



SOPAC/GEF/IWRM/RTAG.4/4
Date: 14th July 2011
Original: English

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

Rarotonga Island, Cook Islands, 25th July 2011

PROJECT INDICATOR FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Task

At RSC2 in Palau the RTAG was tasked with developing a project monitoring and evaluation framework (PMEF) for presentation at RSC3. At the 3rd RTAG meeting, a draft PMEF was presented and RTAG members were invited to provide comments. This session reviews those comments and provides the RTAG with an opportunity for further comments to be incorporated into a revised PMEF for consideration at the 5th RTAG session (Thursday evening 28th July 2011 during RSC3)

1.2 Task Progress

The logframe of the UNEP and UNDP Project Documents provides a suite of “comprehensive baseline and target indicators and sources of verification for both outcome and output levels during project implementation”. It was anticipated that these would “form the basis on which the project’s Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system [would] be built”.

It was envisaged during the project design phase that Demonstration project level indicators would provide an effective way of monitoring progress. It was planned to aggregate these at each of the Demonstration project group levels to enable projects to learn from each other as part of the project twinning approach.

The project logframe and the current Draft PMEF can be found as an addendum to XX.XX

Following-on from the 3rd RTAG meeting, comments on the draft Project M&E Framework (PMEF) have been presented for consideration by the RTAG.

2. PMEFCOMMENTS

Table 1 incorporates comments received on the PMEF. RTAG members are invited to review and make recommendations for revisions to the PMEF. It is intended to revise the PMEF during the RSC meeting with the view of obtaining RTAG and RSC approval of the framework.

Table 1 RTAG Comments on the PMEF

Section	Comment	PCU Recommended Response
General	<p>It might be useful to consider the GEF classification in assessing progress:</p> <p>Highly Satisfactory; S ; Moderately S, Moderately UnS; UnS, Highly UnS. These ratings pertain to overall project but may be adopted to demo site activities and the numerical equivalents could apply. The advantage is that we use these categories when filling in the annual PIR, the upcoming mid term Eval and the Terminal Eval.</p> <p>If this is too late to consider, the current rating scheme should be converted into the above.</p>	Agree – will work to achieve this through the RSC
Target “Strategies in place”	<p>May need to qualify this in the legal context of each country. In place may simply mean endorsement by the government or it could mean that it becomes a legal document. In both cases particularly in the latter, political processes would be determining factors but which the project would not have direct influence. We should be careful about what we promise here.</p>	Agree – need to clarify; although interested in the perception of the RTAG on the outcome to be sought
Target 1 “National Strategies in place”	<p>National vs local IWRM and WUE strategies. While national level strategies should be strived for, consider local level strategies as interim targets. This would mean also that the other indicator on budget allocation is measured at the local level. This suggestion would have relevance for the bigger SIDS where the demonstration site is relatively a small part of the country and where adoption of strategies and budget allocations are done at the local level.</p>	Seeking RTAG comment given the core nature of this indicator in project outcomes
Target 2 Proposed Indicator 3 “Best IWRM and WUE approaches assessed”	<p>It seems to me that this should be done in the context of Target 1 on developing national strategies. The results of the assessment could be inputs in formulating the strategies.</p> <p>In terms of mainstreaming, my understanding is that the IWRM and WUE plans and strategies should be mainstreamed into the broader local (again) and national planning frameworks so it that these would not remain as a sectoral plans/strategies.</p> <p>Suggestion – rephrase the log frame target and the corresponding indicators to mean Mainstreaming of the IWRM and WUE strategies and plans into the broader local, national and regional planning frameworks...</p>	Proposed Indicator 4 deals with this to some extent – is there need for a change or further clarification?
Target 3 Proposed indicator 5 “Increase in land protected and/or rehabilitated over catchment”	<p>Suggest breaking this down into two indicators to provide flexibility:</p> <p>a) Existence of formal policy statement through legislation or other appropriate legal instruments setting aside land for watershed protection and rehabilitation. You might want to refer to the IUCN categories here.</p> <p>b) Extent of protection and rehabilitation done in the area.</p> <p>It is conceivable that the first indicator may be ‘limiting’ considering conflicting interests over use of scarce land. However, even pending such, some rehabilitation/protection may be done and this could be captured in this indicator.</p>	Seeking RTAG thoughts
Target 4 “over eq.~40,000 ha area ”	<p>The specification here is more spatial. At the same time, the target may also interpreted in terms of volume reduction. It may be useful to consider the impact of any intervention in the demo site on the number of people served. Using</p>	Seek RTAG thoughts – unfortunately due to original convoluted targets

	<p>parameters on per capita waste, the volume reduction could be readily measured. Where interventions are made in heavily populated areas, the impacts would be greater in terms of volume reduction compared to area covered.</p> <p>If measured this way, this could be cross-referenced to Target 6</p>	
--	---	--

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is suggested that the RTAG review, revise and approve the PMEF for RSC consideration.