs was that the late start up in implementing pilot activities made it difficult to complete community activities, start to replicate the effort in other communities, and develop national strategies and legislation. The 2–3 year implementation period was insufficient, suggesting that community-based programs need to be designed differently, by reducing the time taken by inception activities, and extending the length of the project.

189. Given that the regional SAP was developed and approved in 1997, it would have been useful for the PICs to work through their priority concern selection during the project planning (PDF-B) stage, so that the Pro Doc would have already delineated each country's area of concern and what they expected to achieve out of the community pilot effort. This would have enabled selection of NCs with suitable technical background, a more rapid implementation, and more time available toward the later project stages to build follow on donor support for replication and national plan implementation.

Development of environmental status indicators

190. GEF is increasingly focusing attention on the development and achievement of indicators, to better gauge the extent of project and program impacts. The IWP M&E plans each included process indicators, and some environmental stress reduction indicators, but not status indictors. It is certainly meaningful to successfully carry out training programs and have countries enact new environmental legislation, yet these achievements are secondary measures of environmental improvement. To directly gauge success, initial baseline assessments are essential, followed by periodic monitoring of environmental status. Every project in the region that seeks to improve the quality of the environment needs to start with a baseline understanding of the current extent of environmental problems generated using real environmental data. Then the same parameters need to be monitored over time, so at project's end there is a verifiable measure for gauging improvement, or the lack thereof. With the increasing sophistication, and lowering cost of remote sensing devices, the ease of environmental monitoring is such that it is no longer defensible, in any region, not to produce environmental monitoring data and to be able to establish environmental status indicators. Hand in hand with this increased determination to track environmental impact, there will need to be training opportunities for project participants on how to elaborate and then track environmental status indicators.

National task Forces

191. IWP country efforts had mixed success in setting up NTFs that were inclusive of key stakeholders, met regularly and provided useful guidance for the IWP LA and project staff. The NTFs that functioned best, and which are expected to continue after IWP's conclusion, are those that have some or all of the following attributes:

- strong LA management support;
- authority to make decisions and have an impact on the project; and
- established to focus on national issues rather than to micromanage the community pilot activities.

Private Sector Involvement

192. The private sector received minimal attention in the ProDoc, and more could have been done to build private sector involvement and support. Waste sector projects in particular are ideally suited to private sector involvement, recognizing that recycled waste has value. Deposit/return programs can be run under private concession, (as in Kiribati), and green waste can be composted and sold, (as is being considered in Tonga). Other environmental concerns, such as depletion of coastal fisheries, should likewise include a private sector component, especially to engage tourism interests to support marine protected areas, restore fisheries and keep beaches clean. IWP, for instance in Crab Bay (Vanuatu), had success with income substitution, recognizing that the suspension of one economic activity — due to its negative environmental impact — may help introduce other economic opportunities, for which project proponents should plan.

Communications

193. Future community-based projects should pay close attention to the successes of the IWP. As the communication strategies were developed, there was a brilliant shift in emphasis from "providing information" to "empowering people". The team understood that environmental stewardship arrives when individuals move beyond awareness to responsibility. The communications approach taken by IWP should also be emulated for the effort taken to understand their audience and to reach them with messages they were likely to respond to. Whether through rap music, theatre, DVDs, photo exhibits or neighbourhood clean up competitions, the IWP community pilot projects got the message out.

Socioeconomic assessments

194. It is already evident that one of the real legacies of IWP will be its introduction to PICs of social and economic assessment tools. Environmental baselines are not enough. To fully understand the root causes of environmental degradation requires a much more detailed understanding of the social and economic factors: income, population density, unemployment, education levels, legal and economic structures, etc., through which the environmental problems arise. As just one example, the research done in Tuvalu through IWP has underscored the direct causal relationship between leaking septic systems and skin problems for children during and after flood events. IWP has helped lay the groundwork by identifying root causes

195. What is also required is to more fully understand the costs associated with taking, or not taking, action to clean up the environment, so that a doubly powerful argument can be made for pollution prevention: because it is both economically and environmentally advantageous. It is also important to identify revenue alternatives, if resource restrictions take away livelihoods and/or impact on diets. The Crab Bay, Vanuatu, effort to promote cocoa as a replacement for income lost due to restricted land crab harvesting is a successful example from IWP, as is the introduction of black pearl and seaweed farming as alternative income generating activities in the Solomon Islands.

196. Those PICs that developed social and economic assessments have a powerful tool in hand that should now be replicated, and expanded to consider root causes impacting other social goods, such as education and health services. The inclusion of social and economic assessments should become the norm for UNDP GEF International Waters projects, including the upcoming SOPAC IWRM.

Sector-specific Issues

197. Future efforts in PICs on coastal fisheries protection should consider lessons learned from the IWP. In particular, advanced research is needed to identify especially critical habitats where protected areas should be established, and where degraded areas should be rehabilitated. The identification of target sites should build both from community interest and marine ecosystem priorities. Baseline studies and ongoing monitoring are essential in order to determine whether restrictions are having the intended effect and to utilise MPAs as a stock enhancement tool. Community residents should be a central part of the monitoring effort.

Project Development Training

198. Future projects in the Pacific need to anticipate and budget for project management training for NCs, including the follow-on training of NC replacements. Many of the IWP NCs had only limited international project management experience when they joined the IWP. They faced difficulties on a variety of conceptual and practical aspects of project management. This is a common issue that arises in many UNDP/GEF projects globally, and suggests additional attention needs to given to project management training by UNDP and its implementing partners.

199. UNDP/GEF should include a training component for staff of multi-country, multi-year projects. From the experiences of the IWP PCU and from other UNDP/GEF IW projects, assistance is commonly needed on activities such as:

- Strategies for the development of Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses (TDAs), and negotiating Strategic Action Plans.
- In the design of logical frameworks and development of indicators (status, process and stress reduction).
- Tools and techniques for basic project management, including hiring consultants, and financial reporting.

200. Project management training must be a shared obligation with the participating countries. MOAs at project inception should include clear agreements on the country obligations to hire competent staff and support the training of replacements

201. There is likely to be scope for a set of project management training modules, which could be utilized through e-learning or face to face workshops.

NEX and Financial Controls

202. The UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality is designed to empower recipient countries and communities, to enable their meaningful involvement in the direction and objectives of projects. The IWP struck a reasonable balance. Through UNDP and SPREP, the PCU exercised tight financial controls, and required that countries adhere to their M&E Plans when making financial requests. Yet significant flexibility was left to the countries to shape their efforts, including selection of the pilot focal area and location for pilot activities. The IWP annual auditing requirement for country activities should be emulated widely, especially when there is a concern that project management capacity problems may arise.

Follow-on Donor Support

203. The project document and logical framework (Outcome 6) envisioned that donors would be approached towards the end of the project to discuss ways to continue supporting IWP interventions. The planned donor conference did not materialize, however this is not surprising, as few GEF IW projects deliver on this promise as envisioned, and if they do, few then see their efforts translate into new project financing from the assembled donors. The basic approach to building post-GEF IW financial support needs to be reconsidered. For projects such as IWP to generate a next wave of donor support requires a far more involved process than organizing a one-off conference during the final project months. The following are a few suggestions on how to rethink this process:

- Include project concept development and donor coordination as part of the country efforts, written

into the country's project document/M&E plan, linked to communication and sustainability strategies, and beginning during the inception and implementation of the project. As soon as it is clear what priority environmental concern will be targeted, countries should be thinking how to build additional funding support. In particular, any investments in infrastructure that are expected to build out of the GEF IW effort need early attention.

- Keep the donor representatives engaged. Include donor representatives in the stakeholder strategy. Invite them as ex-officio members of the NTF. Give them regular updates on the GEF IW progress.
- Ensure that integrated water management issues are included in the donor country strategies and that project concepts emanating from the GEF IW are passed through the Ministry chain to donor focal points, so they can be included in project pipelines.
- Building further donor support is a PIC responsibility. SPREP can help (i) through its knowledge management capacity, and by (ii) providing PICs with information on donor interest and project cycle timing, (iii) providing project concept templates, (iv) identifying consultants in the region who can assist in project development, and (v) sponsoring workshops on how to develop project documents and feasibility studies

204. The IWP country-based activities were managed by national governments, and community focused. This offered a useful direct linkage between local activities and national government policies. It also entailed higher management costs and less of a day-to-day community presence than might be the case if there were a stronger local presence, such as through greater use of NGOs and local staffing. Other multi-country UNDP/GEF projects have taken a small grants approach to engage NGOs in community-level activities, with the national governments focused on national policy aspects. It is evident that many PICs lack technically competent NGOs, and rely on technical expertise provided by the CROP agencies. The GEF small grants program should now be investigated by PICs as a potential funding source to help replicate IWP pilot activities in other communities, to build NGO capabilities, and to more closely engage local, regional and international NGOs as partners to address priority environmental concerns.

Guidance for GEF Interventions in the Pacific.

205. The evaluation team urges a continuing significant UNDP/GEF support mechanism for the Pacific region. The upcoming SOPAC IWRM project provides an important opportunity for added attention to pressing water supply and sanitation system improvements. As it has done through the Danube/Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership, and may replicate in the Mediterranean and elsewhere, GEF should give strong consideration to linking investment facilities to future capacity building projects in the Pacific, including IWRM.

206. The development of natural resource protection projects in the region requires consideration of the optimal geographic scope. Taking a regional, sub-regional or national approach should depend on which approach can be expected to yield cost efficiencies and increased project effectiveness, including knowledge sharing between countries. There are likely to be cases where sub-regional projects are suitable, enabling reduced lead times to implementation, an easing of travel and communications costs, and increased inter-country collaboration.

ANNEX A: COUNTRY REVIEWS

1. COOK ISLANDS

1.1 Background

***Pilot Project Site(s)*:**
Takuvaine Water Catchment

Thematic Focus:
Fresh Water: To improve the management of freshwater quality on Rarotonga

Pilot Project Objectives:

1. The objectives of IWP Cook Islands as presented in the draft Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan developed in 2004 are:

- To develop a freshwater management plan for the Takuvaine Community (Community)
- To develop a national freshwater quality management plan for Rarotonga (National)

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:[1]

2. Four outcomes are identified in the M&E plan:

Local Level:
- Freshwater Management Plan developed
- Freshwater Management Plan implemented

National Level:
- National Management Plan developed
- National Management Plan implemented

Project Activities:

3. The following table lists the status of the activities which were identified to achieve the outcomes and objectives of the project's community and national components.

Takuvaine Water Catchment (community level)	
Objective 1	**To develop a freshwater management plan for the Takuvaine Community**
Output 1	**Freshwater Management Plan developed**
Activity 1	Conduct PPA workshop to understand the root causes of the problem. *Completed*.
Activity 2	Elect Community Working Committee to develop the management plan (including enforcement etc*). Completed*
Activity 3	Consult with catchment landowners. *Ongoing*
Activity 3	Develop and implement community awareness program on the fragility of the catchment area. *Completed*
Activity 4	Community Committee prepares action plan to develop the Freshwater Management Plan. *Completed May 2005 (Takuvaine Management Plan)*
Activity 5	Develop community-based monitoring program to help people understand the problem. *Ongoing*
Activity 6	Assess initial socioeconomic survey attempt for the community. *Completed*
Activity 7	Complete socioeconomic survey of the community. *Completed*
Activity 8	Draft freshwater quality management plan for the Takuvaine catchment (April 2005). *Completed*
Activity 9	Hold Community Forum to endorse implementation of the management plan. *Completed*
Activity 10	Develop communication plan to promote management plan. *Completed*

[1] As these are tangible products and not intended change the outcomes are regarded as outputs.

Output 2	**Freshwater Management Plan implemented**
Activity 1	Establish community management structure and protocols. *Completed*
Activity 2	Establish ongoing community-based M&E Enforcement Program. *Completed* (**Note**: Takuvaine Management Plan and regulations have not yet been implemented but are under consideration by Cabinet).
Activity 3	Legalize management plan — register under the National Environment Act. *Completed*
Activity 4	Implement Community Communications Plan to explain changes/new rules to Takuvaine community and national audience (May 2005). *Ongoing*

Rarotonga (national level)	
Objective 1	**To develop a national freshwater quality management plan for the Rarotonga**
Output 1	**National Management Plan developed**
Activity 1	Consult with traditional leaders of Rarotonga (to propose an island-wide management plan) *Ongoing*
Activity 2	Conduct economic evaluation of freshwater resources and cost-benefits of possible solutions *Completed*
Activity 3	Prepare report analyzing water quality data and forecast trends.*Partially completed.* (**Note**: The project was hampered by incomplete data on intake quality of water, provided from the Public Health Ministry. Important baseline parameters such as weather and temperature were not recorded. Baseline data was also missing from the Ministry of Water Works, which started testing only in 2004. Thus while some trends and data were collected, the IWP project was unable to complete a water quality data report.)
Activity 4	Review Takuvaine Management Plan. *Planned to be done 1 year after implementation of the Management Plan. The review is planned to be conducted by NES at the end of 2007.*
Activity 5	Conduct review of legislation and institutional arrangements relating to protection of freshwater quality. *Completed.*
	Note: for the rest of the project activities – set out below, efforts are still ongoing to achieve completion. The Government has committed to continue IWP efforts, and there are linkages to upcoming donor-supported projects, including the SOPAC-supported Water Safety Plan Development Project. Continued support is also anticipated from the traditional leader's organisation, "Koutu Nui". Currently IWP staff are chairing the sub-committee looking at the catchments, and modifying and extending the management activities of the Takuvaine project to the other catchments.
Activity 6	Prepare Draft Rarotonga Management Plan for consideration by the National Task Force. *Planned for later half of 2006.*
Activity 7	Develop communication plan for the management plan. *Completed*
Activity 8	Conduct a forum for national agencies and stakeholders to discuss and endorse National Freshwater Management Plan. *Planned for 2007 under other projects.*
Activity 9	Conduct public consultation meetings with the various stakeholder groups in the Cook Islands. *Status uncertain*
Output 2	**National Management Plan implemented**
Activity 1	Seek Cabinet endorsement for Management Plan (October 2005), and promote project to outer island MPs.
Activity 2	Legalize Management Plan (e.g. recognized under the Environment Act)
Activity 3	Establish a permanent body (if required) to coordinate Community Freshwater Management Plans. *A bill to establish this body is still in draft form as a result of the legislative review undertaken by IWP.*
Activity 4	Implement Communications Plan to explain new system — encourage other communities to join.

1.2 Evaluation Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

4. The objectives do not predict the ultimate and long-term development impact that is expected to be attained after the project is completed.

5. Despite experiencing delays in implementing some activities, most have been completed, with a small number still ongoing. Some national level activities cannot progress until the community level activities, such as the development and implementation of the management plan, are completed. The delays were a result of other community, government, and individual priorities that did not always coincide with the project schedule. However, the greater part of the project has focused on implementation, with little attention paid to the effectiveness of the activities/outputs/outcomes/objectives towards the attainment of the goal.

There pilot project initially considered the entire Takuvaine Watershed, but was narrowed to the Takuvaine water catchment, with acceptance of the Te Au O Tonga Vaka Council's expression of interest on behalf of the Takuvaine Community

6. While it is acknowledged that objectives and outcomes may not be immediately realized, it is unclear how these are linked to the overall goal of the SAP, which is the integrated sustainable development and management of International Waters.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

7. The Cook Islands developed its own draft country pilot document, based upon the IWP ProDoc and following a template provided by the PCU. This document was subsequently revised during NC meetings. As was true in the other PICs, the project aimed to address root causes of environmental degradation of coastal areas and resources. This was to be undertaken simultaneously at the national and local levels.

8. The specifics for in-country implementation were defined following the development of strategies by the PCU, revolving around three central areas: social assessments and participation, communications, and natural resource economics. In addition to the strategies, guidelines for in-country arrangements and implementation were also developed.

9. The strengths of the project design utilized by IWP and implemented in Cook Islands are in the flexibility provided to consider different project types for selection. The dual (national and community-based) approach to addressing root causes to environmental degradation provided the opportunity for government and the community to work together closely on a common environmental goal. The relationship serves as a model for similar projects in the future.

10. Community participation was an issue with respect to the initial planning and development of IWP activities in the Cook Islands. There was very little community consultation, beginning with the project design effort, and including the expression of Interest submitted by the Te Au O Tonga Council on behalf of the Takuvaine community. This hindered achieving full understanding and ownership by key stakeholders As a consequence, a considerable amount of time needed to be invested in "selling" the project.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

11. Strengths included:

- There was a strong use of local consultants to carry out community activities, helping to build local capacity, reduce the cost of technical expertise and also enabling better receptivity of the community members
- The national taskforce functioned well, and included key government agencies, and Koutu Nui (a traditional leaders organisation registered under the House of Ariki's Act), the tourism council, Vaka council, and landowners. The IWP NTF enabled an improved intergovernmental working relationship in the area of fresh water management.

12. Some weaknesses were identified in the in-country implementation, including:

- While the project was successful in developing cooperative efforts with community-based organizations (CBOs), through its Local Committee, and worked well with the Koutu Nui, there was a lack of NGO involvement (i.e. those types of organisations included under the Incorporated Societies Act 1994). While acknowledging capacity issues exist for many NGO's, it would still have been useful to build partnerships through IWP, and to have NGO input as members of the NTF. This could have enabled these organisations to build greater capacity to work with the government on this and future community-based natural resource protection programs.
- Politics proved a significant hindrance to the pilot project efforts. The general election in 2004 and the snap election in 2006 included attempts by some party supporters to use the project as a campaigning tool.

In-country financial management:

13. The financial arrangements developed for the Cook Islands activities were adequate. The Aid Management Division (AMD) of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management was the repository agency for the IWP funds in the Cook Islands. From there the funds were disbursed to the National Environment Service (NES), based on requisitions. AMD was heavily involved at the start of the project, outlining formats and budget requirements to ensure smooth processing of funds in and out of the various accounts. There were some delays in payment processing, due to the AMD procedures and due to late requisition requests from the NC. In such cases, the NES covered necessary payments, and was later reimbursed by IWP.

14. Training on reporting requirements was delivered by the PCU at various NC meetings. Such training included financial and narrative reporting and development of work-plans and budgets.

15. The Cook Islands was one of only PICs able to identify their in-kind contributions to IWP. In-kind contributions by the LA to the project were in the vicinity of NZ$103,200.00. A breakdown of this contribution is provided in the table below

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

16. This has been partly achieved through the incorporation of IWP into the NES Action Framework; one of the recommendations of the framework gave consideration to freshwater issues, and the IWP project will be considered as a model in dealing with such concerns.

17. A sustainability plan has recently been completed for the project, which makes recommendations on sustaining the results post-IWP. The work of IWP has been built into the LA's work program, with both the NC and the ANC subsumed under the NES budget. The formal recognition of the Management Plan lays out execution and responsibility arrangements for the pilot site.

18. It is expected that the upcoming SOPAC-executed GEF IWRM project, in which the Cook Islands will be participating, will continue some of the work of IWP. The IWRM project is primarily institutional, in line with the attempt by IWP to create a mechanism to enable cooperation between different agencies on water issues. The monitoring and communication activities will be continued by the NES and other agencies, (i.e. Water Works).

19. With the recent advent of a number of small grant initiatives in the Cook Islands for community projects (such as the GEF small grant program), the local component of IWP is a prime candidate to receive additional support. The LA has indicated it will facilitate any further needed financial assistance to support activities relating to replicating and sustaining results post-IWP.

20. This pilot project site may not have been the best choice with respect to replication, as it is the only area on the island where the water intake is below major agricultural activities, making it difficult to fully replicate. However, some of the approaches that the project employed can be replicated for other community-based projects, and the site provides good lessons for all areas within the catchment.

(Cook Islands): Country's in-kind contributions

Activity	Duration	Monthly (NZ$)	Total (NZ$)
Office Rentals	52months	$800.00	$41,600.00
Vehicle Hirage	31months	$280.00	$8,680.00
NTF meetings	26meetings	12members x $50	$15,600.00
Professional Services	24 tests + 20meetings	1 pro test 1 Staff per meet	$1,320.00
Local Project Committee	200 meetings	12 members x $15	$36,000.00
Total			**$103,200.00**

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

21. The collection and analysis of baseline data can not only increase the capacity to measure success or failure, but can also provide community members with a better understanding of the issues and the need to take action to better protect water resources.

22. Topic and site selection at an earlier stage, such as during the PDF-B project development phase, could have enabled greater achievement of objectives and greater replication.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

23. Based on the key indicators included in the monitoring and evaluation plan, it is not clear to what extent the project has been successful in improving water quality and providing further protection in the Takuvaine catchment. Nevertheless, anecdotal information suggests changes in behavior have taken place, even before the Management Plan is in place (e.g. growers have stopped taking their dogs into the catchment, and visitors are now being directed to use sanitation facilities before and after entering the area, in order to prevent pollution).

24. The Cook Islands Communications Strategy included a wide array of activities, including newsletters, brochures, posters, a calendar (popular), TV ads, community champions, and a web page. As a result of the IWP communications efforts, there have been workshops for other government agencies to develop their strategies, and the NES is soon to complete its own Communications Strategy

25. The Cook Islands IWP developed lessons learned, part of which were captured through a collective document prepared at an IWP workshop in 2006 (published in 2007 as IWP-Pacific Technical Report no.44).

26. The NES plans to continue monitoring the catchment, so further indications of success and the sustainability of results, are expected over time.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

27. Considering that the project got underway in 2002, the preparation of the M&E plan in Cook Islands (and the other PICs), should have occurred much earlier in the project cycle, and should have included clear objectives, outcomes and outputs, and verifiable indicators. This may have required intervention or advice from the PCU at the outset, perhaps through the engagement of an M&E consultant to assist countries individually.

28. It would have been useful to produce a communication strategy for the Cook Islands at the beginning of the effort, in order to increase understanding of the project purpose. While the PCU did develop an overall IWP communications strategy early in the project, direct assistance to the countries in the development of their individual communications strategies was delayed, and only achieved when a new Communications Specialist became part of the PCU Team.

29. The need for early implementation of a communication strategy is highlighted by the reference (in the PPA document) to the community's lack of education and awareness on the issues. In addition, the socioeconomic and media awareness study (undertaken in December 2004) revealed a relatively low level of

awareness of IWP's specific purpose. The development of such a communication strategy should take into consideration harmonization of efforts, and utilize the networks of government agencies, NGOs and CBOs. Furthermore, it should be incorporated into the education section of the lead (environmental) agency.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

30. Effort must now be placed on the implementation of the National Management Plan and the development of catchment protection programs across Rarotonga and other islands.

31. Consideration of additional donor support, including planned upcoming projects, must be linked to the management plan implementation. The UNDP/GEF/SOPAC IWRM project is a vital effort to continue fresh water protection programs, and there should be opportunities for New Zealand, Australia, the European Union and Japan to assist, as all have provided support to PICs for water supply and sanitation improvements, and can be invited to help support different aspects of the plan.

32. The Cook Islands IWP plans to conduct a workshop for the Management Committee to help them consider the implementation process and to discuss donor support activities. It could be useful to invite donor representatives to this meeting, and representatives from UNDP and SOPAC, or to plan a follow-up meeting for donors. If donors are invited, it will be important to identify potential project ideas (through Concept Notes) prior to the meeting.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

33. The GEF is poised to provide additional assistance on fresh water quality issues through the IWRM project. There may also be water related aspects in the PICCAP, which will be managed through SPREP. Cook Islands should also identify project proposals, including NGO participation, to access the GEF Small Grants program for catchment protection efforts.

1.3 Summary Conclusion

34. Interesting and useful studies have been undertaken, which would not have been undertaken without financial assistance. IWP also provided an opportunity to undertake an economic valuation of the impact of water pollution for the first time in Cook Islands. In another first, the communication strategy was the first formal and systematic approach to dealing with environmental outreach to the communities and nation, and is under consideration for replication by other agencies.

35. Cook Islands IWP has also demonstrated success in the national policy and legislative arena. The Management Plan has now been adopted, and is the first to be developed under the Cook Islands National Environment Act. IWP also helped to develop the Water Resources Bill, updating the outdated Rarotonga Water Ordinance

36. Replication efforts appear promising, with the IWP National Steering Committee changing over to the Water Safety Plan (WSP) National Steering Committee. They will work with the Ministry of Works and the Ministry of Health to develop Water Safety Plans, with assistance provided by WHO and SOPAC under AusAID funding.

2. FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

2.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Municipality of Riken: Yap Island, Yap State.

Thematic Focus:
Sustainable coastal fisheries / marine protected areas

Pilot Project Goal:
To promote the many benefits associated with establishing LMMAs.

Pilot Project Objectives:

37. Initially, FSM did not develop a National Workplan or M&E plan outlining project objectives. During the course of the project, outcomes, outputs and activities were developed. The following provides the work plan included in the FSM 2006 Work Plan Budget.

Federated States of Micronesia (Yap State) Workplan	
Community level	
Outcome 1	**Community-based management of coastal resources using LMMAs as management tools at Riken**
Output 1	**Effective consultative arrangement for sustainable marine resources use conservation in Yap**
Activity 1	Review ToR for Yap Task Force (YTF) as a sub-committee of the YMRCMP task force
Activity 2	Assign roles and responsibilities to YTF members to contribute to outputs (meet to review progress)
Activity 3	Review existing or planned legislation relating to community-based coastal resources management and the application of LMMAs. Propose any revision recommendations to state Legislators.
Activity 4	Describe IWP's role with MRMD.
Activity 5	Develop institutional analysis reviewing roles and responsibilities for stakeholders in coastal resources management in Yap at government level (including existing consultative arrangement). [Focus on YFA/MRMD and EPA]
Output 2	**The role of LMMA in sustainable coastal resources management in Yap is understood by stakeholders and the public.**
Activity 1	National IWP Communication Strategy and Work Book
Activity 2	Education kit or schools (relating to LMMAs and sustainable coastal resources management)
Activity 3	Radio program
Activity 4	Insert in EPA Newsletter
State level	
Outcome 2	**Sustainable management of Yap coastal resources using LMMAs as a management tool.**
Output 1	**An LMMA effectively monitored and managed by the Gagil Community.**
Activity 1	Describe the sensitivities among stakeholders in the proposed Riken LMMA.

Activity 2	LMMA boundaries and rules agreed by the Riken and neighboring communities.
Activity 3	Capacity building (training in community-based monitoring undertaken (At least 4 people as effective monitors)
Activity 4	Ecological baseline for LMMA complete
Activity 5	Monitoring plan, including selection of indicators, complete and monitoring implemented
Activity 6	Social arrangements for the management of the Riken LMMA described.
Output 2	**Community at Riken informed and aware of the effectiveness of LMMA as a tool to achieve sustainable Management**
Activity 1	Riken/Gagil Communication Strategy designed and implemented (e.g., simplified description of IWP and sustainable coastal resources management and LMMAs) translated and distributed.
Activity 2	Education kits designed and distributed to Gagil school
Activity 3	Regular IWP report (newsletter) to Riken Men's Group.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

38. As indicated above, FSM identified a national and local outcome focused on the development of sustainable management strategies for coastal marine sources.

Pilot Project Activities:

39. (See above table)

2.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

40. The FSM IWP project has focused on establishing an MPA at the municipality of Riken on Yap Island. The Yap Government had originally proposed four pilot sites but this was reduced to one through negotiations with the PCU.

41. The FSM pilot has embraced a combination of modern/scientific and traditional/community-based approaches to MPA establishment and management. Boundaries for the MPA at Riken have been established (and marked with floats), based on traditional knowledge of ownership and resource use. Full engagement and involvement of the community at all stages and levels has been paramount, and the community undertakes day-to-day management and enforcement of the MPA.

42. The lead agency for IWP in Yap coordinated a baseline survey of the MPA as well as one follow-up monitoring survey, with more planned.

43. Some education and awareness materials on the benefits of MPAs have been produced by the IWP lead agency in Yap.

44. Unlike other countries (such as Vanuatu and RMI), which reported very positively on the benefits of the socioeconomic baseline survey, this study for Yap was considered to be of limited relevance and utility.

45. The FSM pilot project was unique in IWP, in that it was executed in-country by a state, rather than the national, government. As a consequence, the project activities in Yap were not closely followed at the national level, and there were corresponding problems in communication, national policy relevance, and replication beyond Yap.

46. Reporting from FSM was problematic. In most cases, the NC communicated directly with the lead agency in the National Government, who in turn made contact with the PCU, which created time delays and confusion. In addition, quarterly reports were often submitted a month or two after the due dates, leading to financing problems for the FSM pilot project, and also causing delays in the payments to other PICs.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:
Strengths

47. At the broad, regional level, there were limitations in the overall project design, as highlighted in the general sections of this review.

48. At the community level, a major strength of the project design in Yap was the very close involvement and engagement of the community in all aspects of planning, implementing and managing the MPA.

Weaknesses

49. At the national level, there was very little consideration of mechanisms for dissemination and replication of the outputs and outcomes of IWP in Yap. The project was entirely focused on the island of Yap. As a consequence, the goals and objectives of the regional SAP and its implementation across FSM were not a focus of the country effort.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:
Strengths

50. In-country implementation arrangements were strengthened when the Department of Resources and Development (DRD) assumed LA responsibility, bringing a greater degree of political influence and availability of Government resources to the project.

51. There was also very close cooperation and coordination between Government agencies in Yap, with a number of agencies working cooperatively to implement IWP activities (e.g. DRD, EPA, Fisheries, etc.).

Weaknesses

52. The project was very slow to start in Yap, due to confusion about the exact objectives and requirements of the broader IWP project document (a point made by most countries), certain disagreements between the Yap government and the PCU about the nature of activities to be undertaken, a high turnover of national project staff, a major typhoon hitting Yap during the project, and transfer of lead agency functions from the EPA to the Department of Resources and Development, about mid-way through the project.

In-country financial management:

53. The FSM pilot site was unique in that it was executed in-country by a state as opposed to the national government. Project staff (within Yap State) reported significant delays in getting finance transfers from the FSM government throughout the project, which caused significant delays to project activities. There were also delays in the government submitting financial reports that had been provided by the Yap state government on to SPREP/UNDP, thereby causing delays in the transfer of replenishment funds back to the project

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

54. Establishment of the MPA under IWP in Yap has generated significant interest from other communities, with some villages taking the initiative to move forward with their own MPAs. This bodes well for replication and sustainability.

55. While taking some timed to get started, overall the FSM IWP has had a measure of success in demonstrating the establishment and management of MPA's and has been instrumental in catalyzing the replication of MPAs at other sites on Yap. The Yap State government has demonstrated its commitment to sustainability of project outputs, through direct funding of a number of follow-up activities (e.g. using "Yap Day" to promote MPAs, continued surveys and monitoring at the pilot site, and assuming responsibility for the salary of the Project Coordinator). Sustainability is further enhanced by the introduction of a "user pays" system for dive-tourism businesses, which operate in and/or near to the Riken MPA.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

56. As noted in the main text, a sub-regional approach, or one focused on a specific aspect of the SAP, (water, or waste, or coastal fisheries etc), could have enabled a clearer focus for the project and a more rapid

inception and start up. The open-ended nature of the country decision-making process during project implementation meant that in FSM, as in many other PICs, two years or more were required to identify the focal area, and then identify a suitable pilot project site.

57. The pilot project would have benefited from more extensive initial and follow-up assessments of coastal fisheries conditions, in order to establish a better baseline against which the project could be evaluated for impact. While an initial monitoring was carried out at project commencement, and then a subsequent monitoring was done after the imposition of the fishing tabu, IWP in FSM could not document improvements in fish stocks, or compare conditions in the tabu area with similar areas.

58. The project could have used a more scientific approach to identifying critical sites for coastal fisheries replenishment. The decision to focus on the Riken municipality was based primarily on local community interest; while this is a critical aspect, other important factors include the need to protect sensitive habitats and to replenish valuable and threatened species. The documentation for the decision-making process does not indicate that biodiversity and ecological criteria were significant factors in the decision on where the pilot project would take place

59. There needs to be an active national counterpart when projects such as this are based at the state/individual island level, especially if the results are intended to inform national decision making on legislation and national coastal protection priorities.

60. In cases such as the Yap pilot project, where there is joint ownership of a pilot project between fisheries and environmental departments, there needs to be clear agreement at project commencement on how the two will work together on implementation.

61. A more rapid and successful implementation schedule could have enabled Yap to have already proceeded with replication of the pilot project, in the other three communities that were vying to be the pilot site. Replication should be an ongoing part of the project effort, not something that is triggered only by the conclusion of the project.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

62. Many of the challenges and lessons are noted above. In addition, it was made clear by IWP in Yap that a more hands-on approach at a senior level of DRD during the early years of the project would have been useful, especially to advance the state and national-level aspects of the project.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

63. Stakeholders advised that while additional and ongoing donor support is always needed and welcomed, there was no intention to develop a proposal for a follow-up GEF project, and that the prospects for sustainability and replication were good, as outlined above.

64. With one section of the Yap coast now piloted for fishing tabus, and three other communities also either implementing or planning tabus, it would be useful for Yap, and by extension islands or states in FSM, to consider a more comprehensive sustainable coastal fisheries project, involving the mapping of fisheries and species in all coastal areas. Such an effort could include consideration of high priority areas where fishing restrictions should be considered, and where selective breeding and restocking could be considered. This may or may not be suitable for GEF funding, but some effort could already be made to identify GEF small grants funding.

2.3 Summary Conclusion

65. While slow to get started, overall FSM IWP has demonstrated success in establishing and managing an MPA, and has been instrumental in building interest from other communities to establish MPAs at other sites. The Yap State government has demonstrated its commitment to sustainability of project outputs, and has been able to build stakeholder involvement and support, including with the private sector (i.e. dive tourism operators).

3. FIJI

3.1 Background

Pilot Project Site(s):
Vunisinu and Nalase

Thematic Focus:

The project for Fiji is focused on waste management. The goal is better management of land-based sources of pollution to promote a healthy human and coastal environment for rural communities in Fiji

Pilot Project Objectives:

66. There are two objectives for the project in Fiji, one relating to the community and the other to the national level:

- Improved management of solid and liquid (sewerage and nutrient) waste in Vunisinu and Nalase villages and promotion of community involvement and responsibility for local resource management and conservation for the health and well-being of communities and the environment.
- Improved national capacity to manage waste (provincial and national level).

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

67. The M&E plan identifies community and national outcomes.

68. Community Outputs/Outcomes:

- Improved understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate solid and liquid waste disposal in Vunisinu and Nalase by end of 2005.
- Improved local capacity to manage solid and liquid waste by end of 2005.
- Improved solid and liquid (animal and human) waste management practices, leading to a reduction in waste in Vunisinu and Nalase by 2005.

69. National Outputs/Outcomes:

- Improved coordination among stakeholders.
- Improve waste management in other areas in Rewa Province.
- Strengthened legislation and institutions for improved waste management.

Pilot Project Activities:

70. The following table identifies activities undertaken to achieve the objectives and ultimately the goal of the project. It also provides the status of each activity.

Goal: Better management of land based sources of pollution to promote a healthy human and coastal environment for rural communities in Fiji

Community Objective: Improved the management of solid and liquid (sewerage and nutrient) waste in Vunisinu and Nalase villages and promotion of community involvement and responsibility for local resource management and conservation for the health and well-being of communities and the environment

Output 1: Improve understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate solid and liquid waste disposal in Vunisinu and Nalase by end of 2005		
Activity 1.1	Conduct Stakeholder PPP&D workshops to identify environmental problems and causes.	***Completed***
Activity 1.2	Develop local level solutions and action plans for implementation	***Part of PPP&D***
Activity 1.3	Undertake socio-economic and resource (waste stream analysis and water quality tests) baseline surveys and monitoring activities.	***Completed***
Activity 1.4	Develop and implement a local communications strategy (Conduct workshop on waste management for decision makers (Village chief, TNK, Navuvola Development Committee and the Environment Committee))	***Completed. Part of the Communications Strategy***
Output 2: Improved local capacity to manage solid and liquid waste by end of 2005		
Activity 2.1	Establish local environment committee	***Completed***
Activity 2.2	Conduct training needs analysis for local facilitators and implement relevant trainings	***Completed during PPP&D and informally during VEC Training on monitoring some aspects of the project completed (s-e, waste audit, composting workshops etc).***
Activity 2.3	Engage community facilitators to assist with PPP&D, baseline surveys, project implementation, monitoring	***Completed***
Activity 2.4	Form a compost, piggery and waste sub-committees in the community to develop solutions in consultation with the community	***Completed but did not work out***
Output 3: Improved solid and liquid (animal and human) waste management practices leading to a reduction in waste in Vunisinu and Nalase by 2005		
Activity 3.1	Implement a household compost program to separate organic waste from waste stream	***Completed (46 out of 52 households composting)***
Activity 3.2	Pilot alternative sanitation practices through demonstration composting toilet	***Completed (there are 3 compost toilets at the pilot project sites)***
Activity 3.3	Pilot a private waste collection service for 4 months (2 months IWP/2 months Community)	***Completed (Community paying)***
Activity 3.4	Undertake regular village clean ups	***Completed (Village cleanups every fortnight)***
Activity 3.5	New rules introduced and enforced by Village Chief to ban littering in the village and community informed of the new rule.	***Informal rules established. No fines introduced***
Activity 3.6	Consider options for collecting recyclable materials from the village and implement recycling activities	***Completed. Recycling centre set up. Community members are enthusiastic about the recycling project.***
Activity 3.7	Encourage the use of traditional /alternatives instead of plastic bags	***Cloth bag project is being undertaken by women's group. Sewing machines also donated by AusAID. Cloth bag to be launched in July this year.***
Activity 3.9	Review feasibility and pilot composting of animal (Pig) waste	***Initially on hold due to land conflicts, subsequently resolved. Planned for review to occur post-IWP.***
Activity 3.10	Develop a village level waste management strategy (based on results of various pilot activities)	***Completed. Strategy is part of the National Solid Waste Management Strategy***

National Level Objective: Improve national capacity to manage waste (provincial and national level)

Output 4: Improved coordination amongst stakeholders		
Activity 4.1	National Task Force and technical sub-committees established and meets at least once every 2 months	*NTF was established and met regularly, chaired by the Director of Environment. 21 NTF meetings held during IWP.*
Activity 4.2	Establish partnerships with other programs and projects dealing with waste	*Partnerships established with Rural Communitie, Dreketi Tikina/ Rewa Province, Ministry of Regional Development and Fijian Affairs, Provincial Offices, Ministry of Multi-ethnic Affairs, Advisory Councilors, Ministry of Public Works Department, Ministry of Health, Rural Local Authorities, Ministry of National Planning, Ministry of Tourism, Municipal Councils, University of the South Pacific (Marine Studies Program/Institute of Applied Science/Geography Dept), University of Western Sydney, SOPAC, SPC, AusAID, WHO, PeaceCorps, PCD-F, SPREP, media, ADB, private waste collectors, UNEP-GPA*
Output 5: Improve waste management in other areas in Rewa Province		
Activity 5.1	Design and implement communications strategy (Awareness/env education/)/workshop	*Communication Strategy Completed.*
Activity 5.2	Build partnerships for waste management in Rewa Province	*Partnership (same as above. see 4.2)*
Activity 5.3	Provide information to stakeholders in the Rewa Province to replicate waste management practices	*Completed. Done through newsletters, one to one meetings, workshops, other Government Departments*
Activity 5.4	Support members of the Vunisinu and Nalase to facilitate project work throughout Rewa Province and other parts of Fiji	*Ongoing. IWP supported local facilitators to assist other communities in the district with waste management projects. Some facilitators helped build compost toilet in Gau Island, at Seaspray backpackers Inn in the Yassawas (upon request from the Ministry of Tourism). Also the local facilitator and Village Liaison Officer also assisted with the ICM project.*
Output 6: Strengthened Legislations and institutions for improved waste management		
Activity 6.1	Review environment related legislation and institutions with the focus on water pollution (includes ICM study)	*Completed*
Activity 6.2	Conduct stakeholder consultations about recommendations and agree on the needed reform	*Completed. Legislation sent to the heads to relevant Ministry and to AG.*
Activity 6.3	Economic evaluation on the impacts of waste on environment	*Completed. Rural Waste Management Policy developed*
Activity 6.4	Formulate Fiji National Solid and Liquid Waste Management Strategies (Strategies to be endorsed by cabinet)	*Solid Waste Management Strategy completed.* *Liquid Waste Management Strategy completed and endorsed by Cabinet*
Activity 6.5	Formulate regulations to manage solid and liquid waste in Fiji (under the EMA)	*Wastewater standards for Fiji developed. Draft regulations for solid and liquid waste being finalized.*

3.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

71. The project has completed or made substantial progress on all activities; except one project on pig waste.

72. The project has been extremely active at both the national and community levels. On the national side, waste-related policies and legislation have been drafted with IWP support and technical input. National actions have included development of :

- a rural waste management policy;
- a liquid waste management strategy and action plan;
- national wastewater standards; and
- draft regulations for solid and liquid waste.

73. At the community level, the project has worked with the villages of Vunisinu and Nalase to develop a waste management system. This project has reinforced working collectively together through a shared waste management regime in the two villages.

74. IWP's dual approach has been effective. Some lessons stemming from the community project have been utilized at the national level. For example, the pilot project experience has contributed to the elaboration of rural waste management issues in the national Waste Management Strategy and Rural Waste Management Policy.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

75. The strengths of the project are the well thought out plan and implementation of the dual approach. Others strengths include:

- Broad-based membership of the NTF, which included government, NGOs, CROP agencies, researchers and representatives from the village. The NTF was also involved to some extent in implementing some parts of the project.
- Partnerships established (see activity 4.2).
- The selection of Vunisinu and Nalase was positive as it has an active development committee and is close to Suva to allow regular exchange.
- A good IWP team including the NC, project assistants, NTF and the village environment committee, coupled with commitment from government.

76. The Fiji IWP weaknesses relate to:

- Too much time and effort spent on the site selection process.
- The method for site selection was well thought out, but the subsequent screening and decision-making that led to the selected site was not.
- While IWP has assisted in the development of new policies and regulations, there remain structural weaknesses in the enforcement of environmental requirements.
- While baseline data has been collected during the project, and a waste audit performed, the data was never analyzed and developed into a waste characterization report. Follow-up monitoring was also incomplete, so it is not possible to measure the extent of positive environmental impact from the project.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

77. The strengths of the Project are an active and supportive NTF and village environment committee. The NTF has met regularly since its inception and some members have been engaged in the work of IWP as, for example, in the pig waste project. The chair of the NTF is the Director of Environment. The project has received a strong commitment from government with many of the IWP activities being incorporated into the Ministry of Environment (previously the Department of Environment) work plan and corporate structure, as well as the National Strategic Development Program (2007–2011).

78. An added strength of the project is that some of the findings of the various IWP studies have been acted upon. For example, the IWP legislation review identified gaps in the Environment Management Act 2005 and this has been addressed through the preparation of regulations, partly funded through IWP. The IWP office has also taken a leading role in the development of waste regulations.

79. A weakness of the project is that the large pool of experience present in several NGOs that worked in previous community-based projects was not well utilized by IWP. Fiji has one of the strongest NGO communities across the Pacific, yet their involvement in IWP was marginal (primarily as members of the NTF).

80. Over 400 villages applied to host IWP. An opportunity has been missed in terms of IWP replication by the fact that no follow up has occurred with the communities that were not selected.

81. The difference in views between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Environment regarding appropriate sanitation systems in rural areas created confusion among the villagers. The Ministry of Health encourages flush toilets, while the Ministry of Environment was promoting composting toilets.

82. The former chair of the Village Environment Committee became a celebrity through his active and enthusiastic involvement in the IWP project. This created envy among some of the villagers. This yields a

lesson to be learned, regarding the need for careful balancing between promotion of community champions and encouragement of other community participants.

83. The capacity-building aspects of the project in Fiji have been greatly assisted by UNEP. A UNEP-sponsored wastewater training workshop on technologies and management for PICs was held in Fiji in October 2005. Discussions with the UNEP Program Officer during the workshop helped greatly in the formulation of Fiji's National Liquid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan, which was subsequently endorsed by Cabinet in Oct 2006. UNEP GPA also provided support for IWP Fiji to send five participants to attend a training seminar on ecological pig farming, held in Xiamen, China in January 2005. Subsequently, the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, and SOPAC have agreed to set up a demonstration project in Fiji, which will be used by UNEP GPA for future regional training.

84. SOPAC has also provided coordinated assistance to Fiji IWP. The SOPAC Water and Sanitation Unit provided technical support, including participating in the IWP Wastewater Standards Committee and the Liquid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan working groups.

In-country financial management:

85. The Ministry of Environment was until recently one of several departments that comprised the Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Squatter Settlement and Environment. With the recent enactment of the Environment Management Act 2005, a separate Ministry of Environment has been established. Under the old structure, the in-country financial management was considered bureaucratic. Several layers needed to be passed before releasing funds to the project. During the initial stages of the project, many delays were caused by governmental processes. For example, IWP had to go through several layers of approvals to engage consultants. However, creation of the Ministry of Environment is expected result in improvements in the disbursement process.

86. The lack of information on project funding led to frustration at the community level. The community's initial expectation was that over $200,000 would be made available, an understanding based on the manner in which the pilot opportunity was first publicized in Fiji. There was considerable frustration among community members when Fiji IWP indicated that direct funding of this magnitude would not be available, and that no funding would be provided for investments, such as to install composting toilets (one was installed as a demonstration unit). The community desired access to project financing information to enable it to assess spending on community activities.

87. Almost $US 270,000 was disbursed to Fiji by the first quarter of 2006. In spite of some delays in the disbursement of funds, financial arrangements were generally handled satisfactorily. IWP Fiji conducted annual audits since the project's inception, and submitted annual audit reports in a timely manner.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

88. IWP is supporting replication of the best-practices in waste reduction through the Ministry of Fijian Affairs and Ministry of Multi-ethnic Affairs, by way of Community Capacity Building Projects, which are operating in 14 provinces.

89. IWP Fiji activities are well integrated with national government initiatives. The Government will continue the waste management work through the Fijian Affairs Board and the Ministry of Environment. This has been incorporated into the Ministry's Annual Corporate Plan and the Government's 5-year Strategic Development Plan (2007–2011).

90. A sustainability plan has recently been completed for the project and endorsed by the Government. The plan makes recommendations regarding sustaining the results post-IWP. The development of national legislation and policies relating to the IWP focal area will also assist in achieving sustainability.

91. With the advent of a number of small grant initiatives in Fiji for community projects (such as the GEF Small Grants program), the local component of IWP is a prime candidate to receive additional support.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

92. Clearly defined project outcomes, outputs and related activities could have led to greater success.

93. A more extensive analysis of baseline data would have increased the capacity to measure impacts. Although water quality data was collected, no reporting was undertaken on changes occurring as a result of the project. Baseline and monitoring data would have been useful with respect to the incidence of water borne diseases in the community and in preparing a more extensive waste characterization.

94. The community will rely on revenue generated from recyclables to cover the cost of their waste collection operations, but this revenue has thus far been insufficient . Fortunately the NDC has incorporated this expenditure into their annual budget/fundraising, which will supplement contributions made by community members. In this and other IWP pilot projects, there was frustration that IWP did not underwrite service costs, so as to enable the recycling program to be fully implemented. Recognizing its limited country funding and focus on piloting new techniques, IWP was justified in not subsidizing the community waste collection services, but more could have been done to push for national funding, and to solicit external financial support for the community from other funding sources.

95. Regular monitoring checks on activities should be included.

96. Care should be taken in the way that community champions are promoted and selected, as it can alienate other community members. The community as a whole should be lauded for the work they are doing.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

97. Many of the successes, challenges and lessons learned have been comprehensively captured by the NCs in the draft lessons learned document. Some examples include:

- Selection of pilot projects needs to be done carefully. Expectations of community members can easily be raised, and managing expectations can be extremely difficult and can impact greatly on the project.
- In order to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings between project implementers and the host community, it is important to ensure that the community members understand the objectives of the project. A communication plan must be put in place from the beginning of the project.
- It is important for the LA and government to put in place measures to ensure that projects are implemented in a timely manner. The government should realize that projects have timeframes and there are certain donor expectations that need to be met. It is important that before signing an MOU the government should take note of the requirements of the MOU, and whether they will be able to implement projects within the given timeframe and resources.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

98. Funds should be set aside to undertake an exercise to monitor and evaluate implementation of the rural waste management policy after conclusion of the GEF assistance.

99. Involve NGOs in implementing community-based initiatives as they have a wealth of experience in this area.

100. Consider appropriate time-frames and resources required to undertake site selections and other activities. This will help in balancing efforts in different areas of work.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

101. The M&E plan needs to be revisited with a view to modifying it with respect to identifying clear and measurable outcomes and outputs. Furthermore, the M&E plan should now be reviewed to take into account activities post-IWP.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

102. Support a monitoring regime to assess the impact of any future and ongoing activities relating to the goal of the Fiji IWP.

3.3 Summary Conclusion

103. The incorporation of IWP into Fiji's government structure has been effective. Sustainability will be increased as a result of government commitment to the project.

104. The project has undertaken a range of activities at both the community and national levels. The excellent team-work has been a huge benefit. This demonstrates that the government is capable of executing such projects if partnerships are maintained and partners engaged in a meaningful way.

4. REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI

4.1 Background

Pilot Project Site(s):
Community of Bikenibeu West on the Island of Tarawa.

Thematic Focus:
Waste management

Pilot Project Goal:
Improving freshwater and marine water quality in Kiribati.

Pilot Project Objectives:

105. The objectives of IWP Kiribati, as presented in the draft M&E Plan, are:

- 1 - (Community): Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage and reduce solid and liquid waste (grey water).
- 2 - (Community): Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage human waste.
- 3 - (Community): Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage pig waste.
- 4 – (National): Improved national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste (grey water).

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

106. The outcomes as identified in the M&E plan are as follows (listed by objective):

Objective 1:
Improved understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate solid and liquid (grey water) waste disposal at Bikenibeu West

- Strengthened local capacity to manage solid and liquid waste (grey water)
- Improved management of solid and liquid waste

Objective 2:

- Identify and trial appropriate sanitation options for Bikenibeu West

Objective 3:

- Identify and trial appropriate options to manage pig waste

Objective 4:

- Strengthened national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste
- Waste legislation and policy reform
- Improved understanding of the causes of inappropriate waste disposal in areas without government waste services and management options

Pilot Project Activities:

107. The following table lists the activities identified to achieve the outcomes and objectives of the community and national components of the project.

GOAL:	**Improving freshwater and marine water quality in Kiribati.**
Community Level	
Objective 1:	**Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage and reduce solid and liquid waste (grey water).**
Outcome 1:	**Improved understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate solid and liquid (grey water) waste disposal at Bikenibeu West**
Activity 1.1	Participatory Problem Analysis. C*ompleted*
Activity 1.2	Baseline assessment of current household waste, management practices and socio-economic situation. *Completed*
Activity 1.3	Communications activities to: (underway and to continuously underway) • Encourage people in the pilot community to sort their waste for collection • Encourage people in the pilot community to reduce, reuse and recycle their waste
Activity 1.4	Use PR activities to raise awareness of the problem throughout the wider community (e.g. through church/religious group leaders)
Outcome 2:	**Strengthened local capacity to manage solid and liquid waste (grey water)**
Activity 2.1	Stakeholder analysis *Completed*
Activity 2.2	Village and school workshops to facilitate local participation in project design, implementing, monitoring and evaluation (February 2005)
Activity 2.3	Set up Local Community Committee *Completed*
Activity 2.5	Develop an action plan which may include (October 2004) • Promoting banana circles • Introduce and promote indigenous crops (i.e. coconut palm for toddy cutting purposes, pawpaw, pandanus & breadfruit) and other agricultural techniques that reduce use of water for irrigation and encourage use of organic waste. • Encourage the local community to manage their domestic liquid waste (grey water).
Activity 2.6	Employment of community facilitators to assist with the implementation of project activities by December 2004
Outcome 3:	**Improved management of solid and liquid waste**
Activity 3.1	Waste reduce, reuse and recycle campaign - Akeatemange competition from October – December 2004
Activity 3.2	Follow up campaigns where necessary (February 2005)
Objective 2:	Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage human waste.
Outcome 4:	**Identify and trial appropriate sanitation options for Bikenibeu West**
Activity 4.1	Participatory Problem Analysis *Completed*
Activity 4.2	Baseline assessment of current sanitation practices
Activity 4.3	Secondary research on possible sanitation options for Kiribati
Activity 4.4	Work with Project Development Team to develop a plan for Sanitation Trial
Activity 4.5	Possible training course with selected group to understand sanitation problems, possible solutions and how to construct them.
Activity 4.6	Small pilot demonstration of alternative sanitation systems in
Activity 4.7	Communications activities to help people understand the connection between poor sanitation practices and water quality problems, and health problems
Activity 4.8	Use PR activities to raise awareness of the problem and to understand the alternative sanitation systems available to them
Objective 3:	**Helping the Bikenibeu West Community to better manage pig waste.**
Outcome 5:	**Identify and trial appropriate options to manage pig waste**
Activity 5.1	Secondary research on possible sanitation options for Kiribati
Activity 5.2	Use Akeatemange! Competition to encourage householders to develop their own solutions to keep pig waste out of the groundwater system and reduce smells
Activity 5.3	Work with Project Development Team to develop a plan for Pig Pens.
Activity 5.4	Small pilot demonstration of most appropriate pig waste system.
Activity 5.5	Communications activities to:

	• Help people understand the connection between pig waste, water quality problems, and health problems. • Use PR activities to raise awareness of the problem and to understand the alternative systems available to them.
Activity 5.6	Standardized pig pens identified, adopted, managed and binding to every pig keeper within the trial site.
National Level	
Objective 4:	Improved national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste (grey water).
Outcome 6:	**Strengthened national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste**
Activity 6.1	Stakeholder analysis.
Activity 6.2	Merging National Task Force into a National Waste Management Committee (awareness, collection, funding etc).
Activity 6.3	Develop and implement communication plan (to advocate the objectives, processes and benefits of the project at the national level).
Activity 6.4	Work alongside Environment and Conservation Division to encourage government to adopt a "self financing" national solid waste management system.
Outcome 7:	**Waste legislation and policy reform**
Activity 7.1	Review (December 2004), amend and draft national legislation (March 2005) by to support activities identified at the community level to reduce, reuse or recycle.
Activity 7.2	Review national level institutional arrangements for waste management including a capacity assessment of relevant authorities (December 2004).
Activity 7.3	Initiate implementation of recommendations of the review (January 2006).
Outcome 8:	**Improved understanding of the causes of inappropriate waste disposal in areas without government waste services and management options**
Activity 8.1:	Cost Benefit Analysis of extending Greenbag waste collection from Bikenibeu West to the rest of Tarawa by end of December 2005.
Activity 8.2:	Economic evaluation of waste by June 2006.
Activity 8.3:	Water testing and monitoring at Bikenibeu West *Underway*

4.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

108. The Kiribati IWP has focused primarily on solid waste management at the community of Bikenibeu West on the island of Tarawa. The project has worked to implement and demonstrate a solid-waste separation scheme, with (i) biodegradable organic waste being used as compost for growing food crops (e.g. in "banana circles"), (ii) aluminum cans, glass bottles and batteries being sent for recycling, and (iii) remaining inorganic waste being placed in project-specific "Green Bags" for collection and disposal at a newly created landfill (a non-IWP project).

109. The project has been highly successful in substantially raising awareness about waste management issues throughout the entire Tarawa community, and has utilized effective communication techniques, including radio campaigns and theme songs by a popular local youth (rap) band, as well as highly effective "community cleanliness competitions", with practical prizes. The latter has generated competition between communities and provides the basis for replication at other sites.

110. IWP on Tarawa has benefited significantly from and linked well with several other pre-existing and ongoing waste management initiatives on the island, including a highly successful recycling scheme for aluminum cans, glass bottles and batteries (Koake Mange), which was established with funding from ADB, UNDP and AusAID, and which is now run as a successful business by the private sector. A new landfill has also been constructed with funding from ADB.

111. IWP has helped to catalyze the proposed development of a National Waste Management Authority for Kiribati; with associated legislation, which will greatly assist the transition to a truly coordinated, integrated waste management strategy and system for the country.

112. IWP in Kiribati made the decision early on to focus primarily on solid waste issues. As a consequence, there was little progress made on the other listed pilot objectives: liquid waste (grey water), human waste (sewage) and pig waste. The decision to focus on solid waste is understandable, as it is less complex and more accessible for community members. Nevertheless, as Kiribati was already very active on solid waste and recycling reforms, an opportunity was missed to engage community members on these other high priority issues.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

Strengths

113. At the national level, a major strength of the project design in Kiribati was the ability to link with and benefit from existing and successful solid waste management activities that were funded by other donors, including the Koake Mange recycling scheme.

114. In addition, the adoption of practical, household-level demonstrations, such as the use of organic waste as compost in banana circles, was a major strength in the project design. This feature "touched people's lives in their own settings", bringing direct, tangible, practical and immediate benefits to families (e.g. increased supplies of fruit and vegetables), and which other households and communities sought to replicate. It should be noted that the banana circles and the Green Bag programs were initiated prior to IWP by the regional NGO Foundation for Peoples of the South Pacific International (FPSI), and IWP built upon this strong foundation (which may be considered a project design strength).

Weaknesses

115. At the national level, the project design was too complex and ambitious, in trying to address solid waste, liquid waste, human waste and pig waste all at once. As a result, only the first element was substantially progressed, with efforts on the other waste types falling off rapidly.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

Strengths

116. Implementation in Kiribati benefited from the fact that the national government is relatively small in size, assisting good communication and coordination between ministries and agencies.

117. A major strength of the Kiribati IWP was a strong emphasis on communication and awareness activities, using innovative communication techniques, including radio campaigns and theme songs by a popular local youth (rap) band, as well as highly effective "community cleanliness competitions", with practical prizes.

Weaknesses

118. Like all countries in the program, the Kiribati IWP required long lead times to establish appropriate administrative and project management arrangements, and to decipher the complex and confusing regional ProDoc and refine it to meet national needs and priorities.

119. IWP in Kiribati did suffer some set backs due to turnover of project staff, and in some instances delays in the transfer of project funds within the government finance system.

120. Implementation in Kiribati also suffered from the high staff turnover at the PCU; support from the PCU dropped off substantially in the latter parts of the program.

121. The pilot project site on Tarawa could have benefited from greater communication and information sharing with other PIC atoll waste management pilot sites, which face similar challenges (e.g. Majuro in RMI and Funafuti in Tuvalu).

In-country financial management:

122. Project staff reported that greater priority could have been given to providing training in financial reporting, although they said that the PCU provided excellent support on financial issues when requested.

123. As noted above, there were some instances of delays in the transfer of project funds within the government finance system (from the treasury to the LA), which caused delays to project activities. No significant financial management issues were reported or apparent for Kiribati.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

124. There are good prospects for the sustainability of the communication and awareness aspects of IWP in Kiribati, as the Environment Department has committed to employing the communications officer for at last one year post-IWP, to develop and implement a departmental-wide communications strategy.

125. There are also good prospects for the replication of the "community cleanliness competitions" in the other municipalities on Tarawa, which have taken the initiative to adopt the concept after observing its success at Bikenibeu West.

126. There do not appear to be any plans or initiatives to replicate IWP activities at other islands throughout Kiribati.

127. While not part of IWP, the highly successful Koake Mange recycling scheme on Tarawa is an excellent model of sustainability, having been handed over to the private sector and now being run as a successful business.

128. In the absence of ongoing IWP support, the sustainability of the Green Bag collection scheme for non-recyclable inorganic waste is doubtful, as the public are now being charged to purchase the bags, and municipal collection schemes are sporadic, inconsistent and currently uncoordinated between municipal councils.

129. While there do not appear to be any specific plans for sustaining the composting (banana circle) activities, this component is likely to be replicated and sustained, as householders realize the direct, practical benefits.

130. Several stakeholders reported that planning for sustainability should be incorporated into projects from the outset, and not added on at the end.

131. At the time of review, Kiribati was still developing its sustainability plan, which has not been received by the review team.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

132. As noted above, a more focused effort, towards one aspect of waste management — in this case solid waste — could have ensured greater success, as the human and animal waste activities were mostly unsuccessful.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

133. Stakeholders reported that a major value of IWP in Kiribati lay in the process of getting community players to talk to each other to identify and plan solutions to problems. The project played a major role in bringing women into community decision-making processes, with the national women's umbrella NGO playing a key role in the project.

134. While IWP and other waste management projects on Tarawa have achieved considerable success in addressing solid waste, it is clear that the major human health and environmental priority on Tarawa is sewage and wastewater management. It is strongly recommended that any future projects give urgent attention to addressing this major problem in a strategic, integrated manner.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

135. Perhaps one of the most significant developments that IWP project has helped to catalyze is the proposed development of a National Waste Management Authority for Kiribati; with associated legislation, which will greatly assist the transition to a truly coordinated, integrated waste management strategy and system for the country. It is strongly recommended that highest priority be given by both the government and donors to realizing this initiative.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

136. Additional GEF support is planned for water resources under the SOPAC IWRM project now under development and for addressing climate change adaptation (through the SPREP Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project). IWP follow on efforts — especially relating to replication of community solid waste and recycling efforts — are well suited to the GEF Small Grants program, and the evaluation team supports the efforts of the Kiribati NC to submit a proposal to GEF.

Other points specific to this country / site(s):

137. Management and maintenance of the new land fill dump site could be improved, including stronger controls on types of waste dumped (bio-hazardous medical wastes were observed in the landfill).

138. One aspect of waste management that does not appear to have been properly explored in Kiribati (and many other islands in the Pacific), is waste reduction through import controls. Many products are imported to Kiribati that have excessive and unnecessary plastic packaging, and which create major waste issues once discarded on the island. Studies could be undertaken to characterize the "waste potential" of all imported goods, and import controls put in place to prevent the importation of the worst offenders (e.g. as has been done for glass beer bottles). Disposable nappies (diapers) appear to be a major component.

4.3 Summary Conclusion

139. The main achievement of IWP on Tarawa has been to greatly enhance community and government awareness about waste management issues, and to link with, benefit from and assist other, pre-existing and successful waste management programs. While IWP and other waste management projects on Tarawa have achieved considerable success in addressing some aspects of the solid waste issue, the objectives and outcomes relating to liquid waste, human waste and pig waste were only partially addressed.

140. It is clear that the major human health and environmental priority on Tarawa is sewage and waste-water management. It is strongly recommended that any future projects give urgent attention to addressing this major problem in a strategic, integrated manner.

5. NAURU

5.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Bauda

Thematic Focus:
Solid Waste

141. IWP commenced operation in Nauru in February, 2002, following signature of an MOU between SPREP and the Government of Nauru. A review in August 2002 observed that the environmental concern most commonly noted in Nauru was waste management (or lack thereof). It noted that few activities had been undertaken in Nauru to address waste problems. Consequently, the National Environment Coordinating Committee selected community-based waste management as the focus for the IWP pilot project. In May 2003 the Buada Community on Nauru was selected as the pilot site.

5.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

142. Nauru was not one of the countries visited during the Mission; because the pilot project ceased to function during 2003, no effort was made by the Evaluation Team to contact officials in Nauru to discuss their activities. As a consequence, this review only provides information that was submitted by the PCU.

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

143. The project was unsuccessful in meeting its objectives and outcomes.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:
Strengths:

144. Stakeholder consultations were carried out and an assessment of waste problems for the Bauda Community was commissioned.

Weakness:

145. The project was closed down in 2003 due to financial audit problems

In-country financial management:

146. Financial issues during 2003 made it difficult for Nauru to continue with implementation of the project. Communications with IWP Nauru broken down during 2003 after numerous requests by the IWP PCU to obtain audits for the project year 2002, and other reports from IWP Nauru. As a consequence, SPREP management became involved.

147. After a number of official letters from SPREP's management, the PCU still had not received the annual audits and other reports requested of IWP Nauru. In subsequent NCM (4) and MPR (3) meetings, IWP Nauru did not attend, and the PCU saw this as a sign of their withdrawal.

148. The effort to get financial audits completed was apparently a source of some difficulty. The Director of Audit for Nauru wrote to the PCU identifying the problems he had encountered in trying to get an audit done. An official letter from SPREP in April 2004 indicated that Nauru would be required to withdraw from the project if no reply to the audit requests was forthcoming by August 2004. No reply was submitted.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

149. Future GEF assistance must be dependent on a clear understanding of the financial requirements and clarification on the auditing and other measures that Nauru will undertake to ensure any GEF funds are spent appropriately.

6. NIUE

6.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Makefu and Alofi North villages

Thematic Focus:
Coastal fisheries: the goal is to strengthen sustainable management of coastal resources.

Pilot Project Objectives:

150. The draft M&E plan identifies two objectives:

- Strengthen capacity at Alofi North and Makefu to sustainably manage coastal fisheries.
- Strengthen capacity at a national level to sustainably manage coastal fisheries.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

151. Whereas the following are indicated as outputs in the M&E plan, most are in fact outcomes. Six outcomes relating to community and national level are identified in the draft M&E. They are:

Community:
- Motivated stakeholders participating in coastal fisheries management arrangements.
- Strengthened local capacity to sustainably manage coastal fisheries at Makefu and Alofi North.
- Options and alternatives for income generating opportunities.
- Increased capacity at Makefu and Alofi North to manage the impacts of local land-based activities on the coastal environment.

National:
- Project implementation arrangements established.
- Project Communication Strategy

Pilot Project Activities:

152. The following table lists activities, outcomes, objectives and goal from the draft M&E plan.

Goal:	**To strengthen sustainable management of coastal resources.**
Local project components	
Objective 1:	**Strengthen capacity at Alofi North and Makefu to sustainably manage coastal fisheries.**
Output 1	**Motivated stakeholders participating in coastal fisheries management arrangements.**
Activity 1.1	Establish, implement and manage a communication strategy for Alofi North and Makefu (posters, radio programs, public education and awareness, etc).
Activity 1.2	Stakeholder analysis and participation plan for Alofi North and Makefu.
Activity 1.3	Complete a PPA (root cause assessment at Makefu and Alofi North).
Activity 1.4	Assess solution options for addressing root causes for non-sustainable use of coastal resources at Makefu and Alofi North.
Activity 1.5	Complete review of prior research literatures in relation to fisheries for Makefu and Alofi North
Activity 1.6	Ecological baseline survey completed for Makefu and Alofi North
Activity 1.7	Socioeconomic baseline survey for Makefu and Alofi North
Activity 1.8	Prepare a village profile
Output 2:	**Strengthened local capacity to sustainably manage coastal fisheries at Makefu and Alofi North.**

Activity 2.1	Describe existing village governance arrangements (community structure) at Alofi North and Makefu
Activity 2.3	Establish a Village Fisheries Management Committee Group in Makefu and Alofi North village (Local Project Working Group) and support regular meetings.
Activity 2.4	Review options for strengthening village co-management arrangements to achieve sustainable coastal fisheries.
Activity 2.5	Design and implement a local community coastal fisheries management plan (incorporating tools such as area rotation permanent closures system of harvesting using the "Fono", and participatory monitoring, etc.).
Activity 2.6	Select and train local facilitators to support participatory marine resource monitoring.
Output 3	**Options and alternatives for income generating opportunities**
Activity 3.1	Evaluate income generating opportunities to reduce fishing pressure for Makefu and Alofi North
Output 4	**Increased capacity at Makefu and Alofi North to manage the impacts of local land-based activities on the coastal environment**
Activity 4.1	Identify and engage partners to monitor impacts of land-based activities on the coastal environment at Makefu and Alofi North (water quality monitoring at coastal springs, etc.) and report results to the communities and relevant Government agencies.
National project components	
Objective 2:	**Strengthen capacity at a national level to sustainably manage coastal fisheries.**
Output 1	**Project implementation arrangements established**
Activities 1.1	Local project staff recruit, administrative arrangements (including information management) established
Activities 1.2	National stakeholder analysis
Activities 1.3	Establish a National Task Committee and service regular meetings
Activities 1.4	Establish a Project Development Team and support regular meetings
Activities 1.5	Undertake review of Priority Environment Concerns
Output 2	**Strengthened institutional capacity for coastal fisheries management**
Activities 2.1	Identify and train local facilitators to support participatory problem analysis (root cause) for coastal fisheries.
Activities 2.2	Complete a profile of Government ministries
Activities 2.3	Complete a national level assessment of root causes for non-sustainable coastal fisheries (Participatory Situation Analysis)
Activities 2.4	Assess existing legislation and institutional arrangements relating to coastal fisheries management (including Coastal Fisheries Management Plan) and revise and strengthen arrangements as necessary.
Activities 2.5	Undertake a training needs analysis for coastal fisheries management in DAFF Fisheries Division
Activities 2.6	Support capacity building for DAFF Fisheries Division staff in coastal fisheries management
Activities 2.7	Support implementation and monitoring of adopted Coastal Fisheries Management Plan including coordinating arrangements for VFMCs
Activities 2.8	Identify and support initiatives to reduce fishing pressure on coastal resources (re-locate fishing effort off-shore)
Activities 2.9	Identify and support initiatives to reduce national level impacts of land-based activities on the coastal environment
Output 3	**Project Communication Strategy**
Activity 3.1	Design and implement a National Project Communication Strategy

6.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

153. The project has produced a considerable number of documents. Some of these have been used to assist attain the project goal in the long term (e.g. policies, bylaws, education and awareness materials, resource surveys and management plans). However, these are not well documented in the M&E structure as they are included with the activities.

154. Niue included the important activity of developing income generating options, which is essential to the sustainability of IWP efforts at the community level. It would have been useful to better link this issue to the national development strategy, so that it becomes a standard inclusion in future coastal resource protection projects and drives also considerations of small business support.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

155. The strengths in project design and implementation are:

- Through facilitator training and PSA consultations, Niue provided an opportunity to pre-test methods and approaches before larger regional training and other national consultations took place. This resulted in extensive consultations with stakeholders in assisting the design.
- One of the aims of the project was to provide training to the community to facilitate their engagement in the project. Thus, the design reflected a strong community based focus.

156. In terms of weakness in the project design and implementation, the otherwise excellent resource surveys have suffered from a lack of data on coastal water quality, fish catch and other information to aid in assessing the problem associated with the decrease in marine resources.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

The strengths relate to:

- The varied representation of the NTF including village members, government and NGOs.
- The project has produced valuable outputs that have the potential for longer lasting results such as legislation, management plans and policies to assist sustainable fisheries.
- The project has undertaken a number of social assessments.
- Traditional rules and by-laws are strong and have official recognition by government, so progress can sometimes be made on environmental issues without the need for national legislation.

The weaknesses relate to:

- National legislation, management plans and policies that get put in place often lack sufficient enforcement and monitoring.
- Limited in-country human resources and expertise forced the project to place a heavy reliance on external consultants. This has resulted in some reservations towards consultants, as it is felt that considerable IWP funds were spent on them, and very little at the community level.
- The success of the pilot project was greatly dependant on the community's participation. Members of the communities were expected to give their time to implement aspects of the project without compensation, but were aware that substantial funds were being spent on the project.
- Issues relating to economic valuation and income generating activities were not considered at the project outset.

In-country financial management:

157. The Finance Ministry was the repository agency for IWP funds, with funds disbursed to the project based on requisition orders. As of the last quarter 2006, approximately USD 426,000 had been disbursed to the project, second only to Kiribati in total country disbursements.

158. IWP Niue engaged auditors from Samoa to undertake the annual auditing requirement, including the final audit report (pending). The financial management of the project is considered satisfactory.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

159. The development of fisheries management plans to assist in achieving sustainable fisheries has the potential to ensure sustainability of results. However, community commitment is vital, as communities represent the primary managers of the pilot sites.

160. Some of the approaches that the project employed are currently being replicated. For instance, village fisheries management plans have been developed in other villages that have expressed interest. The project provided NZD 30,000 to the Fisheries Division to undertake a participatory situation analysis (PSA), as carried out by IWP in all 14 villages on Niue. The PSA will form a basis for developing local inshore fisheries management plans. They in turn will formulate components of a national inshore fisheries management plan that will be administered by the Fisheries Division.

161. With the recent advent of the GEF Small Grants program in Niue, the local component of IWP is a prime candidate to receive additional support.

162. A sustainability plan will be prepared for the project, which will make recommendations on sustaining the results post-IWP.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

163. Clearly define the outcomes and outputs expected of the project, and the activities that relate to achieving them. Combine the outputs listed in the M&E as an outcome.

164. Although the M&E plan included an activity to evaluate potential income generating activities, there was no effort to embark on the relevant findings from the study.

165. The use of international and local consultants could have been better considered. For instance, the resource surveys were carried out across three separate missions by an international consultant: one for the feasibility study to do the survey, the second for the actual survey and third for training. At least two of these visits could have been combined.

166. The collection and analysis of water samples, documentation of catch rates and other relevant data would increase the capacity to determine problems and measure IWP's impact and success.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

167. The NC is currently writing up lessons learned, part of which were captured through the collective IWP document (see IWP-Pacific Technical Report no.44). Some of the successes include:

- Together the villagers have established locally conceived plans to manage their fishery resources. These plans are the first of their kind in Niue. Furthermore, they are binding by law.
- Together the two villages of Makefu and Alofi North have set up four temporary closed areas. The villagers have decided that closed areas will rotate as fishing stocks revive. Fish levels are being monitored to see whether closed areas are increasing stocking levels.

168. The challenges of the project relate to coordinating the different stakeholders in the project's implementation.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

169. Funds should be set aside to undertake smaller pilot activities not officially planned for that can be carried out directly by community members. These smaller activities should assist in attaining the goal of the project.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

170. The M&E plan needs to be revisited with a view to modifying it with respect to identifying clear and measurable outcomes and outputs. Furthermore, the M&E plan should now be reviewed to take into account activities post-IWP.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

171. No specific GEF interventions have been identified, other than replication opportunities in other communities using GEF Small Grants funding and NGO participation. Support will also be needed to improve impact monitoring capabilities.

6.3 Summary Conclusion

172. The project has a strong community focus. However, the level of community participation proposed was not matched by the available local capacity.

173. The project has undertaken many interesting social assessment studies that have now been applied in other programs. Activities and lessons learned from IWP have been integrated into the core functions of the Fisheries Division.

7. PALAU

7.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Madalaii and Ngarchelong

Thematic Focus:
Solid Waste

174. The pilot project in Palau was selected and established to address waste, with the communities of Madalaii and Ngarchelong selected to host the pilot activities and provide a case study for addressing waste generally.

175. At the same time that IWP has been active, Palau has been developing an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (ISWMP), which includes a waste minimization target of 25% diversion of waste from the waste stream by 2010. Major waste minimization initiatives proposed initially include aluminum can recycling and composting of green waste and sewage sludge.

176. To finance aspects of the ISWMP, the Government of Palau has been working to raise finances for a proper landfill site. JICA has granted Palau USD 4.5 million over 3 years to improve solid waste management.

Pilot Project Objectives:

177. Palau was not visited by the evaluation mission visited. Difficulties faced by Palau in providing information, due to theft of the NC's laptop, have meant that the discussion of some outcomes, objectives and achievements is incomplete. .

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

Goal:	**Improve solid waste management for Palau**
Objective 1:	**Strengthen regional capacity for solid waste management**
Output:	**Enhanced regional efforts in recycling program**
Activity 1.1	Collect data on recyclable waste (volume of aluminum cans, scrap metals, rubber tires) to assess infrastructure needs and recycling feasibility Jan. 2005
Activity 1.2	Synthesize collected data and submit recommendations for waste reduction/management initiatives to Micronesian Chief Executive Summit. March 2005
Activity 1.3	Establish Micronesia Waste Managers Alliance working group to facilitate US EPA for funding and technical assistance. End of 2005
Objective 2:	**Strengthen national capacity for solid waste management**
Output 2	**Improved understanding of the cause and effects of solid waste**
Activity 2.1	Conduct National Stakeholder Analysis (completed)
Activity 2.1	Implementation of national communications strategy. (Schools, newsletter, radio spot announcements). *Ongoing*
Activity 2.2	Develop solid waste lesson booklet for all year three elementary students (both national and private). *Completed*
Activity 2.3	Conduct Economic Evaluation on waste. Jan. 2005
Output 3:	**Improved national institutions for managing solid waste (links to regional feasibility)**
Activity 31	Creation of Division of Solid Waste Management to manage landfills in Palau. *Completed*
Activity 3.2	Provide capacity building for newly created Division of Solid Waste Management. Dec. 2006
Activity 3.3	Conduct an institutional and legislative review (start Nov 04, finish Feb 2005); revise and implement recommendations as necessary, including local state policies. End of 2006

Objective 3:	**Strengthen state government capacity to manage solid waste**
Output 4:	**Improve state level institutions for management of solid waste**
Activity 4.1:	Perform Needs Analysis for state personnel on waste management (e.g. handling and disposal of waste) Dec. 2005
Activity 4.2	Support state government composting initiatives (Identified low cost/no cost landfill operation system (semi – aerobic landfill). end of 2006
Objective 4:	**Improve local understanding of household waste management of Ngarchelong.**
Output 4:	Raised awareness and improved understanding of the cause and effects of household waste End 2006
Activity 4.1	Conduct a waste stream analysis (state government) completed
Activity 4.2	Conduct a PPA - **submit report to PCU**
Activity: 4.3	Conduct water data collection. Jan 2005 and thereafter
Activity 4.4	Implementation of the local household waste communication strategy. Ongoing until end of 2006
Activity 4.5	Conduct Ngarchelong Socio-economic baseline survey. Jan. 2005
Activity 4.6	Conduct Ngarchelong ecological survey of Ngarchelong. Dec. 2004
Output 5:	**Increased recycling of household waste**
Activity 5.1	Conduct compost training for the community. March 2005
Activity 5.2	Establishment of compost demonstration site. May 2005
Activity 5.3	Social Marketing (SM) to encourage composting including separation of waste. Jan 2005– Dec. 2006
Activity 5.4	Establish demonstration site for compost toilets. June 2005
Activity 5.5	Create community working group to monitor & evaluate of household waste. April 2005

Pilot Project Activities:

178. Activities are outlined in the above table. They included collecting and synthesizing baseline information on the socioeconomic and environmental situation in the pilot communities. This baseline information included a waste stream analysis for the local community.

179. Work at the national level included an economic valuation to determine the true cost of waste management for Palau, a review of the institutions and legislation relating to waste management, and formalization of the National Solid Waste Management Committee.

7.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

180. Based on the information provided, it appears that Palau has been able to utilize IWP to further its efforts to fund and design a new landfill and IWP has been very helpful in identifying the high social and economic costs of the current improper solid and liquid waste management.

181. With respect to educating the public, changing behaviors, establishing recycling and composting programs and spurring community clean up projects, there do not appear to be strong results.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

182. Palau completed its problem profile ("Review of Priority Environmental Concerns Report, 2003"). In addition, Palau completed an initial stakeholder assessment and national communications strategy.

183. Palau was able to tie the IWP initial design effort together with other national priorities, including linking this effort with its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).

184. Palau completed an economic evaluation of waste problems in 2005, "Economic Cost Scenarios for Solid Waste Related Pollution in Palau" (published in late 2006 as IWP-Pacific Technical Report no. 28).

185. The IWP effort enabled an environmental assessment of the Ngarchelong Solid Waste Site, (within the Chollie watershed) which included suggested priority actions for minimizing environmental impacts from waste disposal practices and reducing potential health impacts (published in late 2006 as IWP-Pacific Technical Report no. 27).

186. Palau did not complete its root cause analysis, nor did they submit a government profile, or NGO profile.

187. The Palau NTF was formed as a subcommittee of the National Environmental Protection Council. The council includes a wide range of stakeholders, including NGOs and the Chamber of Commerce. It was reported that the IWP subcommittee did not meet on a regular basis and was not involved much in project oversight and implementation.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

188. Palau was able to retain its NC for the project duration, however the NC was also in charge of waste issues generally for the Department, and hence had time constraints, especially as Palau has been in the midst of a major landfill development project. So although continuity and integration with national strategies was excellent, the IWP effort did not receive sustained attention.

In-country financial management:

189. Concerns were raised by the PCU regarding financial management based on the audit in Palau in 2003. The PCU then indicated that these budget issues were rectified during 2004.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

190. Waste management assessment activities formulated through IWP are now to be replicated in Melekeok State.

191. IWP in Palau has financially supported the Koror State Government Solid Waste Management Office in its on-going efforts to promote Recycling Programs in Koror through the establishment and promotion of Waste Segregation Stations.

192. The Palau NC indicated in an IWP replication report that Palau is leading the effort to establish a regional Micronesian Waste Managers Alliance Working Group in order to spur funding and technical assistance on waste issues in the region.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

193. A stronger emphasis on community participation and involvement could have enabled the pilot to generate a higher level of community support and greater replication.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

194. As indicated by the PCU it its summary of achievements:

- In Chollie, recycling and regular rubbish collection has been established. Three composting sites have been established, and composting toilets have been built at Bethania High School.
- Nationally, a solid waste management office has been set up, and a national integrated waste management strategy is being developed.
- Legislation for a “Depository Fee and Establishment of a Recycling Center Fund” and a “Clean Palau Act” are being considered by the House of Parliament and House of Delegates, respectively. Also, the Ministry of Education has incorporated waste management courses into school curriculum.
- Palau has a scholarship recipient expected to graduate this fall with a master’s degree.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

195. If the ISWMP is implemented as planned, including investments through JICA and others for a new landfill and an effective recycling program, this will go a long way towards meeting the solid waste objectives set out for IWP. It will be important to continue the community-based activities that were piloted under IWP, including public awareness and community participation.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

196. The key effort appears to be the national launch of a recycling program, with much that can be learned and replicated for example from the successful launch in Kiribati of its deposit/return program.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance

197. Palau should consider a funding request under the GEF Small Grants program for continuing community based waste management efforts, especially as the new waste strategy is introduced and recycling promoted.

7.3 Summary Conclusion

198. Palau was effective in using IWP to further its national solid waste management aims, but less successful in getting on-the-ground improvements in the pilot community.

8. PAPUA NEW GUINEA (PNG)[2]

8.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Barakau Village; Central Province

Thematic Focus:
Primary: Waste Management. Secondary: Coastal Fisheries

Pilot Project Goal:
Improve waste management in PNG to foster a clean and healthy country and environment.

Pilot Project Objectives:
Objectives:
1: Promote proper management of pig feces, solid and human waste in Barakau village in order to improve the health and well being of the community.
2: To improve capacity to manage solid and human waste in PNG.
3: Ensure sustainable utilization of marine resources.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:
Objective 1:
Outcomes:
1: Community awareness and participation in selection of better methods of disposal of pig feces, solid and human waste.
2: Improved capacity to handle solid and human waste.
3: Improved regulation and enforcement for solid and human waste disposal in the community.

Objective 2:
Outcomes:
4: Improved networking and collaboration between relevant organizations.
5: Improved regulatory capacity.
6: Improved awareness on proper waste management.

Objective 3:
Outcomes:
7: Improved understanding of the status of the marine environment and the need for sustainable use of the marine resources.
8: Establishment of appropriate Marine Resources Management plan.
9: Improved capacity for local fishery management.
10: Improved regulation and enforcement.

Pilot Project Activities:

Table 1: ***Activities***

[2] Note: A visit by the Evaluation Team to PNG was not included as part of the UNDP-approved TE country visits. This summary report is therefore based on review of available documents, with extracts from the PNG Implementation and Lessons Learned report prepared by the National Coordinator in August 2006 and remote communication with stakeholders.

Goal:	**Improve waste management in PNG to foster a clean and healthy country and environment.**
Objective: 1.0	**Promote proper management of pig feces, solid and human waste in Barakau village in order to improve the health and well being of the community.**
Outcome 1	***Community awareness and participation in selection of better methods of disposal of pig feces, solid and human waste.***
Activity 1.1	Carry out pig feces, solid and human waste management survey (*Completed May 2004*)
Activity 1.2	Evaluate data and present findings to the community. (by end of October 2004).
Activity 1.3	Compile data on alternative methods of disposal of pig feces, solid and human waste.
	Conduct PPA to analyze causes of problems due to improper disposal of pig feces, solid and human waste.
Activity 1.5	Participatory formulation of Waste Management Plan in relation to pig feces, solid and human waste
Activity 1.6	Develop and implement Communications Strategy on waste management plan
	Seek endorsement of LPMC and NTF
Outcome 2	***Improved capacity to handle solid and human waste.***
Activity 2.1	Identify training needs for the selected methods of waste disposal that will be piloted.
Activity 2.2	Provide appropriate training.
Activity 2.3	Monitor impact of training and make necessary adjustments.
Outcome 3	***Improved regulation and enforcement for solid and human waste disposal in the community.***
Activity 3.1	Review existing regulatory and enforcement mechanisms for proper pig feces, solid and human waste disposal.
Activity 3.2	Discuss deficiencies in enforcement of pig feces, solid and human waste disposal regulations during PPA.
Activity 3.3	Make appropriate regulatory and enforcement amendments.
Activity 3.4	Monitor impacts of management plan and make necessary adjustments to plan and related regulatory and enforcement mechanisms.
Objective: 2.0	**To improve capacity to manage solid and human waste in PNG.**
Outcome 4	***Improved networking and collaboration between relevant organizations.***
Activity 4.1	Update inventory of existing stakeholders involved with solid and human waste management and review their respective roles and expertise.
Activity 4.2	Establish opportunities to meet and exchange information and develop joint work programs to promote collaboration.
Outcome 5	***Improved regulatory capacity.***
Activity 5.1	Review existing national policies and regulations on solid and human waste management.
Activity 5.2	Amendment national policies and regulations as necessary.
Outcome 6	***Improved awareness on proper waste management.***
Activity 6.1	In collaboration with stakeholders, review previous and current awareness strategies.
Activity 6.3	Initiate revised awareness campaigns targeting all sectors of the community.
Objective: 3.0	Ensure sustainable utilization of marine resources.
Outcome 7	***Improved understanding of the status of the marine environment and the need for sustainable use of the marine resources.***
Activity 7.1	Conduct marine and mangrove surveys (completed July 2004)
Activity 7.2	Carry out awareness on the extent and diversity of the local marine ecosystem by end of October, 2004
	PPA
Outcome 8	***Establishment of appropriate Marine Resources Management plan.***
Activity 8.1	Compile data on possible management arrangements incorporating traditional practices and modern concepts by mid -November 2004
Activity 8.2	Discuss management plan with stakeholders by mid - November 2004

Activity 8.4	Discuss strategies with stakeholders by end of November 2004
Activity 8.3	Incorporate selected management strategies into management plan by end of November 2004
Activity 8.5	Finalize resource management plan by mid-2005 and implement from late 2005
Outcome 9	***Improved capacity for local fishery management.***
Activity 9.1	Identify training needs as per RAP by end of November 2004
Activity 9.2	Select participants and provide appropriate training by July 2005
Activity 9.3	Monitor training and make improvements as required by December 2005
Outcome 10	*Improved regulation and enforcement.*
Activity 10.1	Review existing regulation and enforcement by mid-November 2004
Activity 10.2	Discus deficiencies and improvements during PPA by mid-November 2004
Activity 10.3	Make appropriate changes by March 2005 and implement.

8.2 Findings

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

199. The MoU between SPREP and the Government of PNG was signed on 22 May, 2002 and project implementation commenced in mid-June with the recruitment of an NC. The project was implemented through the national Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) and overseen in the first half of implementation by an NTF comprising representatives from relevant agencies in the public and private sector. The operation of the NTF was adversely affected by changing representation and declining attendance. It was subsequently replaced by a Solid Waste Management Task Force which focused on the formulation of a National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan. The project quickly began to focus on waste management and efforts to address the secondary thematic focus of coastal fisheries suffered.

200. The objective for the IWP PNG pilot project was to trial ways and means of assisting a community to improve waste disposal and determine how this experience may be replicated in other communities throughout the country. Due to funding and logistical constraints the Expressions of Interest to host the pilot project were invited only from the Central Province. Barakau village was eventually chosen as the host site as it was judged to fulfill all the requirements for the successful implementation of the project.

201. The project was launched in the village in early December 2003 and implemented from 2004 to 2005. It was run in several phases including initial awareness and familiarization, establishment of a local project management committee, baseline data collection, participatory problem analysis and solution formulation, compilation and implementation of a Remedial Action Plan and finally, monitoring and evaluation. Project implementation was impaired by lack of leadership and cooperation from the community. The subsequent involvement of the local dominant church helped the project to rebuild and regain community support. Implementation at the national level was affected by the apparent lack of interest in the NTF and delayed responses from DEC to review and make appropriate regulatory and policy changes supporting waste management and conservation of marine resources.

202. By the end of December 2005, the following outputs were realized: increased level of awareness in the community on the need to properly dispose of waste and sustainable utilization of marine resources, construction of VIP demonstration toilets, construction of an open pit waste dump, establishment of a waste collection and disposal system and major preparatory work on the establishment of a marine protected area for the Barakau Bay fishery.

203. The project has produced a number of crucial lessons for future interventions of a similar nature. These include: confirmation of community preparedness and support before commitment of resources, concentration on one focal area, adoption of a simple incremental approach to project implementation, execution of an effective communication strategy, proactive engagement of important collaborators and strategic utilization of influential people.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

At the national level, the following were considered weaknesses:

204. The project design was too complex and ambitious, in trying to address both waste management and coastal fisheries. As a result, only the first element was substantially progressed, with efforts on the coastal fisheries falling off rapidly.

205. During initial project design, countries were asked to rank GEF's three global International Waters concerns and their associated problems based on an assessment of the actual national severity of each of the identified problems. In response, PNG developed a report which summarized specific national, regional and international issues and concerns that affect PNG, which could be considered for funding by GEF, UNEP, UNDP or World Bank.

206. Instead of conforming to the prescribed GEF format, the report outlined a detailed project proposal entitled: Management and Protection of Marine and Freshwater Wetlands for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in Papua New Guinea. This approach was deliberately taken to reflect the relative magnitude of the environmental issues in PNG and the preference to solicit funds on a direct bilateral basis rather than being bundled together with the other PICs. The proposal was based on the PNG government's adopted Environment and Conservation Strategic Action Plan for 1997–2000, which was centered upon the Total Catchment Environment Management concept.

207. PNG was not successful in obtaining its own funding, so they requested to participate within IWP, and re-formulated national activities accordingly.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

Strengths

208. There were three main strengths in in-country implementation arrangements:

- There was high-level political support or the project from the Minister of Environment.
- A local project management committee was established.
- The involvement of the local dominant church helped the project to rebuild and regain community support, after Community political leadership adversely affected the program (see below).

Weaknesses

209. The operation of the NTF was adversely affected by changing representation and declining attendance. It was subsequently replaced by a Solid Waste Management Task Force which focused on the formulation of a National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan. The project quickly began to focus on waste management and efforts to address the secondary thematic focus of coastal fisheries suffered.

210. Project implementation was impaired by lack of leadership and cooperation from the community. Implementation at the national level was affected by the apparent lack of interest in the NTF and delayed responses from DEC to review and make appropriate regulatory and policy changes supporting waste management and conservation of marine resources.

211. The NGO community was not represented on the NTF, apparently because of the absence of an umbrella body and due to concerns that the appointment of one group could lead to accusations of preferential treatment or favoritism.

212. Numerous requests were made to other members of the NTF to assist where possible in implementation of the project at both the local and national levels but no concrete responses were received. The main reason given was lack of funding and inability to work outside of pre-determined work plans. Even attempts to involve the Health Inspector from the Central Provincial Administration's Division of Health in the construction and awareness workshop on VIP toilets in Barakau village were complicated by bureaucratic barriers.

In-country financial management:

213. Overall, project staff reported efficient and effective financial management arrangements for the project in PNG; however, there were a number of examples of inefficient use of finances, and of poor communication between the PCU and the PNG government on financial matters.

214. Because DEC was unable to assist with transport the PCU advised that a vehicle could be hired. The NC argued that it would be cheaper in the long term to purchase a second hand 4WD vehicle rather than continuing to hire one. By the time UNDP and PCU endorsed the request to purchase a vehicle; almost PGK 90,000.00 had been spent on vehicle hire. The vehicle was needed for the Expressions of Interest evaluation process with the short-listed sites located northwest and southeast of Port Moresby, as well as regular travel up and down the Magi Highway to the pilot project site during project implementation. PGK 45 000.00 was later spent on the purchase of a second-hand double cab utility.

215. The PNG NC asserted that NCs were not told exactly how much money was available for the duration of the project and that this affected planning and budgeting for project implementation. While this allegation suggests a communication problem between the PCU and the NCs, the project records demonstrate that in fact it was more of a project management capacity issue, with NCs having difficulties keeping track of the budgets for their country activities. Following the budget revision by the first MPR, national allocations accounted for approximately 64% of the Program Budget. Divided equally among 14 participating countries, this provided a provisional national budget of approximately USD 360,000 for each pilot. This information was included in the 2nd MPR documents (26–27 June 2003), and the 3rd MPR working papers (8–9 July 2004). This allocation was then revised every year based on project spending the previous year. The IWP Budget Revision 4 (December 2004) placed the amount available to national projects at USD 336,784, although Revision 5 (July 2005) resulted in an increase to USD 356,857 (a 6% increase), following the withdrawal of Nauru from the project. Revision 6, May 2006 placed this amount at USD 361,000. The amount of funds available to each national project were conveyed to NCs each time there was a budget revision, and was discussed at the MPRs. Except for MPR5, all National Coordinators participated at the MPRs. As of the 4th quarter reporting in 2006, PNG had spent USD 425,000, which was in fact USD 64.000 over allocation and the third highest, after Kiribati and Niue.

216. Because there were two focal areas for IWP PNG, and the population of the village was large, two full-time project facilitators were recruited, which consumed a significant portion of the funding. Substantial savings would have been realized if one focal area had been selected, a secondhand vehicle had been bought much earlier instead of hiring transport, and only one project facilitator had been recruited. Alternatively, funding from government or other sources would have been useful, in order to enable some of the IWP funding spent on project facilitators to be used for other project purposes.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

217. IWP in PNG has not made significant progress with regard to replicating the activities at Barakau; however the neighboring villagers of Tubusereia and Gaire have made enquiries about how they can organize themselves to deal with the same issues.

218. At the national level arrangements are in progress for the IWP initiative to be absorbed within the Environment Protection Branch of the Department of Environment and Conservation's Environment Division. Officers within this Branch will provide technical support to interested communities who adequately demonstrate their willingness to address waste management and related concerns in their villages. In addition, the National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan currently under formulation will define the overall framework for improved solid waste management at all levels.

219. PNG IWP has, since November 1, been fully integrated within the Environment Protection Branch of the Department of Environment and Conservation making the PNG pilot the first to achieve this milestone.

220. IWP in PNG has developed a Sustainability Plan (August 2006); the challenge is now for the Government and other stakeholders to implement this.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

221. Despite delays in starting the project, and a number of implementation challenges, IWP PNG has achieved a number of notable successes. Community members gradually came to appreciate what the project

was tying to do, especially after the results of the shoreline and nearshore water quality surveys were explained to them. The revival of the Tuesday village clean ups also showed how several hours of dedicated community service can drastically improve the appearance and general cleanliness of the village.

222. One of the main findings of the waste management survey was that people were indiscriminately disposing of their household waste because there was no specific dump site, and the provision of such a facility would help promote responsible waste management. In the formulation of the remedial action plan (RAP), it was agreed that IWP PNG would assist in the construction of an open pit waste dump and establishment of a waste collection and disposal system. These outcomes were achieved towards the end of 2005 and the community is now responsible for the maintenance of the dump and implementation of a reliable waste collection and disposal system.

223. An undertaking that was personally supported by the Minister for Environment and Conservation was the introduction of a policy banning the use of plastic shopping bags. IWP PNG was involved in the advertisement of the interim policy in accordance with the publicity provisions of the Environment Act 2000. The policy is currently going through the final phase of public scrutiny and is expected to come into effect in early 2007.

224. Under the postgraduate scholarship scheme, four students were selected to undertake Honors Degree studies at the University of Papua New Guinea in the School of Natural and Physical Sciences. Each student was assigned a research topic related to the focal areas of IWP. The topics allocated include: freshwater quality management in the Barakau catchment, community waste management, mangrove rehabilitation and sustainable coastal fisheries. The scheme turned out to be a mutually beneficial experience for the students and the villagers. The students are scheduled to complete their dissertations by the end of September 2006.

Challenges faced by the project in PNG were numerous, including:

225. The socioeconomic evaluation report for Barakau village was to have been submitted at the beginning of December 2004 for inclusion in the compilation of the RAP. The consultant was paid 50% of the fees but has yet to submit the report. The consultant is expected to furnish a report before the project terminates so that it can at least be used for other village development and resources management undertakings, either by the community in conjunction with the government or NGOs.

226. One of the biggest hindrances to the successful implementation of the project in the community has been the Councilor who is the political head of the village. Twelve months into the project, it became obvious to the IWP PNG team and the community that the Councilor was going to use the project for his personal gain and to expand his support base in preparation for the 2007 Local Level Government elections. As a direct consequence, people started to react negatively to the project and participation in meetings declined steadily. At the same time, the Councilor and the church could not work together and community participation dropped alarmingly, given the substantial influence of the church. The situation was so critical to the continuation of the project that the Project Team had to organize a meeting with the Local Church Executive and the Councilor to sort out their differences and request the Local Church Executive's assistance in reviving support for the project by the community.

227. The project has revealed a number of crucial lessons for future interventions of a similar nature. These include:

- confirmation of community preparedness and support before commitment of resources;
- concentration on one focal area;
- adoption of a simplistic incremental approach to project implementation;
- execution of an effective communication strategy;
- proactive engagement of important collaborators; and
- strategic utilization of influential people.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

228. Despite being a planned five-year project, it did not commence in PNG until June 2002, following the appointment of the NC. The final year was largely devoted to monitoring and evaluation, so the main project activities were carried out over three years, from 2003 to 2005. These covered project awareness, identification of focal area, pilot site selection, participatory problem analysis and solution formulation as

well as implementation of a RAP and institutional arrangements to ensure the continuity and replication of initiatives and positive strategies.

229. All of 2003 was spent on initial awareness, evaluation of priority environmental concerns and selection of the pilot project site. Pilot site activities were planned to run throughout 2004 and 2005, but with delays in beginning the planned activities, the one-year implementation period for the RAP turned out to be insufficient. Ideally the project should have commenced at the pilot site within the first year. This would have presented enough time to trial solutions, monitor impacts and make necessary adjustments as required. In retrospect, the project spent a considerable amount of time and resources in the preparatory phases and was heavily burdened with trying to maintain community support. Similar experiences were reported by other IWP countries (and by other GEF projects).

230. It is therefore recommended that in designing future projects of a related nature, adequate time be allowed for the establishment of project implementation arrangements and undertaking all necessary initiation and preparatory activities.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

231. Some worthwhile opportunities for collaboration that should be pursued by DEC include establishment of the Ward Development Committee system, with assistance from the Department of Provincial and Local Level Government, and placement of fish aggregating devices (FADs) in local reefs as part of local fisheries management plans, with the assistance of the National Fisheries Authority. An effective Ward Development Committee system should expand the scope for greater community participation in village development activities, and promote community service and responsibility. The FADs should help reduce fishing pressure on the reefs and mangrove areas and eliminate the capture of juvenile fish.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

232. Stakeholders advised that while additional and ongoing donor support is always needed and welcomed, there were no intentions to develop a proposal for a follow-up GEF project.

233. Due to the relatively large size of PNG and the enormity and complexity of its environmental challenges, PNG generally has a preference for direct, bilateral assistance from GEF and other donors, rather than being a small part of larger, regional projects. It is recommended that the direct, bilateral approach is more appropriate for PNG for future GEF projects.

Other points specific to this country / site(s):

Most people assumed from the name of the program that it was intended to install a new water supply scheme for the village. The previous system was destroyed by vandals almost a decade ago and most of the people had to resort to obtaining water from the nearby rivers and wells. Carrying water containers from these sources has since become a laborious daily routine especially for young girls and women folk. The quality and quantity of water from these sources vary with the weather and any improvement in the delivery of water to the community would be greatly appreciated. From the people's perspective, improved water supply rather than improved waste management was the main priority. This is seen as one of the main reasons why the people were slow to respond to the project because it did not seem to directly cater for one of their most pressing and immediate concerns.

8.3 Summary Conclusion

234. IWP may be considered to have been moderately successful with regard to addressing waste management in Barakau and largely unsuccessful in addressing the coastal fisheries component.

235. Two highly significant outcomes that have been greatly assisted by IWP in PNG are the moves to ban the use of plastic shopping bags in PNG and the initiation of the development of a National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan.

9. REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS

9.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Jenrok Village, Island of Majuro.

Thematic Focus:
Waste management.

Pilot Project Goal:
Improve sustainable management of waste on Majuro.

Pilot Project Objectives:

236. The objectives of IWP in Marshall Islands as presented in the draft M&E Plan are:

Objective 1 - (Community): Strengthen the capacity for Jenrok to manage waste.
Objective 2 - (National): Increase national capacity to manage waste on Majuro

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

237. The outcomes as identified in the M&E plan fall under each of the above objectives as follows:

Objective 1 - (Community):
Outcomes:
1: Increased understanding of waste issues
2: Improved coordination and participation amongst stakeholder
3: Develop local capacity to manage waste in Jenrok

Objective 2 - (National):
Outcomes:
4: Strengthened institution, policy and legislation to support waste management
5: Trained and qualified personnel to support waste management in designated responsible institutions
6: Increased nation-wide awareness of the impacts of poor waste management practices on lives and livelihood

Pilot Project Activities:

238. The following table lists the activities which were identified to achieve the outcomes and objectives of the community and national components of the project.

Table 1: ***Activities***

Goal:	**Improve sustainable management of waste on Majuro.**
Objective 1	**Strengthen the capacity for Jenrok to manage community waste.**
Outcome 1	**Increased understanding of waste issues**
Activity 1.1	Communication strategy for waste in the Jenrok community
Activity 1.2	Design and implement a communication strategy for the Jenrok community
	Participatory problem analysis for Jenrok.
Activity 1.3	Develop a schedule for PPA
Activity 1.4	Undertake PPA
Activity 1.5	Raise awareness in Jenrok on PPA findings
	Sociojeconomic baseline survey
Activity 1.6	Design terms of reference for social economic baseline survey
Activity 1.7	Select resource person to complete survey
Activity 1.8	Raise awareness in Jenrok (and nationally) on the results of the social economic survey
	Ecological baseline survey
Activity 1.9	Design terms of reference for ecological baseline survey
Activity 1.10	Select resource person to complete survey
Activity 1.11	Raise awareness in Jenrok (and nationally) on the results of the ecological baseline survey
	Waste Stream Analysis
Activity 1.12	Design terms of reference for waste stream analysis
Activity 1.13	Select resource person to complete waste stream analysis
Activity 1.14	Raise awareness in Jenrok (and nationally) on the results of the waste stream analysis
Outcome 2	**Improved coordination and participation amongst stakeholder**
Activity 2.1	Complete a stakeholder analysis for waste in the Jenrok community
Activity 2.2	Design and implement a project stakeholder participation plan for the Jenrok community
	Community Waste Coordinating Committee (CWCC)
Activity 2.3	Use the stakeholder analysis to establish CWCC
Activity 2.4	Provide ongoing support to CWCC work
Outcome 3	**Develop local capacity to manage waste in Jenrok**
	Local facilitators selected and trained in participatory problem analysis.
Activity 3.1	Identify and train suitable resource people for training in community participatory problem analysis
	Identify solutions for addressing waste management problems at Jenrok
Activity 3.2	Assess the options for addressing the root cause for waste management concerns at Jenrok (such as waste re-cycling, community laws, etc)
Activity 3.3	Select the solution options for piloting at Jenrok including implementation of kakien.
	Plan of action to support the implementation of selected options for addressing waste management concerns at Jenrok
Activity 3.4	Design a work program for supporting selected options for addressing waste management concerns at Jenrok
Activity 3.5	Monitor (using community members where possible) the impact of project activities on improving the management of waste at Jenrok
Objective 2	**Increase national capacity to manage waste on Majuro**
Outcome 4	**Strengthened institution, policy and legislation to support waste management**
Activity 4.1	Undertake national level stakeholder analysis and participation plan
Activity 4.2	Establish NTF and technical advisory committee (Project Development Team)
Activity 4.3	Review Priority Environment Concerns (PEC)
Activity 4.4	Review legislation and institutional arrangements for the management of waste on Majuro Atoll and assess options for implementing improved waste management institutional arrangements.

Activity 4.5	Identify and support mutually beneficial partnerships for improved waste management on Majuro

Outcome 5	**Trained and qualified personnel to support waste management in designated responsible institutions**
Activity 5.1	Complete a training needs analysis for responsible institutions in waste management
Activity 5.2	Provide training to relevant personnel on waste management

Outcome 6	**Increased nationwide awareness of the impacts of poor waste management practices on lives and livelihood**
Activity 6.1	Design, develop and implement a national communication strategy
Activity 6.2	Design and support the implementation of waste-related curricula in Majuro primary schools
Activity 6.3	Complete an economic valuation of waste for Majuro

9.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

239. The RMI IWP project has focused on solid waste management at the village of Jenrok on the island of Majuro. Initially, the project took a much broader focus, including sewage/waste water management, coastal management and general community improvement activities

240. As with Kiribati, the project participants have worked to implement and demonstrate a solid waste separation scheme, with biodegradable organic waste being used as compost for growing food crops; aluminum cans, glass bottles and batteries being sent for recycling, and remaining inorganic waste being placed in municipal "skips" or bins for collection and disposal at a landfill (garbage dump).

241. The project has been successful in substantially raising awareness about waste management issues in Jenrok and throughout the entire Majuro community. Following the experience in Tarawa, late in the project (2006) RMI initiated "community cleanliness competitions", with practical prizes. The latter has generated significant interest from other municipalities on Majuro, and provides the basis for replication at other sites.

242. As with Kiribati, the IWP project has helped to catalyze the proposed development of a National Waste Management Authority for RMI, which will greatly assist the transition to a truly coordinated, integrated waste management strategy and system for the country.

243. As with Vanuatu; project staff in RMI reported that the socioeconomic baseline study undertaken as part of IWP was received very positively, providing essential and extremely useful information that has "shone new light" on the pressing issues at the pilot project site, and is being used as a model for 12 other sites throughout RMI (with ADB funding).

244. The IWP project in RMI did suffer some setbacks due to shifting of the LA from the EPA to the Office of Environmental Policy and Project Coordination (OEPPC), turnover of national project staff, and in some instances delays in the transfer of project funds within the government's finance system.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

Strengths

245. At the national level, the project design was too complex and ambitious, in trying to address solid waste, liquid waste, human waste and pig waste all at once. As a result, only the first element was substantially progressed, with efforts on the other waste types falling off rapidly.

246. Project staff reported that much better planning could have gone into the design and provision of the recycling collection points in Jenrok, along with better arrangements with the municipal councils to empty them and transport waste to the recycling centre. The simultaneous and uncoordinated provision of large garbage skips in the community by the municipal councils and the startup of the recycling program provided

an easy option for the dumping of all solid waste, without sorting or recycling. This decreased the effectiveness of the recycling collection points.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

Strengths

247. Like all countries in the program, the RMI IWP required a long lead time, due to the time necessary to establish appropriate administrative and project management arrangements, and to decipher the complex IWP ProDoc and refine it to meet national needs and priorities.

248. The relatively small size of the RMI national government should have aided ministry and agency communications and coordination on IWP; however, it was apparent that fragmented responsibilities in the environment/natural resources sector, and interagency rivalries, impeded project implementation.

249. The IWP project in RMI suffered setbacks during the transition of the LA from the EPA to the OEPPC, from the turnover of national project staff, and in some instances from delays in the transfer of project funds within the national government finance system. The move from EPA to OEPPC saw a major refocusing of the project away from broad objectives that included sewage/waste water management, coastal management and general community improvement activities, to a narrow focus on solid waste management only.

250. Project staff claimed that IWP had been successful in removing pig-pens from beachside areas where effluent runs into the sea, although during a site inspection at Jenrok the Evaluation Team observed many pig pens along the beach.

251. The RMI IWP NC expressed concern that in-country implementation suffered from the high-turnover of staff at the PCU, and noted that support from the PCU dropped off substantially in the latter parts of the program. In response, the PCU noted that there were no requests for PCU staff assistance on record from RMI during the last 12 months of the project. In addition, with respect to project funds utilization, RMI spent $272,000 of its allocation, almost $90,000 less than was available, and second lowest after FSM (excepting Nauru, which ceased activities in 2003). The PCU staff traveled more frequently during project inception, to work closely with NCs as they were initiating pilot projects going, and then as the project continued, support visits shifted more to an as-needed basis, with the PCU assuming the NCs would manage their activities according to the M&E plans and seek help from the PCU when difficulties arose. In this case, the PCU approach was logical, and appropriate.

In-country financial management:

252. Project staff reported that greater priority could have been given to providing training in financial reporting, although they said that the PCU provided excellent support on financial issues, when requested.

253. As noted above, there were some instances of delays in the transfer of project funds within the national government finance system (from treasury to the LA), which caused delays to project activities.

254. Project funds were used for street lighting in Jenrok, with indications that this was needed to deter people from dumping their wastes along the streets of Jenrok at night. As people know that dumping along the streets is illegal, those who are still doing this do it at night in the unlit parts of the streets, where they are not seen by passers-by. The provision of streetlights is now helping deter people from carrying out this illegal activity. At the Lessons Learned workshop in Suva (August 2006) the NCs pointed out that a modest investment in small-scale infrastructure could contribute enormously to raising the profile of the pilot projects, and subsequently IWP. The investment in streetlights in Jenrok was therefore seen as being valuable to the overall project objectives in RMI and consistent with the adaptive management approach of IWP.

255. Questions have been raised about the use of project funds to purchase 1500 tree seedlings, to be used to beautify Jenrok, and which allegedly may have been dispersed to non-target recipients rather than used to benefit the pilot community. Clarification on this was sought from national project staff, but not received.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

256. With support from ADB, the RMI Government is replicating the socioeconomic studies, using IWP methodology, at 12 other islands throughout RMI.

257. Project staff reported that the waste stream analysis conducted for Jenrok under IWP was adopted by other projects (e.g. the UNDP Reduction of Urban Waste Plan).

258. There do not appear to be any initiatives underway to replicate other IWP activities at other islands throughout RMI, although the Uliga, Ebye and Laura councils have expressed an interest in the types of activities carried out at Jenrok.

259. RMI did not complete its sustainability plan in time to be reviewed for the evaluation.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

260. While IWP and other waste management projects on Majuro have made some progress in addressing solid waste, it is clear that the major human health and environmental priority on Majuro, and especially at Jenrok, is sewage and waste-water management. It is strongly recommended that any future projects give urgent attention to addressing this major problem in a strategic, integrated manner.

261. The pilot site on Majuro could have benefited from greater communication and information sharing with other atoll waste management pilot sites, which face similar challenges (e.g. Tarawa in Kiribati and Funafuti in Tuvalu).

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

262. Perhaps one of the most significant developments that the IWP project has helped to catalyze is the proposed development of a National Waste Management Authority for RMI, with associated legislation, which will greatly assist the transition to a coordinated, integrated waste management strategy and system for the country. It is strongly recommended that highest priority be given by both the government and donors to realizing this initiative.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

263. Stakeholders advised that while additional and ongoing donor support is always needed and welcomed, there were no intentions to develop a proposal for a follow-up GEF project.

Other points specific to this country / site(s):

264. Management and maintenance of the new land fill dump site needs to be substantially improved, including stronger controls on types of waste dumped (bio-hazardous medical wastes were observed in the land-fill), significantly improved sealing of the site, significantly improved coastal protection at the site, and better management of the placement of waste within the site.

265. One aspect of waste management that does not appear to have been properly explored in RMI (and many other islands in the Pacific), is waste reduction through import controls. Many products are imported into RMI that have excessive and unnecessary plastic packaging, and which create major waste issues once discarded on the island. Studies could be undertaken to characterize the “waste potential” of all imported goods, and import controls put in place to prevent the importation of the worst offenders (e.g. as has been done for glass beer bottles). Disposable nappies (diapers) appear to be a major component in this regard.

9.3 Summary Conclusion

266. NTF efforts were impeded by inter/agency rivalries, and the changeover of IWP responsibility from EPA to the Office of Environmental Policy and Project Coordination.

267. The main achievement of IWP on Majuro has been to increase community and government awareness about solid waste management issues. In addition, IWP has set the stage for improved national

environmental planning in RMI, through its efforts to determine underlying socio-economic aspects of waste management at the community level.

268. It is clear that the major human-health and environmental priority on Majuro is sewage and wastewater management. Urgent attention is needed by the RMI national and local governments to address sanitation problems. The upcoming GEF/SOPAC IWRM regional project provides an excellent opportunity to develop and implement new water and sanitation strategies.

10. SAMOA

10.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Apolima and Lepa

Thematic Focus:

269. The goal of IWP Samoa is to ensure access to minimum standards of drinking water for rural communities in Samoa.

Pilot Project Objectives:

270. The objective of IWP Samoa as presented in the draft M&E Plan is to:

- Develop and implement a Freshwater Management Plan for Apolima and Lepa.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes and Outputs:

271. Two Outcomes are identified in the M&E plan:

- Improved national capacity to manage freshwater resources.
- Improved understanding of the causes of declining freshwater quality.

272. The Outputs identified from the M&E plan are:

Community:
- Establish Water Quality Monitoring Plan.
- Improved community understanding of the freshwater situation in Apolima and Lepa.
- Develop and implement a Freshwater Management Plan for Apolima and Lepa.

National:
- Improve understanding of national stakeholders of freshwater management issues in rural communities.
- Develop Freshwater Management Plan for Samoa's rural communities.

Pilot Project Activities:

273. The following table lists the status of the activities which were identified to achieve the outcomes and objectives of the Community and National components of the project.

Goal:	**To ensure access to minimum standards of drinking water for rural communities in Samoa**
Community	
Objective:	**Develop and Implement Freshwater Management Plan for Apolima & Lepa**
Output 1	**Establish Water Quality Monitoring Plan**
Activity 1.1	Carry out baseline tests to establish a point of reference
Activity 1.2	Purchasing of water quality testing kit for two pilot sites communities.
Activity 1.3	Train community members in using the kit and recording data/information
Activity 1.4	Undertake monthly water tests at two pilot sites to witness any trend of changes
Output 2	Improved community understanding of the freshwater situation in Apolima & Lepa
Activity 2.1	Complete an initial baseline assessment of the communities (mid 2002)
Activity 2.2	Carry out Participatory Problem Analysis to help the community identify the root causes of their freshwater solutions and possible solutions (April 2003)

Activity 2.3	Develop a Communication Strategy for Apolima & Lepa by December 2004
Activity 2.5	A Socio Economic Baseline at Apolima and Lepa communities by 2004
Activity 2.6	Implement an information and awareness program on threats to water quality (*NC indicated this was on-going; however there is no indication of any formal program being established in this area).*
Output 3:	Develop and implement a Freshwater Management for Lepa & Apolima
Activity 3.1	Establish a Community Committee to find ways to work with the community to improve the management of their freshwater supplies (February 2002)
Activity 3.2	Meet with village council to discuss solutions to existing problems
Activity 3.3	Village council endorsed the enforcement of existing village rules and new rules (such as 30 meter boundary for stock and agricultural activities)
Activity 3.4	Review the effective enforcement of village rules
National	
Output 1	**Improve understanding of national stakeholders of freshwater management issues in rural communities**
Activity 1.1	Stakeholder analysis and participation plan for the management of freshwater in rural communities
Activity 1.1	Conduct PPA workshop for National task Force Team: (*to clarify the roles of agencies)*
Activity 1.2	High level briefings on pilot activities in Lepa & Apolima
Activity 1.3	Develop a National Awareness Program on Freshwater management using Apolima & Lepa
Output 2	**Develop Freshwater Management Plan for Samoa's rural communities**
Activity 2.1	Use the best practice and lessons learned from Lepa and Apolima pilot sites to information the development and implementation of national plan to improve management of freshwater in Samoa's rural communities.
Activity 2.3	An Economic Evaluation of water by Dec. 2006
	Through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and the Samoa Water Authority support institutional and policy reform/strengthening for water sector.

10.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

274. The objective does not predict the ultimate and long-term development impacts that are expected to be attained after the project is completed. In addition, some activities are not indicative of the actions needed to achieve the output. There is confusion on distinguishing an outcome from output, as listed in Output 1 under community and Output 2, national.

275. A number of project outputs have been completed that were not listed in the M&E. These include the following:

- Review of Priority Environmental Concerns
- Initial Stakeholder Strategy
- Environmental legislation and institutional review
- National Communication Strategy
- Problem Profile: Participatory Situation Analysis and Initial Stakeholders Identification (PSA)
- Root Cause Analysis (PPA)
- Identification of Solution(s) [not including impacts/feasibility]

276. It is difficult to assess the overall performance of the project in view of the lack of clarity in the M&E regarding outputs, outcomes and objectives, and how they are to be achieved.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

277. The major strength of the project concept is its holistic and integrated approach to strengthen freshwater management. This is being addressed at the national and local levels.

278. The weakness of the design related to its process. There was a lack of participation and communication with key stakeholders in developing the project. As a result there is a lack of understanding of the purpose of the project among key stakeholders, which has resulted in a lack of real ownership in the project. There has also been very little meaningful engagement of the wider pilot communities, resulting in a lack of genuine interest in the project. In addition, the roles and responsibilities of the PCU, LA, NC, NTF and communities were not clearly defined from the outset, resulting in uncertainties relating to roles and responsibilities.

279. Despite the transparent procedure encouraged by the PCU to select pilot sites, Samoa followed a different approach. Whereas other countries encouraged communities to apply to host IWP (through substantial publicity), in Samoa the government pre-selected five potential sites. Apolima and Lepa were then selected as hosts by the NTF at a workshop. The extent of watershed degradation was the key criterion considered for the final selection, largely manifested by the diminished levels of river flow over the years. However, the diminished level of river flow does not link well to the goal of this project, and the reasoning linking this to degradation is not sound. Robust data and analysis to assist the selection would have helped.

280. The selection of two sites at opposite ends of the island, without adequate staffing, made it difficult and time consuming to carry out project tasks.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

281. Stakeholders represented on the NTF included NGOs, private sector, community members and government agencies. However, despite the diversity of NTF participants, there was inadequate utilization of varying expertise on the NTF to assist implementation. The NTF is disbanding at the conclusion of IWP, for lack of funding. This is unfortunate, given that another NTF will likely then need to be established for the similarly focused GEF/SOPAC IWRM project.

282. The Forestry Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries and Meteorology (MAFFM) initially administered the project. When the Forestry Division was transferred to the Ministry of the Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE) during a government reform of the public service, the IWP project and staff went with it. The project was then placed under the MNRE's Division of Environment and Conservation, until the new Water Resources Authority was established within the same Ministry. During the project, amid this shifting of LAs, IWP had two NCs. The success of the Samoa IWP was impacted by these operational changes, making it difficult for Samoa IWP to maintain national level interest and obtain support for developing national water catchment protection policies and legislation, and replicating the IWP activities in other areas.

In-country financial management:

283. As of the first quarter of 2006, the total cumulative funds disbursed for the Samoa IWP was USD 309,600, USD 51,400 under its total allotment.

284. Training on reporting requirements has been delivered by the PCU at various NC meetings. Such training includes financial and narrative reporting, development of workplans and budgets. The high turnover in NCs may have made it hard for replacement NCs to fully comply with the reporting requirements. However, there have not been any specific concerns raised over the financial management of the Samoa IWP accounts.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

285. Lepa is one of 16 project sites chosen to participate in an EU-funded water system project. This project will continue some of the work of IWP and thereby assist in the sustainability of improved water quality for the village.

286. A sustainability plan was produced in June 2006. The Government is replicating the participatory community entry processes in the Letogo catchment. It is also expected that the upcoming SOPAC IWRM

project will also continue some of the work of IWP, although at this stage the details of the project are under development.

287. The recently established Water Resource Authority (whose primary mandate is to manage freshwater resources), will consider use of some of the approaches taken by IWP with respect to community participation.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

288. The acquisition of good baseline data before selecting the pilot site would have helped develop a better understanding of the issues and determine how best to address them. The analysis of baseline data would increase the capacity to measure success or failure. Although water quality data was collected, there is no reporting on changes that are occurring as a result of the project. There was also a lack of other baseline data (e.g. the incidence of water borne diseases in the community, hydrology and sedimentation).

289. Capacity building should have targeted not just the NC, but also the LA and other key people/groups involved in achieving the goal of IWP.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

290. Recognizing the late completion of many activities, it is too early to tell if the project in Samoa has been successful, and whether the results are sustainable. There is very little indicator data available in the reports, and no documented evidence given as to whether the actions taken to protect stream quality will have the desired effect.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

291. Ensure that the LA is appropriate and the roles between the different entities are clearly defined. In particular, it will be important to achieve the active support and participation of local/tribal authorities.

292. Place more emphasis on the establishment of baseline data and regular monitoring, to validate project activity with a demonstrated positive impact.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

293. Government attention is needed to complete, approve and implement the Freshwater Management Plan.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

294. Depending on the specific interventions planned under the SOPAC IWRM project it may be useful to consider a follow-up effort designed to develop water basin management plans across Apia and the other Samoan Islands.

10.3 Summary Conclusion

295. IWP efforts in Samoa initially suffered from a lack of planning, a lack of transparency in pilot project selection, changes in government, and low stakeholder involvement. Consequently, until the final six months of the project, results were limited.

296. Gaining community support for stream-bed protection efforts in Lepa was difficult, with no GEF resources provided during the first several years for constructing fences and other on-the-ground incentives. The country concept changed when the sustainability strategy was completed and implemented (in the final six months of 2006). Water intakes were upgraded in the pilot areas and storage tanks constructed to improve water quantity and quality. Water reserve zones were fenced to prevent animals (cows and pigs) from reaching the main source of water. Awareness and extension materials were finalized (with dissemination to the public still pending). An MOU had been signed between the community and national government to secure community commitment.

11. SOLOMON ISLANDS

Pilot Project Site(s): Morovo Lagoon

Thematic Focus: Coastal Fisheries Management

Pilot Project Goal: Improved sustainable management (policies and practices) for coastal fisheries resources

Pilot Project Objectives:

Objective 1: Increased national capacity for the sustainable management of coastal fisheries resources.

Objective 2: Increased community capacity for the sustainable management of coastal fisheries resources with a focus on beche-de-mer in Chea and Mbili communities.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

Objective 1:
Outcomes:
1: Strengthened institutions, policy and legislation to support sustainable coastal fisheries management.
2: Trained and qualified personnel in the areas of sustainable coastal fisheries management.
3: Increased awareness of the impacts of human activities on achieving sustainable coastal fisheries management.

Objective 2:
Outcomes:
4: Establish or strengthen community institutional arrangements to support sustainable management of beche-de-mer
5: Improved understanding of the threats to coastal fisheries resources with a focus on beche-de-mer depletion at Chea and Mbili Passage.
6: Sustainable management of beche-de-mer resource in Chea and Mbili
7: Support community engagement on alternative existing income generating activities.

Pilot Project Activities:

Table 1: Activities

Goal:	**Improved sustainable management (policies and practices) for coastal fisheries resources**
Objective 1	**Increased national capacity for the sustainable management of coastal fish resources**
Outcome 1	**Strengthened institutions, policy and legislation to support sustainable coastal fisheries management**
Activity 1.1	Undertake national level stakeholder analysis
Activity 1.2	Establish NTF and technical advisory committees
Activity 1.3	Review Priority Environment Concerns in Solomon Islands
Activity 1.4	Review, amend and implement as appropriate environment related legislation and institutions in Solomon Islands (includes Transboundary Environment Governance review and work on CMT)
Activity 1.5	Establish a community based coastal fisheries management unit
Activity 1.6	Develop and implement a National Beche-de-mer Management Plan (based on local pilot activities and plan)
Activity 1.7	Identify and support mutually beneficial partnerships for coastal fisheries research and management.

Outcome 2	**Trained and qualified personnel in the areas of sustainable coastal fisheries management**
Activity 2.1	Provide scholarships to qualified candidates to undertake studies relevant to sustainable coastal fisheries management (includes CMT system)
Activity 2.2	Undertake capacity needs analysis with Department of Fisheries and Marines Resources.
Activity 2.3	Provide training to relevant personnel (including government and lead agencies) on sustainable coastal fisheries management.
Outcome 3	**Increased awareness of the impacts of human activities on achieving sustainable coastal fisheries management**
Activity 3.1	Design, develop and implement a national communications strategy
Objective 2	**Increased community capacity for the sustainable management of coastal fisheries resources with a focus on beche-de-mer in Chea and Mbili communities**
Outcome 4	**Establish or strengthen community institutional arrangements to support sustainable management of beche-de-mer**
Activity 4.1	Design and implement the community communications strategy
Activity 4.2	Establish and strengthen Local Project Committees at Chea and Mbili communities
Outcome 5	**Improved understanding of the threats to coastal fisheries resources with a focus on beche-de-mer depletion at Chea and Mbili Passage**
Activity 5.1	Training of village facilitators to support participatory sustainable coastal fisheries management
Activity 5.2	Conduct root cause analysis of threats to beche-de-mer resource at Mbili and Chea
Activity 5.3	Conduct a ecological baseline survey (includes student attachment) of the selected areas at the Mbili and Chea
Activity 5.4	Conduct a socioeconomic baseline survey of communities and activities at Mbili and Chea
Outcome 6	**Sustainable management of beche-de-mer resource in Chea and Mbili**
Activity 6.1	Assess options for achieving sustainable management (including the establishment of MPAs and CMT system)
Activity 6.2	Design and implement a community enforced management plan (includes institutions, regulations, community by laws and monitoring activities)
Outcome 7	**Support community engagement on alternative existing income generating activities**
Activity 7.1	Asses and strengthen existing income generating activities (such as carving, ecotourism)
Activity 7.2	Assist communities on market outlet for carving industry
Activity 7.3	Provide information to Visitors Bureau to support existing ecotourism destination.

Findings:

297. While it was planned that the Evaluation Team would visit the Solomon Islands, during the regional trip Air Vanuatu unexpectedly changed its flight schedule which unfortunately prevented the visit from taking place.

298. The Evaluation Team made repeated requests for all relevant reports and documents, including the National Lessons Learned report, to be sent for review. Unfortunately, information was not forthcoming. The political / governance uncertainties in the Solomon Islands during the evaluation period are certainly a factor in the communications difficulties, and well beyond the control of Project staff.

299. The following documents were received by the Evaluation Team via the PCU in relation to the Solomon Islands:

	Author	Date	Title
1	Lane, Marcus B.	2005	Coastal Governance in Solomon Islands: An evaluation of the strategic governance issues relating to coastal management
2	Kinch, Jeff; Kere, Nelly; Mesia, Patrick; Bulehite Kenneth	2005	Community Engagement and Participation in the Eastern Marovo Lagoon, Western Province, Solomon Islands
3	Solomon IWP	2003	Priority Environmental Concerns Report
4	Solomon IWP		Participatory Problem Analysis for the Mbili Passage
5	Solomon IWP	2006	Experience In Community And Related Coastal Fisheries Management, paper presented to the Secretariat of the Pacific

		Community Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management, 17 -21 March 2003, Fiji Mocambo Hotel
Solomon IWP	2005	Financial Reports
Solomon IWP	2006	Communications Strategy
Hills, Roy	2006	Sustainability Report for International Waters in the Solomon Islands

300. It should be noted that the findings outlined below are derived solely from the desk review of these reports and not on a direct assessment of the in-country situation or interviews/discussions with in-country staff, and should be treated accordingly.

301. The Sustainability Report by Mr Roy Hills has been cited significantly, as perhaps the most useful document made available to the Evaluation Team. The Sustainability Report was developed in July–August 2006, at the same time that the Terminal Evaluation was being conducted, and it should be noted the sustainability consultant experienced similar challenges in obtaining information and consulting with stakeholders as the Evaluation Team did, as outlined above, even though he was able to work in Honiara and visit the Project Site at Chea.

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

302. The following table is reproduced from Hills (2006), and summarizes the IWP-SI work that has been completed on-the-ground against the corresponding activity headings. All the work listed here was verified by Hills during his Chea pilot project site visit and/or by other independent sources.

Activity Heading	Work Completed (Verified)
Pilot Project Site (Chea)	
Marine Protected Area	(1) MPA demarcation, (2) Base-line marine surveys, (3) Repeat surveys x1, (4) Management rules, (5) Good awareness in Chea, (6) Options for legal protection identified, (7) Training of community reps in monitoring techniques, (8) Erection of sign boards
Sustainable Livelihoods (Seaweed farming and other aquaculture activities)	(1) Experimental sea-weed raft in place, (2) Training provided, (3) Drier materials delivered
Sustainable Livelihoods (Eco-Tourism)	(1) Guest house 70% completed, (2) Tour attractions identified, (3) Leaflet ready for duplication
Mangrove Reserve	(1) Site selected and agreed amongst elders of Chea, (2) Sign board erected and then removed by unknown parties.
Mangrove Rehabilitation	(1) Site selected, (2) Initial planting trial started, (3) Mangrove planting workshop held
Resource Management Plan	(1) Draft plan developed (incorporating MPA and Mangrove Reserve), (2) Further community consultation started
National	
Sustainable Management of biche de mer	(1) Review of beche-de-mer as part of a general marine resource management and conservation, (2) IWP-SI survey reports contributing to decision to enact a national ban.
Communication Strategy	(1) Communication strategy document, (2) Extensive radio programmes on Paoa FM, (3) 2006 Calendar, (4) Post cards on Marovo Lagoon, (5) Video documentary, (6) Newspaper and magazine articles, (7) Newsletters
Capacity Building (scholarship programme)	(1) One student successfully graduated from UPG with a honours degree in marine science sponsored by IWP-SI

303. Hills (2006) reports "This consultancy could not find any real evidence of 'far reaching positive effects' from the project so far. Most of the activities are still in the relatively early stages and require additional support before they come to fruition. Indeed, it is likely that any lasting outcomes will not become fully apparent until months or years after the end of IWP-SI."

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

304. Hills (2006) reported a very low level of participation in IWP-SI by members of the NTF, particularly on the government side. For example, he reports that only one member of the NTF attended a meeting to discuss the project's sustainability strategies. This clearly presents a serious challenge both to securing commitment on continuing IWP-SI activities and in sharing responsibility during the wind-down process. The current political/governance uncertainties in the Solomon Islands are probably a major factor in this regard, and are well beyond the control of the Project.

305. Hills also reports "Assuming the proposed work plan for the remaining 2006 period is completed as intended, the current challenges to sustainability . . . are adequately addressed and some support post IWP-SI is forthcoming, then there is reason to be optimistic that the project will produce some lasting results".

306. SI IWP has indicated that efforts to ensure the sustainability of the IWP pilot and to replicate the successful results, is progressing. With respect to ongoing community activities, the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) will provide support for:

- Continued monitoring of the MPA in Chea.
- Continued support to see the propagation and sales of seaweed and other aquaculture products.
- Continue to promote Chea forest reserve as a tourist attraction.

307. At the national level, the following actions are expected:

- Support the establishment of a Community Based Fisheries Management Unit in the National Fisheries Division from 2007 onwards.
- IWPSI MPA monitoring data used to support the national ban on export of beche-de-mer.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

308. From the research and consultations undertaken by Hills (2006), particularly with the NC, the following lessons learned emerged (with a particular bearing on project sustainability):

- Greater care should have been taken in verifying the suitability of communities to host IWP-SI activities. In particular, more attention should have been paid to the way expressions of interest were prepared (i.e. level of community participation), the compatibility of the community's development agenda with the type of support available and the outcome of any past projects or initiatives. It is questionable if either Mbili or Chea would have been chosen as hosts if the selection process had been more rigorous in these areas.
- There should have been wider consultation and participation of all stake-holding groups with rights or interests in the resources that may be affected by any process initiated or supported. In the case of the Chea MPA and RMP, the present lack of involvement of the neighbouring communities of Sasaghana and Chubikopi is one of the main constraints to sustainability.
- Full community participation in decision-making processes relating to project activities should have been facilitated by IWP-SI. It might still have been appropriate and respectful for the final decision to be carried by the elders/leaders of the community, but only after having given members of the community the opportunity to express their views. Such an approach would have helped to galvanize support for the MPA and RMA in Chea.
- Misleading financial information relating to the project should not have been made available to community members. In the case if Chea, a leaflet that mentioned an amount of several million dollars was apparently distributed during the initial meetings with the community and this amount has been mentioned by senior community members during this consultancy in relation to community expectations.
- More time should have been taken to clarify to members of the host communities what they can realistically expect in terms of assets to facilitate the work and the arrangement under which that support will be forthcoming. Proper written guidance on the acceptable use of those assets would also have been beneficial in preventing and addressing any issues relating to inappropriate usage.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

309. Hills (2006) makes a number of very clear and well developed recommendations in this regard, and his report should be referred to in detail, as it provides an excellent framework for the transition and follow-on phases. Hills' recommendations cover audit requirements, allocation of funds from PCU to allow activity completion, handover of project assets, integration of project activities into government work plans and engagement of NGO's to continue project activities.

12. TONGA

12.1 Background

Pilot Project Site(s):
Nukuhetulu Village

Thematic Focus:

The focal area is waste management. The goal of the project is to improve management of solid and liquid waste in Tonga

Pilot Project Objectives:

The M&E Plan lists two objectives:

1. Improved capacity at Nukuhetulu village in managing solid and liquid waste.
2. Improve national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

The outcomes listed in the M&E plan comprise:

- Increased understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate waste disposal.
- Increased recycling of waste in Nukuhetulu village.
- Strengthened national capacity in management of waste.
- Improve awareness of waste management issues.
- Improve quality of groundwater and lagoon.

Pilot Project Activities:

Goal:	**To improve management of solid and liquid waste in Tonga**
Objective 1	**Improved capacity at Nukuhetulu village in managing solid and liquid waste**
Outcome 1	**Increased understanding of the causes and impacts of inappropriate waste disposal**
Activity 1.1	Conduct Stakeholder Analysis ***(completed)***
Activity 1.2	Conduct Awareness and Participatory Problem Analysis Workshop ***(completed)***
Activity 1.3	Conduct baseline socio-economic and waste characterization survey ***(completed)***
Activity 1.4	Conduct regular village meeting ***(ongoing)***
Activity 1.5	Produce and distribute monthly newsletter (Tongan) ***(ongoing)***
Activity 1.6	Community Theatre Performance ***(status uncertain)***
Activity 1.7	Monitor indicators for effective communication activities **(*ongoing*)**
Outcome 2	Increased recycling of waste in Nukuhetulu village ***(ongoing)***
Activity 2.1	Set up village project committee and hold regular meetings ***(ongoing)***
Activity 2.2	Conduct compost training workshop ***(completed)***
Activity 2.3	Set up and maintain demonstration of household compost and home gardening ***(ongoing)***
Activity 2.4	Set up and maintain village organic farming demonstration plot and plant nursery ***(ongoing)***
Activity 2.5	Conduct village waste reduction competition ***(completed)***
Activity 2.6	Set up demonstration for compost toilet ***(completed)***
Activity 2.7	Set up demonstration for proper piggery ***(to be implemented end of 4th 2006)***
Activity 2.8	Set up and enforce village rules ***(ongoing)***
Objective 2	**Improve national capacity to manage solid and liquid waste**

Outcome 3	**Strengthened national capacity in management of waste**
Activity 3.1	Set up NTF and related technical sub-committees & hold regular meetings ***(Status uncertain)***
Activity 3.2	Establish partnerships with other programs/projects dealing with waste management ***(ongoing)***
Activity 3.3	Award scholarships to research students on topics related to waste management ***(completed)***
Activity 3.4	Review legislation and policies related to waste management in Tonga ***(completed)***
Activity 3.5	Draft new legislation related to waste management (SWMP) ***(ongoing)***
Activity 3.6	Conduct Economic Evaluation of waste in Tongatapu ***(completed)***
Activity 3.7	Conduct nation-wide stakeholder consultation in preparation for the development of a waste strategy *(o**ngoing)***
Activity 3.8	Develop National Integrated Waste Management Strategy ***(ongoing)***
Outcome 4	**Improve awareness of waste management issues**
Activity 4.1	Install Information Board at Nukuhetulu ***(completed)***
Activity 4.2	Conduct Economic Evaluation of Waste in Tongatapu ***(completed)***
Activity 4.3	Complete Communication Strategy ***(completed)***
Activity 4.4	Set up Communication Team ***(completed)***
Activity 4.5	Produce 15 minute DVD documentary ***(completed)***
Activity 4.6	Maintain and update website ***(ongoing)***
Activity 4.7	Production and airing of TV/radio spots ***(completed)***
Activity 4.8	Production and distribution on project t-shirts ***(completed)***
Activity 4.9	Conduct schools competition during National Environmental Awareness Week ***(completed)***
Activity 4.10	Conduct nation-wide village (household) compost competition ***(Status uncertain)***
Activity 4.11	Produce and Distribute Newsletter (monthly and quarterly) ***(ongoing)***
Activity 4.12	Produce and Broadcast TV/Radio program (fortnightly) ***(ongoing)***
Activity 4.13	Produce newspaper articles/magazine feature articles ***(ongoing)***
Activity 4.14	Conduct Nukuhetulu Exhibition Day ***(completed)***
Activity 4.15	Monitor indicators for effective communication activities ***(ongoing)***
Outcome 5	Improve quality of groundwater and lagoon
Activity 5.1	Conduct water quality baseline and monitoring survey ***(status uncertain)***
Activity 5.2	Review legislation and policies related to management of water resources ***(completed)***
Activity 5.3	Conduct stakeholder consultation on potential area for legislative development ***(completed)***
Activity 5.4	Draft new Water Resource Bill ***(ongoing)***

12.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

310. The Tongan pilot project has made good progress towards the objectives and outcomes. The objectives, outcomes and activities are clearly understood and the means to achieve the goal are well designed.

311. The indicators to verify progress are well selected in regards to monitoring the project. Most of the activities have been completed in a timely and steady manner. It would, however, have been useful to indicate the expected outputs of the project. These are not listed in the current M&E structure.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

312. The project was well planned. The Tongan government took into account previous studies from preceding projects, and factored them into their planning for IWP. These included, for example, the AusAID supported Tonga Environment, Planning and Management and the Fanga'uta Lagoon System.

313. Other strengths include:

- Considerable and varied baseline data were obtained to help assess the impacts of the project.

- Firm partnerships were established between the project and key stakeholders, including NGOs such as the Tongan Development and Community Trust and Tongan National Youth Congress, other government agencies, and the Tonga Solid Waste Management Project (TSMWP).
- A well qualified and experienced national co-coordinator was selected and a good team was developed, consisting of the NC, IWP support officer and an assistant.
- A well thought-out M&E plan was developed.
- There was transparency of the project at both the national and local levels.
- The community project had an income generation component through the selling of nursery plants and organic farming produce. This provided a strong incentive for community members to participate.

314. The weaknesses of the project include:

- The national taskforce was ineffective, primarily due to issues such as sitting fees and a lack of understanding for the project. This resulted in a poor level of participation by the NTF in the project.
- The involvement of women and youth groups from Nukuhetulu occurred late in the project stage. It would have been better to involve them earlier to increase the potential for sustainability.
- Some activities were initiated late in the life of the project, such as the pig waste demonstration. However, activities focused on this important issue are planned to continue post-IWP.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

315. Tonga had been heavily involved in the design of the SAP and consequently there was a sound knowledge of the context and purpose of IWP. This was an advantage in the design of their project.

316. A major strength of the pilot has been the utilization of partners in implementing aspects of the project. For example, the Tonga Development Trust has been engaged in assisting with the composting demonstration activity. The IWP project has assisted the TSWMP with some of its work, for example in community mobilization. IWP-funded socioeconomic studies have also been used to assist implementation of the TSWMP.

317. The successful use of communication strategic planning and implementation by Tonga IWP has raised the interest of other stakeholders, especially the LA for the project (the Department of Environment). They have expressed their hope to incorporate the "community-based social marketing" approach into the Corporate Plan 2006–2008. The involvement of relevant stakeholders in the Communication Team has resulted in a very useful forum for exchanging and sharing of information and resources.

318. With respect to implementation weaknesses, ineffective NTF participation was the most significant. The limited understanding, commitment and expectation by the NTF may have attributed to this aspect. Furthermore, the inconsistent participation of some NTF members has created knowledge gaps of the project within member organizations.

319. Time and effort could have been reduced in some areas of the project, for instance in the site selection process. There is now a hurry to implement activities towards the end of the project

320. The lead agency contribution to the implementation of IWP has been low. Limited financial and human resources constrained their full participation in IWP.

In-country financial management:

321. The IWP MOU between the government of Tonga and SPREP was signed in November 2001. Implementation of the project commenced in the first quarter of 2002. Guidelines for the in-country financial arrangements were provided for in the PCU formulated document entitled "Administrative Procedures for National Coordinators and Participating Countries".

322. Early in the project, IWP funds received had to be endorsed by Cabinet before the Ministry of Finance could release them. This process often took up to two weeks and resulted in delays in implementation. The system has since been changed with the endorsement authority now being the Director of Environment; funds are thus accessible immediately under the revised system. The Finance Ministry is the repository agency for the IWP funds. After the Director of Environment endorses the funds, they are then deposited for use by IWP, and disbursed based on requisition requests.

323. Tonga is one of the very few countries that did not encounter problems associated with late receipt of funds from SPREP, because the Tongan NC had good management skills and managed his budget extremely well. The Tongan NC always reported on time and provided very clear accounts of how funds have been spent, in accordance with the project work program.

324. The PCU was very responsive in making sure that funds were available in time.

325. There have been regular quarterly financial reports submitted to SPREP by Tonga. Up until the first quarter 2006, nearly USD 300,000 has been disbursed to Tonga.

326. The government Audit Department conducts annual audits on the IWP accounts. The last audit report expressed satisfaction with how the project funds were utilized to achieve the project goal.

327. In the quarterly newsletter the project produces, there is a regular column on financial news in both Tongan and English.

328. In the co-financing table below, the Tonga NC has estimated that Tonga provided IWP co-financing of USD 100,740.

CO-FINANCE FOR TONGA IWP: Government Contribution

Item		**Amount (USD)**						
		2002	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**Total**
1. Office space	$500 per month	6000.00	6000.00	6000.00	6000.00	6000.00	1000.00	31,000.00
2. Electricity	$100 per month	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	200.00	6,200.00
3. Water	$20 per month	240.00	240.00	240.00	240.00	240.00	40.00	1,240.00
4. transportation		2000.00	3000.00	2000.00	1000.00	600.00	200.00	8,800.00
5. National Task Force		5000.00	5000.00	4000.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	16,000.00
6. Project Development Team		0.00	3000.00	4000.00	4000.00	3000.00	0.00	14,000.00
7. IWP project staff overtime		2500.00	2500.00	3000.00	3000.00	2500.00	0.00	13,500.00
8. DoE staff		2000.00	2000.00	2000.00	2000.00	2000.00	0.00	10,000.00
								100, 740.00

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

329. Sustainability of results achieved is likely to occur mainly through partnerships that have been formed and by securing funds to support certain activities. These include:

- Ongoing partnership with Tonga Community Development Trust and women's group in Nukuhetulu in setting up home composting and village clean up;
- Partners with AusAID-funded TSWMP in promoting composting and recycling;
- Seeking co-finance with Canada Fund on replicating composting toilet;
- Co-finance with UNEP/GPA to develop National Program of Action on Sanitation in Tonga;
- Commence developing a National Integrated Waste Strategy for Tonga;
- Preparing supporting letters seeking financial supports from NZAID and AusAID for three communities in Tongatapu that want to replicate aspects of IWP pilot project;
- Developing a partnership with village youth group to conduct regular rubbish pick up, manage a commercial composting center, and seek long term markets for organic farming products; and
- Partnership with National Youth Congress to build capacity of Nukuhetulu youth and replicated project activities with youth from other villages.

330. To assist with the above, a sustainability plan has been completed for the project, which makes recommendations on sustaining the results post-IWP. The development of national legislation and policies relating to the IWP focal area will also assist in achieving sustainability of the results. The upcoming Sustainable Land Management Project, which has waste management generally included in its activities, may provide a mechanism for continuing the coordination of the waste strategy.

331. Because of the substantial amount of work carried out to date, replication is likely to occur over a period of time. It is expected that incomplete activities will be taken up by the department in 2007.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

332. The role expected of the NTF should be clearly defined at the beginning of the project. Moreover, the results of the NTF meetings should be transparent and summarized in an easy to read format and widely circulated.

333. The involvement of women and youth groups in project implementation from the outset would improve the prospects for sustainability.

334. The initiation of activities to address the community's primary environmental concerns (such as the demonstration of an environmentally friendly piggery) should be addressed early in the project cycle.

335. The recruitment of the NC was undertaken in conjunction with the assistant position. Thus, the NC was not involved in recruiting the assistant, who later resigned. It would have been better to hire the NC first, who would then assist in the recruitment of other IWP staff.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

336. The NC has completed a comprehensive draft lessons learned document, part of which was captured through a collective document prepared at an IWP workshop.

337. Many of the successes, challenges and lessons learned have been comprehensively captured in this document (see IWP-Pacific Technical Report no. 44). Some examples include:

- Stakeholders must be engaged right from the outset: from problem analysis to selecting options, implementing and monitoring of practical solutions;
- Awareness raising on its own is not sufficient but must be accompanied with practical demonstrations of simple solutions in order to foster behavioral change;
- Start with simple and small activities, which are easier to implement because they are manageable, aspects of the project or new behaviors that work well can then be expanded;
- Seeing is more convincing than hearing (pertains to adoption of home composting and composting toilets);
- Work with dedicated stakeholders and bring others on board as project start to show concrete results; and
- Use effective tools such as social assessment, effective communication and economic analysis where appropriate to raise awareness and foster behavioral change.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

338. Adequate baseline studies have been completed. However follow-up studies to assess the effectiveness of the project for comparison purposes would be useful. For example, a follow-up waste characterization survey could be used to assess the success of the project.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

339. The M&E plan should now be reviewed to take into account activities post IWP.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

340. With the new legislation and policies that will come into effect as a result of IWP efforts, compliance, enforcement and implementation efforts will need support.

341. The replication of IWP into other villages could be supported through GEF Small Grants program or other assistance.

12.3 Summary Conclusion

342. The project has been designed and implemented in a strategic and successful manner and shows great promise for sustainability. The Tonga IWP management has recognized that not all activities will be completed within the IWP time frame and they are looking beyond IWP to obtain funding assistance. Activities have been identified that will be continued beyond 2006, such as enforcement of village regulation, ongoing rubbish collection, education/awareness efforts. Although, the project has shown excellent progress towards achieving its goal, the impacts will not be realized immediately. The continued progress towards the goal will largely depend on the commitment of key stakeholders to satisfactory see it through to its conclusion.

343. The success of the project to date owes very much to the excellent work of the NC, which shows the importance of recruiting the right people for such positions.

13. TUVALU

13.1 Background:

Pilot Project Site(s):
Alapi and Senala

Thematic Focus:

344. The focal area for the Tuvalu IWP is wastewater management. The goal is to reduce sewage contamination of groundwater, the surrounding community, and marine ecosystems, from human and animal waste

Pilot Project Objectives:

345. The objectives as identified by the draft M&E plan are:

1. The community to be aware of the wastewater problem, the causes, the possible alternative solutions, and have a plan to implement the preferred solutions, by December 2005.
2. Improve the management of wastewater at the national level.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

346. Six expected outcomes have been identified:

- Increased community capacity in the management of their wastewater.
- Increased community understanding of sanitation problem.
- Deliver a 2-week course on how to select and build appropriate toilet systems and identify solutions by June 2005.
- Establish a water quality monitoring site and plan to determine whether existing toilets are the main source of groundwater faecal pollution.
- Increase national capacity to manage wastewater.
- Start a public education campaign to raise awareness of the problem and promote possible solutions by March 2005.

Pilot Project Activities:

347. The following table lists activities, outcomes, objectives and goal from the draft M&E plan.

Goal:	**To reduce sewage contamination of groundwater, the surrounding community, and marine ecosystems, from human and animal waste**
Community	
Objective:	**For the community to be aware of the wastewater problem, the causes, the possible alternative solutions, and have a plan to implement the preferred solutions, by December 2005**
Outcome 1	**Increase community capacity in the management of their wastewater.**
Activity 1.1	Seek endorsement from community Kaupule and the Falekaupule to participate in IWP.
Activity 1.2	Establish a community Working Group to fast track and increase stakeholder participation in IWP implementation.
Activity 1.3	Promote stakeholder participation through a PPA Workshop with the Community.
Activity 1.5	Seek endorsement on the M&E Plan and the 2005-2006 Work Plan from the community. ***(Status uncertain)***
Activity 1.6	Formulate an ongoing proposed list of long-term wastewater management strategies for Falekaupule to agree to and approve for the community to implement post IWP. ***(Status uncertain)***
Outcome 2	**Increased community understanding of sanitation problems**

Activity 2.1	One-day workshop on the problems associated with unmanaged wastewater identified during PPA workshops ***(Completed)***
Activity 2.2	Under baseline assessment and feedback results of assessment to the community ***(Ongoing)***
Activity 2.3	Regularly reminders on the impact of poor sanitation practices during community meetings ***(Ongoing)***
Activity 2.4	Community awareness campaign to raise awareness of the sanitation problem (see National Public Education Campaign) started by March 2005 ***(Ongoing)***
Outcome 3	**To deliver a 2-week course on how to select and build appropriate toilet systems and identify solutions by June 2005.** (Output)
Activity 3.1	Discuss with Health Department ***(Ongoing)***
Activity 3.2	Discuss proposal with Working Group by November
Activity 3.3	Seek endorsement from community and NTF by December
Activity 3.4	Prepare Cabinet Paper by December
Activity 3.5	Submit to Cabinet for approval by January 2005
Activity 3.6	Development of tailored course materials by February 2005
Activity 3.7	Advertise Trades Course throughout Funafuti (with criteria)?????? By February 2005
Activity 3.8	Closing of applications by end of February
Activity 3.9	Selection of participants by 2nd week of March (completed)
Activity 3.0	Community selects pilot sites for demonstration systems by 2nd week of March
Activity 3.1	Run 2-week training course by April 2005
Activity 3.2	Deliver Evaluation Report and Recommendations to the Community by May 2005
Activity 3.3	Community Workshop to decide next steps and how to fund and implement solutions
Outcome 4	**Establishment of a water quality monitoring site and plan to determine whether existing toilets are the main source of groundwater fecal pollution (Output)**
Activity 1.1	Submit Monitoring Plan to Clerk to Cabinet by November
Activity 1.2	Conduct and report on informal survey to establish groundwater use by December 2004
Activity 1.3	Seek endorsement from community, working group, NTF, and Cabinet to install bores and restrict use of toilets in the designated site by January 2005
Activity 1.4	Seek formal approval from Health to use testing equipment
Activity 1.5	Put the monitoring bores in place by March 2005
Activity 1.6	Collect baseline information on water quality (fecal indicator) by March 2005.
Activity 1.7	Initial monitoring period before stopping toilet use (one month) completed by April 2005
Activity 1.8	Begin continuous three-month monitoring on impact of non-use of toilets until December 2005
Activity 1.9	Information and results will be disseminated to all stakeholders, mainly the Community for future management strategies.
National	
Objective	**Improve the management of wastewater at the national level**
Outcome 1	**Increased national capacity to manage wastewater**
Activity 1.1	Undertake Stakeholder analysis, and identify key stakeholders for participation in NTF.
Activity 1.2	Selection of NTF, to work as a multi-sectoral working group to manage the wastewater problem face by the IWP Selected Community. This group includes government officers, Kaupule representative and NGO's.
Activity 1.3	Working with other government agency (Water Management Committee) in the development of a Tuvalu National Water and Sanitation plan.
Activity 1.4	Working with other environment departments on solutions to the pig waste problem on Funafuti.
Outcome 2	**To start a public education campaign to raise awareness of the problem and promote possible solutions by March 2005** **Remember : Phased Approach , Deal with the emergency, Long-term solutions**
Activity 2.1	Completes secondary research on the problem and possible solutions – medical statistics – talk to Doctors at the hospital – diarrhea, hepatitis, cholera, typhoid WHO report, - need to get presence-absence test for baseline information and as a way of engaging the community – by November
Activity 2.3	Complete Draft Communications Strategy and Campaign Proposal by November

Activity 2.4	Present Campaign Proposal to NTF and Cabinet for approval by December
Activity 2.5	Select Communications Team – representatives from Working Group, Broadcasting, Health, PWD by December
Activity 2.6	Workshop with Communications Team to endorse Campaign Proposal by January
Activity 2.7	Creative Brainstorm with Communications Team to Develop Campaign ideas by January
Activity 2.8	Workshop with community focus groups to pre-test campaign messages and tools by February
Activity 2.9	Develop initial campaign tools for national campaign by February – includes community theatre, schools program, advertising, media, draw attention to algae, etc Remember the campaign also includes: Community-based water quality monitoring and training course
Activity 3.0	Start 6-month pilot "Emergency" campaign by March 2005
Activity 3.1	Focus groups to review effectiveness of campaign by September 2005 – did the message get through?
Activity 3.2	Final report to evaluate effectiveness of pilot campaign by October 2005 – can you measure any change?
Activity 3.3	Meeting with Communications Team to discuss next steps by July 2005.

13.2 Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

348. The overall performance and progress towards the objectives and outcomes is difficult to evaluate because outcomes are confused with outputs. Outcomes 3 and 4 of Objective 1 are considered outputs that point towards tangible products. This also applies to Outcome 2 of Objective 2. Since some outcomes are considered outputs, the M&E plan should list these as such. Additionally, the activities are vague in working towards achieving the outcomes and objectives. The structure omits many of the outputs that have resulted from the project such as the Initial Stakeholders Strategy.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

349. The major strengths of the project design are that the M&E plan underwent wide consultation, engaging the NTF, government and the community in this process. Cabinet approved the document in 2005.

350. The selection of wastewater as a focal area was important. Waste water is a critical environmental issue in Funafuti. The IWP project has been the first in the country dedicated to highlighting this problem. Prior to its commencement, wastewater was seldom considered an issue by the people of Funafuti. For the vast majority of citizens, it is a case of "out of sight out of mind."

351. The project undertook useful studies that also assist other agencies in their work. For instance, the gathering of data relating to water borne diseases was extremely useful information for the Ministry of Health.

352. A major weakness of the project design was that the communication campaign was delivered late in the project cycle. This initiative was launched in the second quarter of 2006. To be more effective in achieving the outcomes, a systematic, consistent and informative communications program should have been implemented earlier in the project cycle.

353. While draft environmental legislation is pending, Tuvalu continues to operate without a stand-alone environmental legislation. Environmental concerns have been inadequately addressed through various pieces of legislation associated with several Acts. This has resulted in confusion over roles and jurisdiction between different entities over waste water issues. Although, there was an effort to undertake a legislative review under the project, it was never completed. Waste water can not be addressed adequately until legislation is in place that provides a clear mandate to a responsible authority to tackle the issue.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

354. The evaluators were informed by the elected councilors of the Kaupule (Town Council) that they were not represented on the NTF. However, the M&E plan indicates that they are and the NC asserts they were members but did not participate regularly. In any case it is apparent that the Kaupule was not closely involved in the project, and there were disagreements over jurisdiction between the Kaupule (who are responsible for town development) and the national government

355. One of the strengths of the project was the use of NTF members to assist in implementation. For example, the Tuvalu Association of NGOs (TANGO), a member of the NTF, was utilized to facilitate community consultation.

356. An additional strength was the regular consultations with key stakeholders' to them inform on IWP activities. The stakeholders included the communities, cabinet, Kaupule and NTF.

357. A major weakness in implementation arrangements was the lack of linkages with other externally-funded environmental projects being implemented parallel with IWP. For example, the climate change project (NAPA) is addressing water issues, which involved similar activities, and which would have provided opportunities for synergy with the IWP project.

358. A further weakness is that insufficient attention was paid to connecting the findings of some of the interesting and useful studies into existing systems that would benefit from the information and help to achieve IWP goals. For example, key findings from the economic study should be incorporated into the draft building code on sanitation systems.

359. Another weakness is that the NC took on other tasks unrelated to IWP, resulting in delayed completion of some of the IWP activities.

360. The weak institutional setup of the Environment Department, which is subsumed under the PM office with no standalone legislation, has lead to a heavy reliance on externally-funded projects. This mode of operation fails to work systematically towards effective long-term environmental management.

In-country financial management:

361. Despite a minor reconciliation discrepancy, the financial arrangement in Tuvalu can be considered satisfactory. Other financial aspects include:

- There have been regular quarterly financial reports submitted to SPREP by Tuvalu. Up until the first quarter of 2006, USD 239,556.92 had been disbursed to Tuvalu.
- IWP accounts are subject to an annual audit by the Auditor General's office. Audits have revealed minor differences between reconciled figures prepared by the project to those of the aid coordinating unit.
- The aid coordinating unit within the Ministry of Finance is the repository institution for IWP funds. From there the funds are disbursed to the Department of Environment, based on requisitions.
- In addition to the NC, the IWP project has a clerk and a part time campaign officer (3 days/week).
- The late disbursement of funds by the PCU has sometime seen the NC miss timely salary payments. However, the NC was recently informed that funds could be transferred from one project account to another to pay the salary, with reimbursement when funds finally arrived.

362. In response to a request for PICs to estimate their in-kind contributions and co-financing for IWP, the Tuvalu NC estimated that approximately AUD 284,700 had been co-financed by Tuvalu. A breakdown of how this amount was derived was not provided to the evaluation team.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

363. A sustainability plan is expected to be produced before the end of the project. The plan will make recommendations on sustaining the results post IWP.

364. The AusAID-supported sanitation project will continue some of the work of IWP. This project proposes to establish a trust fund to support the purchase of water tanks, groundwater surveys in the outer islands, promotion of composting toilets and other activities related to sanitation.

365. The sustainability of IWP will likely be hindered due to the lack of institutional capacity of the Department of Environment, which is overly reliant on externally-funded projects.

Design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success:

366. Capacity building should have targeted not only the NC but also the LA and other key people/groups involved in achieving the goal of IWP.

367. The project would have been better housed in another established and appropriate government institution with the required legislative mandate.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

368. The project has successfully highlighted the need to take serious action regarding wastewater. It has also undertaken useful studies, which can assist in addressing wastewater issues, but their ultimate value will depend largely on the willingness and commitment of those involved to take these issues further.

369. The lack of legislation, policies and weak institutional arrangements in the waste and sanitation sectors are the key challenges that this project faced.

370. It was evident from interviews during the evaluation mission that showcasing of composting toilets by IWP has not significantly increased public support for this sanitation solution. During the course of the project two were built as demonstrations (using non-IWP funds), yet no residents of the pilot community have financed additional outhouses, and no additional funding from government or other sources was obtained for new construction. In addition, the project did not identify remedies for the existing problem of insufficient and inoperable equipment for septic system maintenance. So, while public awareness is growing about the acute groundwater contamination problem and its link to human health, no long-term options or solutions have been put forward through IWP to effectively deal with the problem.

371. With the additional lessons learned through IWP, the problem for Tuvalu now is not a shortage of ideas, but a lack of government will to revise, adopt and implement the sanitation strategy that has already been tabled to develop an integrated sanitation system for Funafuti. Such a system should not start from the goal of building composting toilets, but rather from the goal of building an effective island-wide sanitation system at the lowest cost (taking into account construction and operation). The plan may include a variety of techniques and solutions, including reticulated sewage lines, pump out septic systems, low flush and dry (including composting) toilets. The techniques adopted will depend on access to finance as well as to population densities, physical/geological/climactic considerations, and social norms

372. Institutional capacity is a key issue. If the responsible department or agency has insufficient staff to carry out the expected work, then expectations need to be lowered, or additional funding and staffing utilized. It is not acceptable for an implementing agency to say it will achieve certain outputs under IWP and then saddle the NC with so many other duties that the IWP outputs cannot be achieved.

Recommendations on designing future projects of a related nature:

373. More attention should be paid to ensuring that pilot projects have clearly defined goals, objectives, outcomes, and outputs, with activities designed to achieve them, and milestones built in to help monitor ongoing progress.

374. The relevant findings from other similar studies and projects should be linked into activities that contribute towards attaining the goal.

375. Careful planning and coordination of work efforts with other relevant projects need to be considered to provide synergies and avoid duplication of activities.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

376. Further efforts should now be directed towards revising, approving and implementing the draft sanitation plan and feasibility study for Funafuti, including a financing plan. The plan should take into consideration high population densities and the very real possibility of rising sea levels during the coming decades. Current septic system practices will need to be changed, for instance to include inspections to prevent the construction of faulty septic systems. The existing pump-out truck needs to be repaired, and a proper septage disposal site constructed. Funding to expand the use of composting toilets will be useful, with construction especially targeted for rural sites on the outskirts of Funafuti. Over the longer term, a feasibility study for constructing sewer lines and constructing small ”package” waste treatment facilities should be considered.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF (and other donor) assistance:

377. The GEF-SOPAC IWRM constitutes the main upcoming effort from GEF for continued institutional strengthening to improve sanitation. It should be linked to one or more investment instruments, possibly through GEF, but more likely from other donors. The GEF adaptation project for the Pacific (PACC) also presents opportunities for Tuvalu, recognizing that flooding exacerbates the ground water problems created by faulty and full septic systems.

13.3 Summary Conclusion

378. The Tuvalu IWP focused on one of the key environmental issues facing the island and raised awareness of the direct link between groundwater contamination and the threats to human health. The project suffered from a lack of the necessary legal/regulatory foundation for addressing household waste and sanitation problems.

14. REPUBLIC OF VANUATU

14.1 Background

Pilot Project Site(s):
Crab Bay, Malekula Island, Malampa Province

Thematic Focus:
Sustainable coastal fisheries

Pilot Project Goal:
Sustainable management of subsistence and artisanal coastal fisheries in Vanuatu

Pilot Project Objectives:

379. The objectives of IWP in Vanuatu as presented in the draft M&E Plan are:

- Objective 1 - (National): Improved National Capacity for management of sustainable subsistence and artisanal coastal fisheries.
- Objective 2 - (Community): Strengthen Crab Bay community capacity to sustainably manage artisanal coastal fisheries resources with focus on land crabs.

Pilot Project Planned Outcomes:

380. The outcomes as identified in the M&E plan fall under each of the above objectives as follows:

Objective 1 - (National):
- Outcome 1: Legislation and policy reformed and implemented for sustainable artisanal coastal fisheries resources with a focus on land crabs (habitats/land ownership).
- Outcome 2: Strengthened national capacity to support sustainable artisanal coastal fisheries management
- Outcome 3: Improve understanding on the status of artisanal coastal fisheries

Objective 2 - (Community):
- Outcome 4: Improve community understanding of the causes of artisanal coastal fisheries resource depletion in Crab Bay
- Outcome 5: Strengthened local management of land crabs in Crab Bay

Pilot Project Activities:

381. The following table lists the activities which were identified to achieve the outcomes and objectives of the community and national components of the project.

Table 1: ***Activities***

Goal:	**Sustainable management of subsistence and artisanal coastal fisheries in Vanuatu**
National	
Objective 1:	**Improved National Capacity for management of sustainable subsistence and artisanal coastal fisheries.**
Outcome 1:	***Legislation and policy reformed and implemented for sustainable artisanal coastal fisheries resources with a focus on land crabs.***
Activity 1.1	Review and assess national environmental legislation and institutions relevance to coastal fisheries resources management including issues of relevance to management of land crabs in Crab Bay (completed).
Activity 1.2	Amend as necessary national legislation and policies related to sustainable management of artisanal coastal fisheries of relevance to activities in Crab Bay community (Aug, 2005).
Activity 1.3	National awareness campaign to explain any changes in legislation or institutional arrangements (Sept, 2005).
Outcome 2:	***Strengthened national capacity to support sustainable artisanal coastal fisheries management***
Activity 2.1	Stakeholder analysis (*completed)*
Activity 2.2	Establishment of a National Task Force representing key stakeholders for decision making related to sustainable artisanal coastal fisheries resource management (*completed)*
Activity 2.3	Work with other National agencies involved in coastal resource management and establish linkages between the National Task Force with the proposed National Integrated Coastal Management Committee (Nov, 2004).
Activity 2.5	Develop and implement communication plan to advocate the objectives, processes, outcomes and benefit of the project at the national level, (Nov, 2004).
Activity 2.6	Develop participatory tools to promote community participation in obtaining information on resource use and management at the community level with relevance to Crab Bay community (*completed)* Establish standard ecological and socio-economic survey methods for obtaining information at the community level on coastal resource us, threats and management (Nov, 2004). Work with Lead Agency and Department of fisheries in development of national sustainable coastal fisheries management plan with a particular focus on Crab Bay (Feb, 2005). Work with Lead agency and Department of fisheries to establish an information network on coastal fisheries management activities in Vanuatu (Mar, 2005). Provide support to student under IWP scholarship scheme to support research on institutionalizing effective local management arrangements into provincial and national policy (refer to policy).
Outcome 3:	***Improve understanding on the status of artisanal coastal fisheries***
Activity 3.1	Undertake PEC survey and information gathering (done).
Activity 3.2	Collate information of the current status (stock, utilization and management) of Vanuatu Fisheries with focus on coastal fisheries (currently undertaken).
Activity 3.3	Collate scientific information on the biology and ecology of land crabs as part of baseline assessment, (Nov, 2004).
Activity 3.4	Contribute information from Crab Bay pilot activities to existing fisheries databank. (Dec, 2004).
Activity 3.5	Information awareness on causes to decline of coastal resources in Vanuatu with focus on activities in Crab Bay communities as part of implementation of communication strategy.
Community	
Objective 2:	**Strengthen Crab Bay community capacity to sustainably manage artisanal coastal fisheries resources with focus on land crabs.**
Outcome 4:	***Improve community understanding of the causes of artisanal coastal fisheries resource depletion in Crab Bay***
Activity 4.1	Undertake community workshops to facilitate local community participation in obtaining information on threats to resources with focus on activities related to sustainable fisheries at Crab Bay community (*completed)* Training workshops of local facilitators on survey methods Undertake PSA and PPA
Activity 4.2	Undertake ecological and socio-economic baseline surveys involving community related to management of fisheries in Crab Bay community (Dec, 2004) Training workshops of local participants on survey methods Undertake baselines surveys

Activity 4.3	Information awareness on outcomes of activities generated from the implementation of the pilot project related coastal resources in Vanuatu with focus on activities in Crab Bay communities
Outcome 5:	***Strengthened local management of land crabs in Crab Bay***
Activity 5.1	Recruitment of a local project officer to assist provincial staff and with project activities implementation at the community level. (Nov 2004)
Activity 5.2	Review of existing community institutional arrangements for the management of the locally initiated taboo (MPA) (Nov, 2004) Community meetings to provide feedback on the information and established effective arrangements
Activity 5.3	Strengthen existing local MPA committee for the management of land crabs (Nov 2004) Stakeholders consultations
Activity 5.4	Development and implementation of management plan for land crabs in Crab bay community (July, 2005) Community consultation workshops Community endorsement & implementation of the plan
Activity 5.5	Work with Provincial authorities to promote sustainable market opportunities for land crabs for the local communities. Provincial consultation workshops (June 2005)
Activity 5.6	Campaigns to promote sustainable use of land crabs (Nov, 2004)

14.2 Terminal Evaluation Findings:

Overall performance and progress towards objectives and outcomes:

382. The national-level objectives and outcomes have been partially achieved as a result of the project, and through the Crab Bay pilot project a strong foundation has been laid for national activities. The Vanuatu Environment Unit and Fisheries Department are working cooperatively to replicate the Crab Bay model at other communities throughout Vanuatu. Project staff in Vanuatu reported that the socioeconomic baseline study undertaken as part of IWP was received very positively, providing essential information that has "shone new light" on resource management issues at the pilot site, and is being used as a model for other sites.

383. The project has strengthened national capacity to support artisanal coastal fisheries management (Outcome 2) and helped to improve the understanding of the status of such (Outcome 3). With regard to national policy and legislation reform (Outcome 1), national project staff report that Vanuatu fisheries legislation has been amended to incorporate the principles demonstrated at Crab Bay (including the use of traditional, community-based resource management).

384. Performance and progress towards community-level objectives and outcomes has been excellent in Vanuatu. Both Outcome 4 and 5 have been achieved at Crab Bay. The project has successfully established a traditional protection and management regime (tapu) over key parts of Crab Bay, with full engagement and ownership by the communities, strengthening traditional marine tenure in the area. Formal monitoring and anecdotal reports indicate a positive impact; with significantly increased land-crab stocks.

Strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation:

Strengths

385. At the national level, a major strength of the project design in Vanuatu was the intentional selection of a site where existing artisanal fisheries management programs (e.g. for community re-seeding of *trochus*) could be linked with and built upon.

386. At the community level the project was designed to adopt community-relevant approaches (e.g. setting the maximum size for taking crabs at a carapace width of three fingers rather than "x" centimeters).

Weaknesses

387. At the national level, the distance of Malekula Island from the capital (Port Vila) and the associated costs of travel for project staff, were considered weaknesses, but which were outweighed by the strengths of using this site.

Strengths and weaknesses in the in-country implementation arrangements:

Strengths

388. Implementation of the project in Vanuatu benefited from excellent retention/continuity of national project staff; and also from well-established inter-ministerial coordination arrangements covering all donor-funded projects in the country, with good cooperation between Ministries.

389. Implementation of the project was based on full engagement and ownership by the communities (11 villages in the Crab Bay area), a key strength in its success. The project also worked hard to fully involve the Provincial Government (Malampa), thereby facilitating ease of implementation and enhancing prospects for sustainability.

390. A major strength in in-country implementation in Vanuatu was a strong emphasis on communication and awareness activities, including innovative communication techniques, such as community-based drama (organized by the Won Small Bag group).

391. National project staff reported that there was a high level of delegation from the PCU, allowing national engagement of consultants, thereby facilitating in-country implementation.

392. The engagement of government at senior Ministry levels (Environment and Fisheries) was high, and expectations were raised for IWP outcomes to be relevant to the Vanuatu situation, and applied.

393. The NTF was not a stand-alone body, but rather IWP issues were taken up as part of a ministry-sponsored task force covering a wider array of water quality and coastal fisheries issues. This broader NTF mechanism, while perhaps diminishing the time spent specifically on IWP issues, nevertheless helped to ensure that the NTF stayed active and also ensured that IWP activities and achievements were taken into account when considering related projects and issues.

Weaknesses

394. Possible improvements for in-country implementation of future projects, as suggested by stakeholders, include more time and resources for capacity-building of project staff (e.g. in project management and executing agency (EA) and implementing agency (IA) reporting requirements), in the first year of the project, and more time allowed in the overall project timetable for countries to establish the necessary administrative arrangements.

395. IWP in Vanuatu had limited success in engaging and involving relevant private-sector industries and NGO, but these sectors are not strong in Vanuatu in relation to coastal resources management.

In-country financial management:

396. Financial management appears to have been very well handled in Vanuatu, with no reports or indications of problems or issues.

397. National project staff reported that after receiving training and support from the PCU, financial reporting requirements were not onerous, and were greatly assisted by clear, standard templates.

398. It was reported that the IA policy of not replenishing country impress accounts until after all 14 countries had submitted their periodic financial reports, had caused unfair delays to Vanuatu, which had mostly submitted its reports in reasonable time. In such instances the government exercised adaptive management, advancing national funds to the project, which could be replenished when project funds were received from the EA.

Replication and sustainability of results achieved:

399. The Project has successfully built-upon and integrated with pre-existing and on-going community-based fisheries management activities at Crab Bay (especially regarding *trochus* shell), thereby achieving effective synergies between projects with beneficial multiplier effects.

400. As outlined above, there is significant potential for replication and sustainability of the IWP achievements at Crab Bay, with the Vanuatu Environment Unit and Fisheries Department working

cooperatively to continue work at Crab Bay, and to replicate the Crab Bay model at other communities throughout Vanuatu. Project staff in Vanuatu reported that the socioeconomic baseline study undertaken as part of IWP was received very positively, and is being used as a model for other sites throughout Vanuatu.

401. Replication and sustainability is assisted by the presence of well-established inter-ministerial coordination arrangements, covering all donor-funded projects in the country, with apparently good cooperation between Ministries/Departments (especially Environment and Fisheries). This means that resources from different projects can be coordinated nationally to enhance synergies and multiplier effects between projects.

402. At the time of review, Vanuatu was still developing its sustainability plan, which has not been received by the review team.

Successes, challenges and lessons learned:

403. Stakeholders reported that a major value of IWP in Vanuatu lay in the process of getting community players to talk to each other to identify and resolve resource conflicts. The project played a major role in bringing women and youth into community decision-making processes, a major development for Vanuatu.

404. The project resulted in a significant improvement in the understanding of the crab resource by the communities at Crab Bay; expanding beyond a perception of the crabs as just a source of food, to incorporate understanding of population dynamics, densities, size, recruitment, life-cycles, as well as of the environment.

405. The project also greatly assisted in harmonization between 11 communities which had previously been involved in ongoing resource ownership and access disputes, and helped to strengthen traditional "restorative" justice systems of conflict resolution.

406. The project has generated significant interest from other communities throughout Vanuatu, with several others taking the initiative to further develop their traditional coastal and marine resource management regimes, based on the experience at Crab Bay.

407. The project was also effective in engaging and retaining the active involvement of the provincial government, which traditionally have not been involved in natural resource management in Vanuatu.

Recommendations on transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability at National-level after December 2006:

408. It appears that the prospects for sustainability and replication are good in Vanuatu, based on national government investments in project activities and linkages with other aid projects, both underway and planned. It is recommended that the national and provincial governments continue to work towards integrating IWP outcome into core government programs and national budget planning. More could be done to involve relevant private industries and NGOs as possible sources of resources to support sustainability.

Recommendations on the need for possible future GEF assistance:

409. Stakeholders advised that while additional and ongoing donor support is always needed and welcomed, there were no intentions to develop a proposal for a follow-up GEF project, and that the prospects for sustainability and replication were good, as outlined above.

14.3 Summary Conclusion

410. IWP in Vanuatu can be considered a success, with all community-level objectives and outcomes being achieved, good progress being made towards the national level objectives and outcomes, apparently good prospects for sustainability and replication without further GEF intervention, and many benefits having been realized beyond the initial scope of the project.

ANNEX B: EVALUATION TOR

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE UNDP-GEF STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES RAS/98/G32

I. Introduction:

The Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States (the GEF/SAP) was originally a 7-year initiative of 14 independent Pacific Island States[1]. It is implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and executed by the Secretariat Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP). The Project Document was signed by UNDP and SPREP in February 2000. Actual execution did not commence until July 2000 when the Program was activated at SPREP. Delayed implementation resulted in approval to extend the timeframe for the GEF/SAP to seven years with a new scheduled completion date of December 2006.

The GEF/SAP is designed to support actions to address the root causes of degradation of the international waters of the Pacific Islands region. The actions are to be carried under the auspices of two complementary, linked consultative programs: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (ICWM) and Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM). This Terminal Evaluation (TE) is confined to the ICWM component of the GEF/SAP.

The ICWM Component of the Program was designed to "address root causes of the degradation of international waters in coastal regions". It will do this through "improved integrated coastal and watershed management". This is to be achieved through action at the community level to address priority environmental concerns within participating countries relating to:

- Marine and freshwater quality;
- Habitat and community modification and degradation; and
- Unsustainable use of living marine resources.

The Project Document acknowledged that all sustainable development issues related to International Waters in the Pacific region couldn't be addressed at once. Therefore four high priority areas were identified for immediate intervention:

- improved waste management,
- better water quality,
- sustainable fisheries, and
- effective marine protected areas.

Targeted action within these activity areas were proposed in five categories:

- management,
- capacity building,

[1] The 14 Pacific Island States that qualify for GEF support are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

- awareness/education,
- research/information for decision-making, and
- investment.

To address these concerns the ICWM component of the GEF/SAP has focused on the underlying economic and social factors affecting resource use. It supported the establishment of one pilot or demonstration project in each participating country. Drawing on natural resource economics and social science (particularly community participation and anthropological issues), the coastal component has worked with communities in the pilot project areas to identify why actions are occurring that harm environmental quality. Recognising that environmental threats cannot be addressed through community level action alone the Project also sought to engage district and national level administrations in pilot activities relating to policy, legislation and institutional arrangements. At all levels the Project was to partner local stakeholders in an effort to address the root cause of the environmental concerns. Community participation at all stages in the project cycle is a central element of the pilot activities.

Together with relevant scientific information, the ICWM Component has sought to develop an integrated approach to solving environmental problems. The GEF/SAP's community focus requires a strong communications element. Communications feature significantly in publicizing to other development/environmental agencies the outcomes of each pilot project and the lessons learnt in the component overall. Each pilot project seeks to strengthen capacity and provide lessons for best practice and appropriate methodologies for sustainable resource management and conservation.

The Project was designed to promote partnerships with other development assistance agencies that were/ are active in the region. The objective in this respect was to plan and coordinate regional and national development assistance for international waters to address imminent threats and their root causes more effectively. The Project was designed to provide a framework for overall national and regional planning and assistance for the management of international waters. It also endeavored to provide a catalyst for leveraging the on-going participation of other donors throughout the life of Project-related activities at the regional or national level.

A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at SPREP administers the Program.

II. Objective and Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation

Guidelines for the TE of UNDP/GEF projects are available at: http://www.undp.org/gef/undpgef_ publications/undp-gef_publications.html

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-size projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of

implementation[2]. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of Evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation and on completion of the Project.

The overall objectives of this TE are to:

i. assess overall performance and review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes;
ii. assess the efficiency and effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes;
iii. to critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation;
iv. assess the sustainability of results achieved;
v. provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success;
vi. provide recommendations on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature and, identify, document and disseminate widely the successes, challenges and lessons learned;
vii. advise on activities in place for a transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability of IWP initiatives after December 2006;
viii. assess the need for possible future GEF assistance and provide guidance for future GEF interventions in the Pacific (including mechanisms, scale and themes).

III. Key Issues

In pursuit of the overall objectives, the following key issues should be addressed during the TE of the Pacific IWP[3]:

- assess to what extent the ICWM component achieved the IWP's regional and global environmental objectives as described in GEF operational focal areas 8 and 9;
- assess the effectiveness with which the IWP addressed the root causes and imminent threats identified by the Strategic Action Program (SAP) as giving rise to the concern about the degradation of water quality, degradation of associated critical habitats and the unsustainable use of coastal resources in the Pacific Islands region;
- assess the extent to which the planned objectives and outputs of the IWP were achieved and document results and impacts for each country.
- describe the IWP adaptive management processes – how did institutional and management arrangements within the PCU and other levels of the project management and project activities change in response to new conditions encountered during implementation, and were the changes appropriate?
- review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for IWP implementation and the level of coordination between relevant players in-country and across the program;
- review the PCU changing roles in implementation and management of the project and the provision of technical support and capacity building over the life of the project;
- review any partnership arrangements with other stakeholders (local, national and regional) and comment on their strengths and weaknesses;

[2] The TE for this Project is scheduled 6 to 9 months prior to its formal conclusion. This has been done so that the Evaluators have access to all those that who been involved in its implementation.

[3] Further guidance concerning the scope, objectives and format for TE's for UNDP/GEF projects is available at: http://www.undp.org/gef/undp-gef_publications/undp-gef_publications.html particularly Annexes VII and VIII.

- assess the level of public engagement in the IWP and recommend whether public engagement has been appropriate to the goals of the project;
- describe and assess efforts of UNDP and SPREP in support of the implementation of the ICWM Component of the IWP;
- review and evaluate the extent to which IWP impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- assess the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes, impacts and benefits after completion of ICWM Component of the IWP.
- describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of IWP outcomes, impacts and benefits, and the potential for replication of the approach.
- assess whether the Logical Framework approach and performance indicators (as revised for the Mid Term Evaluation) have been used as effective IWP management tools;
- review the implementation of the IWP's monitoring and evaluation plans;
- review the knowledge management processes of the project including the use of IW: LEARN and strengthening links with SPREP knowledge management initiatives.

IV. Lessons Learned

In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

- Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
- country ownership, initiative and leadership;
- community level assessment and participation at all stages of the project cycle;
- socio-economic analysis and resource management economic analysis where these have been undertaken;
- communications approaches and strategies and their impact on behavioral change and raising awareness at all levels - both in country, regionally and international;
- regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
- national cooperation through NTF, intra government cooperation, and other project management initiatives;
- stakeholder participation (at the project site, district, province and national levels);
- adaptive management processes;
- efforts to secure sustainability after December 2006;
- efforts at the development of in-country replication strategies; and
- the role of M&E in project implementation and as required by GEF guidelines..

Other items that need to be examined:

- Comment on whether or not the Lessons Learned identified the Terminal Evaluation for the Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Program have been applied to IWP and identify gaps that need to be addressed attention in the future.
- Identify further research and analysis work that could be undertaken before the close of the project, which would facilitate the exit strategy phase, next steps and identification of best practice for community based natural resource management projects

V. Format

The Report of the TE will be a stand-alone document, not exceeding 50 pages that substantiate its recommendations and conclusions.

The Report will be targeted at meeting the evaluation needs of all key stakeholders (GEF, UNDP, other GEF implementing agencies, SPREP, Regional Agencies, and stakeholders in Participating Countries).

VI. Scope

Three main ICWM Component IWP elements to be evaluated include Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness.

Project Delivery

The TE will assess to what extent the IWP has achieved its immediate objectives? It will also identify what outputs, impacts and results have been produced and how they have enabled the SAP to achieve its objectives?

The section will include an assessment of the following priority areas:

1. Institutional arrangements
- strategic planning, preparatory work and implementation strategies,
- consultative processes,
- technical support,
- capacity building initiatives,
- project outputs,
- assumptions and risks, and
- project-related complementary activities.

2. Outcomes/ Results and Impacts:
- efficiency of all IWP activities in the four target areas,
- progress in the achievement of immediate objectives (level of indicator achievements when available), and
- quality of IWP activities

3. Partnerships
- assessment of regional collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations,
- assessment of national-level involvement and perceptions,
- assessment of local partnerships, and
- involvement of other stakeholders

4. Risk Management:
- were problems/ constraints, which impacted on the successful delivery of the IWP identified at project design and subsequently as part of the MTE?
- were there new threats/risks to project success that emerged during project implementation?
- were both kinds of risk appropriately dealt with?
- are they likely to be repeated in future phases?
- were recommendations arising from the MTE addressed and, if so, how and why?

5. Monitoring and evaluation:
- assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the project implementation.

- has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the IWP and how was this developed?
- is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- has M&E been used as a management tool in directing project implementation in a timely manner and ensuring on-going participation at all levels?
- is this framework suitable for replication/ continuation for any future Project support?

Project Implementation

Review the IWP's management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to
provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost-effectiveness. This includes:

1. Processes and administration:
- project-related administration procedures,
- milestones,
- key decisions and outputs,
- major project implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful, and
- processes to support national components of the Project.

2. Project oversight and active engagement by the following agencies:
- GEF; UNDP; SPREP
- participating country mechanisms

3. Project execution:
- SPREP as the Executing Agency (under the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality)
- PCU
- national functions

4. Project implementation:
- UNDP as the Implementing Agency

5. Comparative assessment
Compare the IWP's overview (GEF/UNDP), execution (SPREP) and implementation (PCU, National Lead Agencies, National Coordinators, etc) elements of the Project with similar regional natural resource management programs in the Pacific and elsewhere. Provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of the structure and recommend alternatives (if required) for future consideration.

.

Project Finances

How well and cost-effective did financial arrangements of the IWP worked? This section will focus
on the following three priority areas:

1. Project disbursements.
- Provide an overview of actual spending vs. budget expectations:
- With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "directly" in-country against total funds spent

- With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "indirectly" in-country (i.e. external consultants and regional training) against total funds spent, and
- Critically analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.

2. Budget procedures
- Did the Project Document provide enough guidance on how to allocate the budget?
- Review of audits and any issues raised in audits; and subsequent adjustments to
- accommodate audit recommendations;
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an
- opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions, taking into account
- the increased duration of the IWP.

3. Coordinating mechanisms
- Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between
- national agencies, SPREP (including internal coordination), UNDP and the GEF.
- Does the IWP approach represent an effective means of achieving the objective of
- the ICWM Component of the IWP?
- How can the approach be improved?

VII. Methodology

The TE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, visits to selected participating countries, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including (but not restricted to): UNDP (Apia), GEF, SPREP, Regional Agencies, participating Governments, National NGOs, communities, resource users and local governments.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:
- desk study review of all relevant IWP documentation;
- Apia-based consultations with UNDP, SPREP and the PCU;
- visits to as many participating countries as feasible within budgetary and timeframe constraints; and
- possible participation in the final Multipartite Review of the Project tentatively scheduled for August/September 2006 in order to coincide with the 17th Annual SPREP meeting.

VIII. Final Products

Terminal Evaluation Report (see format outline at Annex 1):

The Terminal Evaluation report will include:
i) an executive summary of the findings and conclusions in relation to the issues to be addressed identified under sections II and III of this TOR;
ii) assessment of gaps and/or additional measures needed that might justify future GEF investment in the Pacific Islands region,
iii) guidance for future investments (mechanisms, scale, themes, location, etc), and
iv) a summary of lessons learned from the Project.

The Evaluation Report will be written in the format outlined in Annex 1. The draft report will be submitted to UNDP and SPREP by 1st May 2006 and final report by 30th June 2006..

The final report will be formally presented to the Annual Meeting of SPREP in September 2006. It will also be forwarded to the GEF for review and extraction of broadly applicable lessons by the Independent M&E Unit and IW: LEARN.

The reviewers will provide UNDP and SPREP with an electronic copy of the final reports at the time of their submission.

IX. Reviewer Attributes:

Team Leader and UNDP/GEF M&E Specialist:

- academic and/or professional background in institutional aspects of ICWM. A minimum of 15 years relevant experience;
- an understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- detailed knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, with particular emphasis on regional priorities of the Pacific SIDS. Knowledge of Pacific regional and participating country national institutions, structures, processes, priorities and operations;
- experience in the monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors;
- experience in the monitoring and evaluation of GEF-funded international waters and/or biodiversity conservation projects;
- demonstrated experience in institutional analysis;
- excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions;
- experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations;
- proven capacity in working across the levels of institutions from policy, to legislation, regulation, and organisations;
- an ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives, and
- excellent facilitation skills.

Natural Resource and Social Issues Specialist

- academic and professional background in community-based resource management, economics and conservation with demonstrated practical experience in participatory processes and socioeconomics - preferably in Pacific Island environments;
- an understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- an understanding of participatory approaches and practices in the natural resource area and able to engage in a participatory way with all stakeholders
- a minimum of 15 years relevant work experience;
- experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects; an understanding of UNDP and SPREP activities and operational procedures in the Pacific Islands region;
- skills and experience in ICWM-related processes and projects;
- excellent English writing and communication skills, and
- excellent facilitation skills.

Communication and knowledge management specialist

- academic and professional background in resource management and conservation, community based communications and social marketing;
- an understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- a minimum of 15 years relevant work experience;

- experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects; an understanding of UNDP and SPREP activities and operational procedures in the Pacific Islands region;
- skills and experience in ICWM-related processes and projects;
- excellent English writing and communication skills, and
- excellent facilitation skills

At least one of the Reviewers will be a Pacific Island national and have experience in the delivery of community based environmental management projects using participatory tools.

X. Tentative Schedule

October 2005	Calls for Request for Proposal[4]
Early November 2005	Request for Proposal close
November 2005	Selection of Reviewers
April 2006	Reviewers commence the Evaluation
1 May 2006	Draft report submitted
30 June 2006	Final Report submitted to UNDP and SPREP
September 2006	Presentation to Annual Meeting of SPREP Members and MPR5

XI. Report Submission

The report will be submitted simultaneously to:
Ms Joyce Yu,
Resident Representative,
UNDP,
Private Mail Bag,
Apia, Samoa
(to the attention of Ms Easter Galuvao
Email: easter.galuvao@undp.org).

Mr Asterio Takesy,
Director,
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program,
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa

Contact to Express Interest

Expressions of interest should be sent to –
Ms Easter Galuvao
UNDP Country Office
Apia
SAMOA
Email: easter.galuvao@undp.org
Fax: +685-23555

Additional Information

Additional information about the project is available at http://www.sprep.org/iwp .

[4] Two Envelope System applies to your Submission: 1) Technical Proposal and 2) Financial Proposal

(TOR) Annex I

EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE
(Minimum GEF requirements[5] are underlined)

Executive summary
- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context
- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions
- Project formulation
  - Implementation
  - Stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Indicators
- Implementation
  - Delivery
  - Financial Management
  - Monitoring and evaluation
  - Execution and implementation modalities
  - Management by the UNDP country office and other partners
  - Coordination and operational issues

  Results
  - Attainment of objectives
  - Sustainability
  - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for consideration in future projects
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

[5] Please refer to GEF guidelines for explanation of Terminology

ANNEX C: EVALUATION MISSION ITINERARY

Date	Day	Location	Activities	Evaluation Team Participants
24/5	Wednesday	Apia, Samoa	Meetings at SPREP	AF, SR, AT
25/5	Thursday	Apia, Samoa	Interviews	AF, SR, AT
26/5	Friday	Apia, Samoa	Interviews & site visit	AF, SR, AT
27/5	Saturday	Apia, Samoa	Review	AF, SR, AT
28/5	Sunday	Apia, Samoa	Review	AF, SR, AT
29/5	Monday	Samoa - Tongatapu	Travel	AF, AT
30/5	Tuesday	Tongatapu, Tonga	Interviews	AF, AT
31/5	Wednesday	Tongatapu, Tonga	Interviews	AF, AT
1/6	Thursday	Tongatapu, Tonga	Interviews & site visit	AF, AT
2/6	Friday	Tongatapu, Tonga	Interviews	AF, AT
3/6	Saturday	Tongatapu – Suva - Funafuti	Travel	AF, AT
4/6	Sunday	Funafuti, Tuvalu	Review	AF, AT
5/6	Monday	Funafuti, Tuvalu	Interviews	AF, AT
6/6	Tuesday	Funafuti, Tuvalu	Interviews & site visit	AF, AT
7/6	Wednesday	Funafuti, Tuvalu	Interviews	AF, AT
8/6	Thursday	Funafuti - Suva	Travel	AF, AT
9/6	Friday	Suva, Fiji	Interviews	AF, AT
10/6	Saturday	Suva, Fiji	Interviews & site visit	AF, AT
11/6	Sunday	Suva, Fiji	Review	AF, AT
12/6	Monday	Suva, Fiji	Interviews	AF, AT
13/6	Tuesday	Suva – Port Vila	Travel	AF, SR
14/6	Wednesday	Port Vila, Vanuatu	Interviews	AF, SR
15/6	Thursday	Port Vila, Vanuatu	Interviews	AF, SR
16/6	Friday	Port Vila, Vanuatu	Interviews	AF, SR
17/6	Saturday	Port Vila - Brisbane	Travel	AF, SR
18/6	Sunday	Brisbane-Honiara-Nauru-Tarawa	Travel	AF, SR
19/6	Monday	Tarawa, Kiribati	Interviews	AF, SR
20/6	Tuesday	Tarawa, Kiribati	Interviews & site visit	AF, SR
21/6	Wednesday	Tarawa, Kiribati	Interviews	AF, SR
22/6	Thursday	Majuro, RMI	Travel	AF, SR
23/6	Friday	Majuro, RMI	Interviews	AF, SR
24/6	Saturday	Majuro, RMI	Review	AF, SR
25/6	Sunday	Majuro, RMI	Review	AF, SR
26/6	Monday	Majuro, RMI	Interviews & site visit	AF, SR
27/6	Tuesday	Guam	Travel	AF, SR
28/6	Wednesday	Yap, FSM	Interviews & site visit	AF, SR
29/6	Thursday	Yap, FSM	Interviews	AF, SR
30/6	Friday	Yap, FSM	Interviews	AF
1/7	Saturday	home	Travel	AF

ANNEX D: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Country	Name	Organization
Samoa	Easter Galuvao	UNDP, Environment and Energy
	Veronika Levi	UNDP, Environment and Energy
	Asterio R. Takesy	Director, SPREP
	Bruce Chapman	Program Manager – Pacific Futures, SPREP
	Stuart Chape	Program Manager – Island Ecosystems, SPREP
	Taito John M. Roache	Corporate Services Manager, SPREP
	Muliagatele (Joe) Reti	IWP Management
	Cedric Schuster	IWP Management
	Rama Vaa	Accountant, IWP PCU
	Steve Menzies	Community Communications Specialist, International Waters Program
	Raymond C. Voigt	National President, SUNGO
	Moelagi Jackson	Vice President, SUNGO
	Lasalo Salima	Organic Project Officer, Women and Business
	Maturo Paniani	National Coordinator, IWP
	Moefaauo Taputoa Titimaea	Manager Director, Samoa Water Authority
	John Tagiilima	Team Leader, Assets, Samoa Water Authority
	Faumuina Sailimalo Vole Pati Liu	Assistant Chief Executive Officer – Environment and Conservation
	Sulumalo Amataga Petaia	Assistant Chief Executive Officer – Water Resources Division
	Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea	ACEO - MET
Tonga	Sione Faka'osi	National Coordinator, IWP
	Viliami Mahe	Project Support Officer, IWP
	Uilou Samani	Director, Environment
	Nukuhetulu Women and Youth groups	Nukuhtetulu Village
	'Ofa Fakalata	Tonga Development Community Trust
	John Gildea	Australian Team Leader, Solid Waste Management Project.
	Sonia Chigrin	Solid Waste Management Project.
	Niu Fakakovi'aetau	Ministry of Health
	Tasi Ledger	Tonga National Youth Congress
Tuvalu	Kelesoma Saloa	National Coordinator, IWP
	Enate Evii Taua	Acting Director, Environment, Office of the Prime Minister
	Panapasi Nelesone	Secretary to Government, Office of the Prime Minister
	Niko Apinelu	Director of Fisheries
	Filipo Taulima	Director, Public Works Department (PWD)
	Gunter Koepke	Water Resource Officer, PWD
	Semeli Manase	IWP community member champion, Funafuti

Tuvalu (cont)	Pula Maatia	Coordinator, Tuvalu National Council of Women
	Iete Avanitele	Rural Development, Department, Home Affairs
	Poni Faavae	Coordinator, NAPA
	Temate Melitiana	Aid Coordinating Unit
	Dr Nese Conway	Acting Director of Health, Public Health
	Solomona Ielemia and other council members to the Funafuti town council	President, Funafuti Kaupule
	Semese Alafaio	TANGO
	Siuila Toloa	Secretary, Island Care
	Susan Tupulaga	Coordinator for Waste Management Project, Environment
Fiji	Epeli Nasome	Director of Environment
	Manasa Sovaki	Principal Environment Officer
	GD Sharma	Accountant, Ministry of Local Government
	Tevita Dawai	Ministry of National Planning
	Winifereti Nainoca	Fiji Institute of Technology
	Alena Lewadrau	Water Resources Officer, SOPAC
	Bill Aalbersberg	Institute of Applied Science, USP
	Merewai Tonganivalu	SPC, Nabua
	Members of Vunisinu and Nalase Village communities	Vunisinu Village, Rewa
	Sailasa Vatucawaqa	Vunisinu Vilage headman
	Sandeep K. Singh	IWP National Coordinator,
	Hugh Govan	Manager, Coastal Program, FSPI
Vanuatu	Russel Nari	Director-General, Ministry of Lands, Energy, Environment, Geology, Mines and Water Resources
	Ernest Bani	Director, Environment Unit
	Leah Nimoho	IWP Coordinator, Environment Unit
	Moses Amos	Director, Department of Fisheries
	Francis Hickey	Researcher, Vanuatu Cultural Centre
	Kevin Morris	Crab Bay Community
	Manoa Kaun	Crab Bay Community
	Thomas Banga	Natural Resource Analyst, Department of Economic Strategy and Planning
	Wycliff Bakeo	Senior Provincial Officer, Department of Provincial Affairs
	Douglas Nqwele	Board Member, PIANGO and VANGO.
	Lai Sakita	VANGO/NCDT
Kiribati	Hon Martin Tofinga	Minister of Environment
	Mr Derek Andrewartha	One Stop Stores / Tarawa Recycling Program
	Ms Ritia Bakineti	Ex IWP Coordinator
	Mr Tererei Abete-Reema	IWP Coordinator
	Mr Tiroia Tabwea	IWP Communications Officer
	Mr Arawaia Moiwa	IWP Project Assistant
	Mr Akau Tiarie	Manager, Bobotim Kiribati Ltd
	Mr Betarim Rimon	Senior Project Officer, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development

Kiribati (cont)	Mr Tonganibeia Taam	Chief Councilor, Betio Town Council
	Mr Bouataake Tengkam	Clerk of Betio Town Council
	Mr Tierimo	Chief Councilor, Teinainano Urban Council
	Mr Maraki Bokai	Clerk, Teinainano Urban Council
RMI	Ms Yumi Crisostomo	Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC).
	Ms Deborah Barker	Deputy Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC).
	Mr John Bungitak	RMI Environment Protection Agency (EPA)
	Mr Terry Mellan	General Manager, Majoro Water & Sewer Co.
	Mr Arlington Robert	Deputy General Manager, Majuro Water & Sewer Co.
	Mr Greg Karben	Solid Waste Officer, Ministry of Public Works.
	Mr Ben Chutaro	Consultant
	Mr Jisam Kaisha	Executive Director, Majuro Atoll Local Government
FSM (Yap)	Joseph Giliko	Director, Department of Resources and Development (DR&D)
	Mr Tamel Gajdusek	Deputy Director, Department of Resources and Development (DR&D)
	Hon Vincent A. Figir	Governor
	Mr. John Mangefel	1st Governor / Landholder at MPA site
	Cyprian Mugunbey	Community Outreach Team Member
	Leo Yinug	EPA Director
	Mike Gaan	Small Business Development Corporation Deputy Director
	John Mangafel	Community Outreach Team Member
Darwin, NT, Australia	Dr Natasha Stacey	Program Coordinator, School of Environmental Research, Charles Darwin Univ (ex PCU staff).

ANNEX E: SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS

In addition to interviewing stakeholders in each of the seven visited pilot countries, the evaluation team included site visits to nearby pilot communities.

Samoa

Date	**May 26**
Site	**Apolima**
Participants	**Evaluation team (SR, AT, AF), Samoa IWP NC Maturo Paniani,**
Comments	**The original plan was to travel to both pilot sites: Apolima and Lepa. However, these could not both be visited in the time available, so Apolima Tai was selected by the evaluation team. Travelling by car and boat, Apolima Tai is over an hour distant from Apia.** **The team was met by the village elder and his family, and after lunch walked the project site (stream bed and surrounds), noting IWP and villager efforts on replanting of vegetation to reduce runoff, and maintaining cleanliness in the water collection area and bathing area. The planting nursery contained a large number of dead seedlings in pre-planting pots which did not appear to have been maintained. This raised questions about the village's commitment to the project and future sustainability. The village was reportedly awaiting another set of seedlings, although the value of providing these is questionable given that the existing stock was allowed to die. Plants previously planted were taking root successfully.** **It was clear that community interest was directly related to receiving financial support. The community interest faded when they did not get funding for construction of improved water intakes.** **For superstitious reasons the villagers had refused to make any structural improvements to the water basin area where water is collected, however the area was clean and the shed covering in good repair. Also for superstitious reasons the villagers had refused to allow any sampling to be done of the water quality, so there is no baseline and post-project data, and assessment of the impact of project interventions is unknown. The stream appeared to run cleanly with no surface scum and we observed an abundance of small fish species and one large freshwater eel.**

Tonga

Date	**June 1**
Site	**Nukuhetulu**
Participants	**Evaluation Team (AT, AF); Sione Faka'osi , IWP NC; Viliami Mahe, (IWP Project Support Officer); Nukuhetulu women's and youth groups**
Comments	**The drive to Nukuhetulu from Tongatapu takes approximately 30 minutes. The village is on the lagoon side of the island shoreline, adjacent to mangrove swamps. The visit included viewing the plant nursery that has been developed under the IWP, which is in very good condition, well kept**

	and included several hundred plants planned for sale to government and commercial enterprises. The site included farming land that had been made available to the Youth Group for organic farming. The site included composting bins, which were used but not maintained especially well. On the edge of the mangrove swamp we were taken to an area that had previously been used as an informal garbage dump. The site had been cleared very well by the community, and signs are posted prohibiting dumping. **After a meal with the women's and youth groups, continuing discussions with the youth suggested that they had a focus and specific plans for their money- raising activities with the nursery and composting efforts. They hope to repair and pave their volleyball court, get new volleyballs and a new net. The community was noticeably free of rubbish. Placing restrictions on the free roaming of pigs has been less successful. There was a composting toilet outhouse constructed at one of the houses near the community.**

Tuvalu

Date	**June 6**
Site	**Alapi & Senala, Funafuti**
Participants	**Evaluation team (AT, AF); Kelesoma Saloa, IWP NC**
Comments	**The two communities are on Funafuti, a short walk or ride from the government office building. The evaluation team visited and observed several homes that had participated in the trash cleanup and composting competitions. The sites were very clean and well cared for.** **The evaluation team visited a "borrow pit" (large areas where sand, gravel, dirt and other atoll ground material was removed in order for the US military to pave the Funafuti airport during WW2). The pits are now polluted muck pits that pose a health threat to the inhabitants. Tuvalu would like to utilise these spaces to construct rainwater retention basins, and they have requested funds from the EU and other donors for this purpose.**

Fiji

Date	**June 10**
Site	**Vunisinu and Nalase**
Participants	**Evaluation Team (AT, AF); Sandeep K. Singh, IWP NC; Members of Vunisinu and Nalase Village communities**
Comments	**The two villages are next to each other, a roughly 75 minute drive from Suva, adjacent to mangrove swamps. The site visit included several hours of discussion with village elders of Vunisinu at the village communal hall. The community members were proud of their accomplishments, and honest in their assessment of what worked and did not work in the IWP effort. A walk around both villages showed great success in keeping the village clean, including a recycling depot in front, and elevated trash bins set around the houses. Many community members had erected compost heaps, and there were two composting toilets that had been constructed. Interestingly, right**

	next to the communal hall and one of the compost toilets was a brand new building housing flush toilets for the community, which was built using funds from the Health Ministry just prior to the recent elections. The tour around the neighbourhood also provided a view of an area on the shore beside the mangroves, which had been used as a trash site, and was now cleaned up.

Vanuatu

Date	
Site	**Crab Bay**
Participants	
Comments	**Crab Bay (on the island of Malekula) is quite remote from Port Vila (located on Efate Island), and time did not permit a site visit. During the interviews, several persons from Crab Bay came to Port Vila to discuss community issues with the team.**

Kiribati

Date	**20, June**
Site	**Tarawa**
Participants	**Evaluation Team (SR & AF); Mr Tererei Abete-Reema IWP NC**
Comments	**The project site was immediately adjacent to the hotel, so in fact it was visited each day in Tarawa.. A brief tour to view some of the banana circles was provided. Additional visits were made to the Recycling Centre, where the team viewed their can crushing and plastics shredding procedures, and car battery return program, and discussed the economics of the deposit/return waste recycling program. The operation appears to be operating quite successfully. The new ADB-funded landfill was also visited and appears to be well designed and constructed. However, management and maintenance could be improved, including stronger controls on types of waste dumped (bio-hazardous medical wastes were observed in the land-fill).**

Majuro (RMI)

Date	**June 26**
Site	**Jenrok Community, Majuro**
Participants	**Evaluation team (SR, AF); Ms Deborah Barker, Deputy Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC).**
Comments	**Jenrok is within two km of the OEPPC offices and the hotel where the evaluation team stayed. Two small excursions to the site were made. One involved meeting the local coordinator for Jenrok at the community office that the project paid to refurbish and rent. Occasional community meetings are held at this small office. A short drive around the neighbourhood showed several of the skips (waste bins) that the government has placed for rubbish collection. These are open, industrial bins, unsuitable for household waste or for materials to be recycled. Many are rusting as they are open to the elements and collect water. The periodic collection and emptying of the skips has been irregular, and it was evident that maintenance is a problem.** **Project staff claimed that the IWP had been successful in removing pigpens**

	from beachside areas where effluent runs into the sea, although during the site inspection at Jenrok the Evaluation Team observed several pigpens along the beach. **The garbage dump was visited, and this is a major problem for Majuro. The shoreline refuse site is overfilled, poorly managed, and abuts the shoreline, with obvious direct pollution into the lagoon area. Half-hearted attempts had been made to create a break wall to stop shoreline erosion and garbage flowing out into the lagoon. There is also an incinerator on the site for burning hazardous biomedical waste that has not been maintained, and is now inoperable. Apparently it is still used as a receptacle for such waste, with kerosene or diesel being applied for burning. This will not achieve the temperatures required for safely and effectively burning hazardous biomedical waste. The garbage area is on a limited lease from the landowner, and follows a common atoll strategy of leasing out private shoreline property in order to fill it and extend land out into the lagoon and /or reef-flat using solid waste. In this way, land owners can expand the size of their holdings at no cost. Potential impacts on the lagoon/reef-flat do not appear to be considered.** **During the site visit, we were taken to a tidal basin area on the shore edge of Jenrok, which the community and prominent landholders would like to use as the next landfill creation project.**

Yap (FSM)

Date	**29, June**
Site	**Municipality of Riken, coastal waters protected area**
Participants	**Evaluation Team (SR, AF) and two staff from the Department of Resources and Development (DRD)**
Comments	**The Riken community have created a tabu area where no fishing is allowed. The community is approximately 30 minutes drive from the main town centre on Yap. The evaluation team was driven to Riken and then taken out by boat and had a chance to snorkel at the MPA. The coral in the area was in excellent condition and there was abundant and varied sea life observed, mostly small reef fish species. The site is adjacent to a famous dive site for viewing of giant manta rays, and the community receives fees from the dive companies for the rights to dive at the site. The monitoring of fish species in the area had so far not been done in a manner that can yield direct evidence of increased marine life; in particular, a comparison test site outside of the tabu area has not been sampled. Anecdotal evidence from the community and from the staff of DRD suggests the fishing restrictions are helping to restore marine life.**

ANNEX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

IWP & General

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Joseph Aitaro, Lowell Alik, Ritia Bakineti, Sione Fakaosi, Narua Lovai, Sione Leolahi, Patrick Mesia, Leah Nimoho, Maturo Paniani, auraki Raea, Kelesoma Saloa, Sandeep K Singh and Andy Tafileichig	2006	**20 Lessons for future environmental initiatives in the Pacific: Summary of lessons from the IWP National Coordinators**
2	Joseph Aitaro, Lowell Alik, Narua Lovai, Sione Leolahi, Patrick Mesia and Andy Tafileichig	2006	**IWP Learning and Reflection PART 2 Successes, Problems and Lessons from Six IWP Pilots: Cases from the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau and the Solomon Islands. Report from a `Lesson Learning Workshop' Cloud Nine Eco-Lodge (March 13th-17th 2006).**
3	Ritia Bakineti, Sione Fakaosi, Leah Nimoho, Maturo Paniani Tauraki Raea, Kelesoma Saloa and Sandeep K Singh	2006	**IWP Learning and Reflection PART 1 Successes, Problems and Lessons from Seven IWP Pilots: Cases from the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Report from a `Lesson Learning Workshop' Boomerang Creek (28th Nov - 2nd December 2005).**
4	Crennan, L. and G. Berry	2002	**A synopsis of information relating to waste management, pollution prevention and improved sanitation with a focus on communities in the Pacific Islands region. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.).** ***Issues for Community based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*****. Volume 3. IWP Technical Report 2002/03 108 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.**
5	Dalzell, P. and D. Schug	2002	**A synopsis of information relating to sustainable coastal fisheries. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.).** ***Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*****. Volume 4. IWP Technical Report 2002/04, 38 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.** **International Waters Project. (2003), 'Integrated coastal watershed management, sustainable coastal fisheries and the International Waters Program', paper presented to**

			the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management, 17-21 March 2003, Fiji Mocambo, Nadi, Fiji, IWP, SPREP, Samoa
6	Falkland, T.	2002	**A synopsis of information relating to the quality of freshwater and watershed management issues in the Pacific Islands region. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.).** ***Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*****. Volume 2, IWP Technical Report 2002/02, 128 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.**
7	Huber, M. and K. McGregor.	2002	**A synopsis of information relating to marine protected areas. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.).** ***Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*****. Volume 1. IWP Technical Report 2002/01, 132 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.**
8	Holland, P., Wright, D., Stacey, N. and Menzies, S.	2004	**'Economics and coastal resource management in the Pacific: the work of the International Waters Project', paper presented at the Coastal Zone Asia Pacific Conference – Improving the Quality of Life in Coastal Areas, 5-9 September 2004, Brisbane, Australia, International Waters Project, SPREP, Samoa.**
9	Holland, P., Mahanty, S, Wright, D, Menzies, S. and Stacey, N.	2005	**"Designing monitoring plans in the Pacific Islands International Waters Project", paper presented to the Pacific National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan Meeting – Papua New Guinea, July 20 – 29, 2005, Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States, SPREP, Apia, Samoa.**
	Hunnam, P.	2002	**Lessons in Conservation for People and Projects in the Pacific Island Region, SPBCP Terminal Evaluation Report,**
10	Hunnam, P. and Schuster, C.	2004	**IWP, UNDP/GEF Mid Term Evaluation Report June 2003, SPREP, Apia**
11	Lal, P. and M. Keen	2002	**Economic considerations in community-based project planning and implementation. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.).** ***Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*****. Volume 5. IWP Technical Report 2002/05 56 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Re gional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.**

12	Lal, P. and Holland, P	2004	**Economics, human behaviour and community based projects in the Pacific', in *Coastal Zone Asia Pacific conference – Improving the Quality of Life in Coastal Areas 5-9 September 2004 Brisbane Australia: Proceedings,* Desktop publishing, Erica Maddock Acacia Computing Services Pty Ltd, pp. 368-390.**
13	Stacey, N		**Community Assessment Specialist International Waters Project Terminal Report**
14	Stacey, N		**Exit Note: Community Assessment and Participation Specialist International Waters Project Period at SPREP – 27 November 2000 to 20 May 2005**
15	Stacey, N., A. Wright, and P. Holland	2003	**The Pacific International Waters Project: Aims, Approaches and Challenges in Addressing Management of Waste and National and Local Levels. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Sustainable Development of the East Asian Seas, Putrajaya, Malaysia, 8-12 December 2003.**
16	Stacey, N and Samasoni, S.	2003	**Communications and Community Participation in the International Waters Project: Strategies, activities and lessons learned. *Development Bulletin*, No 63; 91-94. [Special Issue on Water, Governance and the Political Economy: Water Security and Poverty Reduction in Asia-Pacific, Development Studies Network. Based on paper presented by Ms Sandeep Singh, International Waters Project, Fiji at Workshop on Water Communication and Community: practical strategies for achieving equitable and sustainable water use in the Pacific, University of the South Pacific, 11-12 September 2003, Suva, October 2003.]**
17	Stacey, N., Holland, P., Wright, D. and Menzies, S.	2004	**The Pacific International Waters Project: Approaches to stakeholder participation in coastal resource management', in *Coastal Zone Asia Pacific conference – Improving the Quality of Life in Coastal Areas 5-9 September 2004 Brisbane Australia: Proceedings,* Desktop publishing, Erica Maddock Acacia Computing Services Pty Ltd, pp. 596-604.**
18	Tortell, P. and S. Tarte	2004	**Terminal Evaluation of the Oceanic Fisheries Management Component. March 2004**
19	UNDP-GEF		**Regional Project for Asia and the Pacific *(Project of the Governments of the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu)* Project Document**
20	Whyte, J	2002	**A review of lessons learned and best practice in integrated coastal watershed conservation and management initiatives in the Pacific Islands region. In. Wright, A. and N. Stacey. (Eds.). *Issues for Community-based Sustainable Resource Management and Conservation: Considerations for the Strategic Action***

			***Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States*. Volume 6. IWP Technical Report 2002/06 88 pp. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa. 6 volumes.**
21	Mahanty, S and N. Stacey.	2004	**Collaborating for Sustainability: A Resource Kit for Facilitators of Participatory Natural Resource Management in the Pacific. SPREP, Apia, Samoa.**
22	Holland, P		**Natural Resource Economist International Waters Project Terminal Report. February 2006. Period at SPREP –March 2002 to February 2006**
23	Wright, A	2003	**Coastal Zone Management in the Pacific Islands Region: issues for improved harmonization and implementation. Draft discussion paper prepared for an informal brainstorming meeting, Suva, Fiji 10-12 December 2003**
24	Wright, A	2004	**'The Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy – a global first', paper presented to the Coastal Zone Asia Pacific conference – Improving the Quality of Life in Coastal Areas, 5-9 September 2004, Brisbane, Australia, International Waters Project, SPREP, Samoa.**
25	Wright, A.	August 2005	**Exit Note: Andrew Wright Project Manager International Waters Project**
26	Wright, A., Stacey N. Holland, P and Samasoni, S.	2002	**A New Initiative in Community-based Sustainable Resource Use and Conservation: The Pacific Islands**
27	Wright, A., Stacey N. and Holland, P.	2003	**Cooperative Framework for Ocean and Coastal Management in the Pacific Islands: effectiveness and constraints. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Sustainable Development of the East Asian Seas, Putrajaya, Malaysia, 8-12 December 2003**
28	IWP/ANU/USP	2003	**TRAIN:SEA:COAST. Community-based Resource Economics Course Development Mission Report: 10-14 February 2003.**
29	IWP PCU	2001	**Inception Report. United Nations Development Program and the South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 70 ppg.**
30	IWP PCU	2001	***First Regional Task Force Meeting. 26-27 March 2001, Apia, Samoa.* South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 23 ppg.**
31	IWP PCU	2002	**Social Assessment and Participation Strategy. Version 1.00. South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. March 2002. 55 ppg.**
32	IWP PCU	2002	**International Waters Project (). Communication Strategy. Version 1.02. South Pacific Regional**

			Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. March 20.02. 29 ppg
33	IWP PCU	2003	**Economic Strategy, Version 1.00. The International Waters Project, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, Apia, Samoa**
34	IWP PCU	2004	**'Economic data and community based fisheries management: a framework for the IWP', paper prepared by Paula Holland and presented to the South Pacific Commission Scientific Roundtable Discussion: *Bringing Together Socio-Economic and Ecological Data to Provide the Basis for Sound Management Decisions*, 2-4 June 2004, SPC Headquarters Nouméa, New Caledonia, SPREP, Samoa.**
35	IWP PCU	07/ 04 & 09/03 revisi ons	**Logical Framework , ICWM Component**
36	IWP PCU	2001	**Administration Procedures for National Coordinators and Participating Countries. United Nations Development Program and the South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 20 pages, 13 Appendices.**
37	IWP PCU	2002	**First Multipartite Review Meeting Summary Report. 25 July 2002, Majuro, Republic of Marshall Islands. South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 15 pages.**
38	IWP PCU	2002	**Gender Policy, Draft Version 1.0. South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. April 2002. 12 pages.**
39	IWP PCU	2002	**International Waters Project (2002). Guidelines for the Initial Phase of the International Waters Project: In-country Arrangements, Review of Priority Environmental Concerns and Selection of Pilot Projects. Version 1.04. South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. May 2002. 33 pages.**
40	IWP PCU	2002	**Justification for a Project Extension. United Nations Development Program and the South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 53 pages. [presented as Annex 12 to the Project Document].**
41	IWP PCU	2002	**First National Coordinator's Meeting. 29 April – 3 May 2002, Apia, Samoa. South Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa. 42 pages**
42	IWP PCU		***Development Bulletin, 58, 99-101. Special Issue: Environmental sustainability and poverty reduction:***

			Pacific issues. **Development Studies Network, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.**
43	IWP PCU	2003	**Guidelines for the Initial Phase of the International Waters Project, Working Draft, Version 2.00, Project Coordination Unit, Strategic Action Program for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Islands Developing States, SPREP, March, Samoa.**
44	IWP PCU	2000 – 1st Q 2006	**Quarterly Progress Reports .**
45	IWP PCU	2004	**'IWP approaches for considering socio –economic and ecological issues for community-based resource management', paper prepared by Natasha Stacey and presented to the South Pacific Commission Scientific Roundtable Discussion: *Bringing Together Socio - Economic and Ecological Data to Provide the Basis for Sound Management Decisions*, 2-4 June 2004, SPC Headquarters Nouméa, New Caledonia, SPREP, Samoa.**
46	IWP PCU	2004	**Fourth National Coordinator's Meeting. 5-7 July 2004 and Third Multipartite Review, 8-9 July 2004, Apia, Samoa. Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa.**
47	IWP PCU	2004	**Fifth National Coordinator's Meeting. 25-29 October 2004, Nadi, Fiji. Pacific Regional Environment Program, International Waters Project, Apia, Samoa.**
48	IWP PCU	2006	**IWP Achievements and Outcomes Power Point Presentation**
49	IWP PCU	2006	**Lessons Learned And Priorities For 2006 Power Point Presentation**
50	IWP PCU	2004	**Promoting Environmental Friendly Behaviour in the Pacific: A Communications Planning Guide. Version 1.0, SPREP**
51	**Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu through their respective National Task Forces for International**	**1997**	**Strategic Action Program for International Waters of Pacific Islands**

	Waters		

Cook Islands

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Hajkowicz, S. and P. Okotai	2005	**An economic valuation of watershed pollution in Raratonga, the Cook Island. International Waters Project - Cook Islands**
2	Okotai, P	2005	**Scoping Study for the Rarotonga Watershed Area, IWP**
3	Okotai P	2005	**A Socio Economic and Media Awareness Study of Takuvaine and Rarotonga for the IWP" IWP Cooks, Rarotonga, Cook Islands.**
4	Rongo, Teariki & Julia	2002	**Priority Environmental Problems PEC, International Waters Project, Cook Islands Report**
5	Rongo, T. & Turia, G	2006	**Project Draft Sustainability Strategy For Sustainable Continuation Of The Program 2007.**
6	Rongo, T. & Rongo, J	2006	**Takuvaine Water Catchment Ra'ui Management Plan Regulations 2006. Cook Islands International Waters Project**
7	GEF		**Global Environment Fund Cook Islands Strategic Action Plan**
8	Cook Isles IWP		**Kapua'anga Meeting House, Takuvaine - Workshop Report**
9	Cook Isles IWP		**Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**
10	Cook Isles IWP	2003-2005	**Annual Reports**
11	Cook Isles IWP	2003	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
12	Cook Isles IWP	2004	**2nd Participatory Problem Analysis Workshop, Takuvaine Community, Rarotonga, 18th – 21st October 2004**
13	Cook Isles IWP	2005	**Draft Communication Strategy**
14	**Cook Isles IWP**	**2005**	**Communications Strategy**

Fiji

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Lane, M.	2005	**Governance of Coastal Resources in Fiji**
	Sesaga, Sam (PECL) and Singh, Sandeep (Fiji IWP)	2006	**Fiji IWP Sustainability Strategy**
2	Fiji Department of Environment	2005	**Department of Environment Annual Report**
3	Fiji Department of Environment	2006	**Ministry Corporate Plan for the financial year ending 31 December.**
4	Fiji Department of Environment	2006	**National Solid Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan 2006 - 2010**
5	Fiji IWP	2005	**Legislative Review (Parts 1 & 2**
6	Fiji IWP	2003	**Participatory Project Planning and Design Reports draft**

7	Fiji IWP	2003 - 2006	**International Water Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan(s)**
8	Fiji IWP	2006	**Brief Report On Economic Evaluation Analysis Of Rural Waste Management In the Rewa Province**
9	Fiji IWP	2003 - 2006	**National Task Force Meeting Minutes**
10	Fiji IWP	2003	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
11	Fiji IWP	2002- 1st Q. 2006	**IWP quarterly reports**
12	Fiji IWP	2003 - 2004	**IWP Annual Reports**
13	Fiji IWP	2005 - 2006	**IWP Progress reports**
14	Fiji IWP	2006	**International Waters Project Draft Lessons Learned.**
15	Fiji IWP	2006	**Draft Successes, Problems and Lessons National Task Force of Fiji. Report from a `Lesson Learning Workshop' Southern Cross, Suva, Fiji 28th Nov - 2nd December 2005**
16	Fiji IWP	2006	**Monitoring Plan**
17	Fiji IWP	2005	**Communications Strategy**

FSM

#	Author	Date	**Title**
1	Foale, Simon	2004	**Socio-economic Baseline Assessment Reports 1-4**
2	McCoy, M.A. Gillett, Preston & Assoc	2005	**Strengthening Yap State Government Services in Coastal Resources Management**
3	Palau International Coral Reef Center	2005	**Ecological Baseline Assessment**
4	FSM IWP		**Stream Analysis**
5	FSM IWP		**PCDF PLA Training**
6	FSM IWP	2005-2006	**Financial Reports**
7	**FSM IWP**	**2006**	**Yap Communications Strategy**

Kiribati

#	**Author**	**Date**	**Title**
1	Leney, Alice	2006	**The Impact of the Greenbag on Waste Generation in South Tarawa**
2	Roniti Teiwaki & Associates	2004	**Preliminary Socio -Economic Baseline Survey & Waste Analysis for Bikenibeu West, S.**
3	Kiribati Solid Waste Management Project	2005	**Kaoki Mange Project Annual Report**
4	Kiribati IWP & Komeri Onorio (PECL)	2006	**Sustainability Strategy for Kiribati's IWP**
5	Kiribati IWP		**Akeatemange End of Competition (draft)**
6	Kiribati IWP		**Workshop Report for IWP**

7	Kiribati IWP	2004	**Analysis of Legislation**
8	Kiribati IWP	2003	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
9	Kiribati IWP	2005	**Greenbag Competition & Report**
10	Kiribati IWP	2006	**"Ruffdogs" radio spot**
11	Kiribati IWP	2005	**Lessons Learned**
12	**Kiribati IWP**	**2005**	**Communications Strategy**

Nauru

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Leney, Alice	2003	**The Way Ahead: An Assessment of Waste Problems for the Buada Community, and Strategies Toward Community Waste Reduction in Nauru**
2	Nauru IWP	2005	**Work program**
3	**Nauru IWP**	**2002**	**Stakeholder Consultations Report**

Niue

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Fisk, David A.	2004	**Marine Baseline Survey and Monitoring Program for International Waters Program Niue.**
2	Fisk David A	April 2004	**Report to Niue IWP. Literature Review and Pilot Baseline Survey**
3	Fisk David A	Dec. 2004	**Report to Niue IWP. Community Based Monitoring Training**
4	Niue IWP	2003	**Participatory Situation Analysis: Summary Report of Village Consultations in Niue, June 2003**
5	Niue IWP	2003	**Summary of Recommendations for Pilot Project Activities and Site Selection: Report to the Niue IWP National Task Committee**
6	Niue IWP		**Review & Pilot Data and Marine Baseline Survey Report**
7	Niue IWP	2002	**Community facilitator planning workshop**
8	Niue IWP	2003	**Participatory Situation Analysis Report**
9	Niue IWP	2003	**The Niue Experience in the Involvement of communities, paper presented to the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management, 17-21 March 2003, Fiji Mocambo Hotel**
10	Niue IWP		**Final Report Marine Ecological Baseline and Monitoring Plan**
11	Niue IWP	2003	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
12	Niue IWP	2003	**Government Profile Report**
13	Niue IWP	2003	**Solutions Report**
14	**Niue IWP**	**2003**	**Summary of Recommendations for Selection of Host Sites**

Palau

#	Author	Date	Title
1	The Environment, Inc	2004	**Ecological Baseline Report**

2	Hajkowicz, Stefan; Tellames, Kyonori; Aitaro, Joseph	2005	**Economic Cost Scenarios for Solid Waste Related Pollution in Palau**
3	Palau IWP		**Socio-economic Baseline Report**
4	Palau IWP	2004	**Promoting Waste Reduction in Palau**
5	Palau IWP	2003	**Review of Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
6	Palau IWP		**Marketing Trainers Guide**
7	**Palau IWP**	**2004**	**Communications Strategy**

PNG

#	Author	Date	Title
1	PNG IWP		**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
2	PNG IWP	2006	**Work Program**
3	PNG IWP	2005	**Financial Report**
4	**PNG IWP**	**2005**	**Communications Strategy**

RMI

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Chutaro, Ben	2004	**Social and Economic Baseline Survey, Jenrok Voillage, Majuro**
3	Chutaro, Ben	2005	**Waste Stream Presentation**
4	Chutaro, Ben	2006	**Waste Stream Results**
5	Leney, Alice	2005	**Ejjelok Kwopej! Turning Rubbish into Resource: A Waste Reduction Plan for the Urban Marshall Islands**
6	RMI Economic Policy, Planning and Statistics Office	2006	**Summary of key Findings, RMI 2006 Community Survey and Socio Economic Analysis**
7	RMI IWP	2004	**Proposal for Consultancy – Jenrok Solid Waste Stream Study**
8	RMI IWP	2006	**Community After School program (CAP)**
9	RMI IWP	2006	**Work Plan**
10	RMI IWP	2002	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
11	**RMI IWP**		**Country Status Update**

Samoa

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Powell, G.B	2004	**Review of natural resources and environmental Related legislation – Phase 2. Apia, Samoa, SPREP.**
2	Powell, G., B	2004	**Review of natural resources and environmental related legislation – Phase 1 Apia, Samoa. SPREP**
3	Samoa IWP	2002	**Initial community profile (reconnaissance report)(draft)**
4	Samoa IWP	2002	**Legislative Review (Phase 1 & 2)**
5	Samoa IWP	2003	**Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**
6	Samoa IWP	2006	**Communications Strategy**
7	**Samoa IWP**	**2005**	**Lessons Learned**

Solomon

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Lane, Marcus B.	2005	**Coastal Governance in Solomon Islands: An evaluation of the strategic governance issues relating to coastal management**
	Hills, Roy,	2006	**Sustainability Report for International Waters in the Solomon Islands**
2	Kinch, Jeff; Kere, Nelly; Mesia, Patrick; Bulehite Kenneth	2005	**Community Engagement and Participation in the Eastern Marovo Lagoon, Western Province, Solomon Islands**
3	Solomon IWP		**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
4	Solomon IWP	2003	**Participatory Problem Analysis for the Mbili Passage Experience In Community And Related Coastal Fisheries Management, paper presented to the South Pacific Commission Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management, 17 -21 March 2003, Fiji Mocambo Hotel**
5	Solomon IWP	2006	**Project Budget**
6	Solomon IWP	2005	**Financial reports**
7	**Solomon IWP**	**2006**	**Communications Strategy**

Tonga

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Faka'osi, S	2006	**Draft Implementation and Lessons Learned Report for Tonga**
2	Lal, P and Taka'u, L	2006	***'Economic costs of waste in Tonga,'* A report prepared for the IWP–Tonga, SPREP and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat.**
3	Prescott, J	2003	**Profile of institutional elements of the environment sector in Tonga of relevance to the International Waters Program: An update of the first project coordination unit country visit. Tonga IWP Technical Report, SPREP**
4	S. Langitoto Helu	2005	**Preliminary C of Waste in Tongaollection of Information for an Economic Evaluation**
5	Secretariat Pacific Regional Environment Program, S	2002	**Review of priority environmental concerns in Tonga. Apia, Samoa, International Waters Program, Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP): 29.**
6	Sesega, S. & Faka'osi, S.	2006	**Sustainability Strategy for Tonga's IWP Project. Tonga IWP Technical Report No. 11, Department of Environment, Tonga**
7	Tongia, Semisi & Niu, Lesieli	2004	**Nukuhetulu Household Survey and Waste Characterization Study Analysis**
8	Tonga IWP		**Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**
9	Tonga IWP	2002-2005	**Annual Reports**
10	Tonga IWP	2002	**Priority Environmental Concerns**

11	Tonga IWP	2004	**Selection of a Pilot Community**
12	Tonga IWP	2005	**Institutional Profile**
13	Tonga IWP	2005	**Legislative Review, Final Inventory of Laws**
14	Tonga IWP		**Economic Aspects, draft**
15	Tonga IWP	2004	**Household Surveys and Waste Characterization Report**
16	Tonga IWP		**Community Awareness, Engagement and Participation Report**
17	Tonga IWP	2005	**Lessons Learned Report**
18	Tonga IWP	2002 - 2005	**Annual reports**
19	Tonga IWP	2003	**Selection of a Pilot Community for IWP**
20	Tonga IWP	2006	**Annual Work Plan & Budget**
21	**Tonga IWP**	**2006**	**Communications Strategy**

Tuvalu

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Crennan, L	2004	**Solutions Report: Waste Management, Pollution Prevention and Improved Sanitation in Tuvalu. Tuvalu International Waters Project**
2	Falekaupule, T., L. & Side, S.	2004	**First National Workshop Report Participatory Problem Analysis Funafuti Community, 9th-17th December 2003. Government Of Tuvalu Office Of The Prime Minister Department Of Environment International Water Program.**
3	Lal, Padma N. , Saloa, Kalesoma, and Uili, Falealili	2006	***'Economic costs of liquid waste management in Funafuti, Tuvalu'* A Technical Report prepared for the IWP-Tuvalu Project, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva. 47 pp.**
4	Reynolds, C.	2004	**10 year Water & Sanitation Master Plan, 1993-2002, Initial Draft**
5	Tuvalu IWP	2004	**Profiles of Non- Government Organizations (NGOs)**
5	Tuvalu IWP	2002-1st Q 2006	**Quarterly reports**
6	Tuvalu IWP	2005	**Work Program and Budget**
7	Tuvalu IWP	2006	**Project summary of National Task Force Meetings**
8	Tuvalu IWP		**Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**
9	Tuvalu IWP		**Draft and Final Baseline Reports**
10	Tuvalu IWP		**Solutions Report**
11	Tuvalu IWP	2002	**Priority Environmental Concerns Report**
12	Tuvalu IWP		**Participatory Problem Analysis Report**
13	Tuvalu IWP	2004	**Government Profile**
14	Tuvalu IWP	2004	**NGO Profile**
15	Tuvalu IWP	2006	**NTF, DCC and Cabinet Work Plan**
16	Tuvalu IWP	2002	**IWP Annual Equipment Report,**
17	**Tuvalu IWP**	**2005**	**Draft "Farming Environmentally plus Energy**

			Generation project"

Vanuatu

#	Author	Date	Title
1	Hickey, F.	2005	**Crab Bay Area Review,**
2	Leah Nimoho, NC		**Using Communications to Promote Sustainable Coastal Fisheries Management in Vanuatu, IWP-WCCD**
	Sesega, Sam, PECL	2006	**Sustainability Strategy – Vanuatu International Waters Project**
3	Yoli Tom'tavala & Marie Hakwa	July, 2004	**Review of Environmental Legislations and Policies in Vanuatu,**
4	Wykliff Bakeo	April 2004	**Draft Participatory Situation Analysis Workshop Report, Crab Bay Area**
5	Vanuatu IWP		**Crab Bay Solutions Analysis Workshop Report**
6	Vanuatu IWP	18.10. 2004	**Participatory Situation Analysis Toolkit Report**
7	Vanuatu IWP		**Review of Environmental Legislation and Policies**
8	Vanuatu IWP		**Marine Ecological Baseline Report - final**
9	Vanuatu IWP	October , 2005	**Vanuatu Communications Strategy –**
10	Vanuatu IWP	(4^{th} Q 2002, 1^{st} Q 2006)	**Quarterly Progress reports**
11	Vanuatu IWP	2003, 2004, 2005	**Final Annual Reports**
12	Vanuatu IWP	September, 2005	**Crab Bay Socio-Economic Overview, final**
13	Vanuatu IWP		**PCU Comments on Draft Solutions and Work Plan Workshop Report**
14	**Vanuatu IWP**		**Vanuatu Resource Profile**

ANNEX G: QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

SPREP- IWP QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL

1. What is your and responsibility area with respect to the IWP pilot projects?
2. What activities for the IWP pilots have you and your organization been directly involved with?
3. How long have you been working for or cooperating with the IWP?
4. Who are your primary counterparts and/or colleagues in the IWP?

PROJECT DESIGN (Relevance):
Relevance concerns whether the results, purpose and overall objectives of the project are in line with the needs of aspirations of the beneficiaries, and with the policy environment of the project.

1. How would you describe the pilot project objectives?
2. Did the project objectives change during the course of the project?
3. How do the project objectives and purpose match your organisation's objectives?
4. Was the pilot project relevant to community needs and environmental priorities?

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (Effectiveness):
Effectiveness describes how well the results achieved have furthered the achievement of the project purpose.

1. Were the pilot project objectives achieved?
2. What were the main reasons why the objectives were or were not achieved?
3. Are you aware of any particular issues that may have limited the effectiveness of project implementation?
4. Did the pilot project make a positive impact on the community?
5. Were the pollution reduction methodologies promoted through the pilot project suitable to the economic and development situation of the persons served?
6. Were there public awareness and outreach efforts? And how effective was the project in attracting public attention?
7. Were the pilot project managers able to get companies and industries involved in problem solving efforts?
8. Did the project succeed in building support and sponsorship from other local and international organizations?
9. Were the local and state governments and community leaders supportive and involved in the pilot project?

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (Efficiency):
Efficiency concerns the relation between the result and means i.e. whether the process of transforming the means into results has been cost-effective.

1. Do you think the money that went into the pilot effort was worth it? Do the ends justify the means?
2. Were the project funds well managed?
3. Was there good coordination and cooperation among the participants involved in the community project?
4. Did the project implementation team remain the same or was there a lot of staff turnover?
5. Were the activities carried out timely and according to work plans?
6. Was there good support for the project from the SPREP IWP management unit?
7. Are you aware of any financial, legal or other project implementation concerns with respect to IWP activities?
8. If you could start over again, would you implement the pilot project differently? How?

PROJECT IMPACT (Impact):
Impact concerns whether there has been a change towards the achievement of the overall objective as a consequence of the achievement of the results and specific objectives. Both intended and unintended impacts are reviewed.

1. What has happened as a consequence of the pilot project?
2. What practical improvements have there been as a result?
3. Can the pilot project impacts be quantified? (e.g.. number of septic systems rehabilitated / replaced: increased amount of garbage picked up/separated/recycled: evidence of improvements in coastal fish populations and fresh water quality, etc.).
4. How many people have directly benefited from the IWP pilot activities?
5. Did the pilot project help to influence environmental and development policies programs and plans in the community and across the island?
6. Did the IWP provide opportunities to work with neighbouring island states on common issues and problems?

PROJECT IMPACT (Sustainability):
Sustainability can be described as the degree to which the benefits produced by the project continue after the external assistance has come to an end.

1. Is the pilot effort continuing after the end of IWP funding?
2. Have the lessons learned from the IWP pilots been shared with other communities and other island states in the region?
3. Have any of the pilot efforts been replicated in other communities?
4. Are there efforts under way to find new sources of funding to continue and expand the activities that were started under the IWP pilots?

RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Audience and Method

The questionnaire was submitted by email to the PCU, NCs and key stakeholders in April 2006, four weeks prior to the start of the evaluation mission. A series of follow up emails were sent by the evaluation team, urging IWP project stakeholders to respond. The questionnaire went out to approximately 80 persons, including national coordinators, external consultants to the IWP, other members of the national task forces, regional representatives of NGOs and other identified key stakeholders. 15 questionnaires were filled in and returned (> 20% return rate). Some were submitted to the evaluation team during the evaluation mission. It was indicated to the respondents that their responses would be kept confidential, accordingly, respondent names have not been included in this annex. The breakdown on respondents is as follows: International Consultants: 3; Local Consultants: 3; NCs: 3; PCU Staff (former): 3; Local Officials: 2; NTF members: 1.

2. Content of Responses

The responses were wide ranging, with some responders choosing to provide comments on each question, and others responding to only those they deemed directly pertinent to their involvement with the project. Some spent considerable time responding to the wide ranging and open ended questions. Others moved quickly through the exercise. Taken together, the questionnaire responses were useful in that they drew attention to issues that the evaluation team have deemed important, in terms of considering how the project was formulated and implemented.

"Wide-ranging", "overly-ambitious", and "not well-defined" were some of the comments received about the IWP project document, and these problems were cited as complicating implementation, and were one reason the project took time to get up and running. One respondent indicated:

> "Lack of clarity and focus in the project document meant that considerable time was spent clarifying what the project was about in the initial stages".

An issue that came up frequently during the evaluation mission was the structure developed for the project activities and the degree of autonomy accorded to each country effort. To the question: How would you describe the pilot project objectives? one respondent replied:

> "Confusing and it seems little room was left for countries to adopt changes to the objectives to meet their country needs"

Several respondents (and many of the persons interviewed) stressed the difficulty in implementing a project on such a large scale (14 countries stretched across distances wider than all of Europe) during such a short time (5 years). In response to the question: If you could start over again, would you implement the pilot project differently? How? one respondent mentioned:

> "Narrow implementation to one or two pilots initially, and build out from that. Concepts and strategies were sound but capacity, both in PCU (to adequately service 14 countries) and at the national level (new approaches and ideas) handicapped potential for success"

Frequently during the mission, issues of traditional community and government jurisdiction and relationships arose. When asked the question: Are you aware of any particular issues that may have limited the effectiveness of project implementation? one respondent noted:

> "Not following the communities' traditional protocol. Any notification of visits by the team to the villages needs to be relayed to the village 'Turagani koro" and ultimately to the chiefly

household. Keeping the Turaga in the dark about the happenings and progress of the project can be taken to be a sign of disrespect"

3. Critique of the questionnaire effort:

- As developed, the questionnaire proved useful as an introduction to the project for the evaluators; however the general nature of the questions, the limited number of responses, and the variable level of detail in responses received means that the questionnaire could not be used as a tool for comparative analysis.
- The effort to secure responses was insufficient. While the evaluation team sent numerous emails asking for responses, this was insufficient to motivate the PCU, NCs and other key stakeholders to make the effort to respond.

4. Future efforts should consider to:

- Utilize a questionnaire format that includes both open and closed (forced-choice) formats, enabling some comparative analysis while still enabling respondents to freely express their opinions.
- Post the questionnaires to respondents in hard copy as well as email to increase~~d~~ the response rate.
- Receive agreement from the PCU to help with the questionnaire effort by urging their colleagues and contacts to respond to the evaluation team.