



**Second Meeting of the SOPAC Division
Noumea, New Caledonia, 3-9 November 2012
(SOPAC-2)**

AGENDA ITEM	TITLE
2.	REPORTS
2.5	PMEG Reports
2.5.3	WSP Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Group Report

**Water and Sanitation Programme
PMEG Report
29-31 October 2012
Suva, Fiji**

SUMMARY

Highlights

- Without question, there have been achievements in every area of the WSP work plan.
- Many and varied strong collegial partnerships in project proposals and delivery with DRP and OIP programmes and with SPC divisions.
- An expanding regional water and sanitation network, with the Disaster community and the full SPC family of countries and territories.
- A lasting regional asset of technical project managers whose skills and qualifications are internationally recognised and transferable.

Challenges and opportunities

- Retaining contract staff as projects near the end.
- Producing fit-for-purpose outputs and communicating impacts.
- Managing necessary distractions from delivery.
- Identifying and securing WSP's next lead niche area, building on previous and current concepts and capabilities.

Recommendations

- Communicate WSP's niche/focus, expertise and country and regional impacts within SPC, to countries, and to donors and partners, to minimise the risk of being crowded out by the proliferation of projects and providers.
- Develop/implement a more structured approach to retention of key staff/expertise, to reduce the risk to successful project delivery.
- Nurture the prospering partnerships between WSP and SPC-SOPAC programmes and SPC Divisions, to realise the value and impact of presenting integrated solutions.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Group (PMEG) for the Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP) met for 3 days, 29-31 October 2012, at the SPC-SOPAC Divisional office in Suva.
- 1.2. The 2011 WSP PMEG team was Jan Gregor (Chair), Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited, New Zealand, Sarah Mecartney, UN Habitat, Pacific Programme Manager, Suva and Milika Sobey, Water and Wetlands Programme Coordinator, IUCN Regional Office for Oceania, Suva.
- 1.3. The WSP PMEG teams thanks staff for their time and informative discussions.
- 1.4. The WSP comprises about 14 staff, across four technical teams, Water Resources Management, Water and Sanitation Services, Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management Demonstration and Water Governance.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF 2011 PMEG RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The WSP has taken note of the PMEG 2011 report and taken action where possible within the responsibilities and resources of the WSP. Some recommendations, such as identifying and resourcing core expertise, now come under the umbrella of broader SPC considerations.

3. HIGHLIGHTS

- 3.1. Without question, the WSP PMEG team heard of achievements and impacts in every area of the work plan. It became apparent to the WSP PMEG team that there were a number of additional highlights to those reported in the SPC-SOPAC Divisional Meeting papers that are important to recognise.
- 3.2. The WSP work programme demonstrates many and varied strong collegial partnerships in project proposals and delivery with DRP and OIP programmes and with SPC divisions. These partnerships present integrated planning and solutions to countries and donors, and have assisted with strengthening relationships in-country and consequently greater impact on the ground.
- 3.3. The joint meeting of the 4th Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Pacific Regional Water and Sanitation Consultations was the first time these two communities of practice have come together, was the first time water and sanitation representatives of 21 of the 22 SPC countries had come together, and marked the true start to regional consultations. The WSP can be rightly proud of its expanding regional water and sanitation network.
- 3.4. Country-level impacts of the IWRM demonstration programme are in abundance. All credit to the approach of establishing strong in-country project management and country-driven activity design and implementation activity, and also fostering the IWRM-family of project managers who encourage, challenge and learn from each other. This programme has created what should be a lasting regional asset of technical project managers whose skills and qualifications are internationally recognised and transferable.

4. DELIVERY CHALLENGES

- 4.1. One line of discussion this year was capturing the challenges ahead in completing substantive project work to specification, on time and to budget, retaining core expertise and preparing for the next wave of projects.

- 4.2. Retention of staff. WSP has been in a fortunate position of relatively few changes in staff in the last 12 months. However, as projects near the end, and in the absence of a follow-up project or new project that can utilise the same expertise, contracted staff will naturally be looking for their next contract. This uncertainty puts at risk project-end delivery.
- 4.3. Producing outputs and communicating impacts. Fit-for-purpose and audience communication is a vital part of programme delivery, and has been used to effect particularly in the IWRM demonstration programme. WSP's communications advisor left during the year. However this crucial position has not been replaced because of programme resourcing constraints.
- 4.4. Managing necessary distractions from delivery. At top of mind for staff is effective and Efficient delivery of WSP's agreed annual work plan and projects. However, staff time is also required for predictable business planning, development and proposal preparation, and for responding to the unexpected such as reviews and administrative processes. With full delivery workloads, WSP staff have been resourceful in meeting these non-project delivery demands in the short-term, but not without risk to project delivery and verging on being non-sustainable in the long-term. For planning and proposal preparation, WSP use a mix of prioritising which opportunities to progress, sharing the effort with other SPC-SOPAC programmes, using proposal preparation as learning opportunity for less experienced staff to step up, and outsourcing.
- 4.5. Identifying and securing WSP's next lead niche area. WSP operates in a flexible and responsive way to country and donor needs and priorities, while keeping its sights on future needs. The programme has introduced a number of substantive concepts and capabilities to the Pacific region over the years, for example HYCOS, drinking-water safety planning and water quality monitoring programmes, and IWRM. As these concepts and capabilities become embedded as the norm in-country and other providers start to move in, WSP moves forward to lead development of the next important concept/capability. Previously introduced concepts/capabilities continue to be supported. Water security in atoll states has emerged as a lead concept for WSP over the next few years with some project funding secured, incorporating and building on many of the existing concepts and capabilities. The challenge is to secure this concept as WSP/SPC-SOPAC/SPC's niche while at the same time thinking further ahead to what follows.

5. OPPORTUNITIES

- 5.1. WSP has an impressive list of successful project proposals and proposals pending funding decisions, reward for the effort over the past year.
- 5.2. WSP is not short of ideas and country and partner support for proposals. There is a resourcing issue of time to develop these into concepts and proposals, requiring the team to prioritise.
- 5.3. Influencers of opportunities include utilising Water, Sanitation and Climate country outlooks and updating the Pacific Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Water Management that will guide and support the Pacific's water community, joint country strategies, partnerships with SPC-SOPAC programmes and SPC Divisions, partnerships with external organisations, working with the full SPC family of countries and territories.
- 5.4. Examples of concept opportunities raised by staff include climate change adaption viewed as a development issue (social and demographic drivers impacting on water and sanitation), gender mainstreaming in water and sanitation.
- 5.5. Building on WSP's successful implementation of GEF-funded projects, working through the process of applying to become a GEF-implementing agency seems a natural progression.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. Communicate WSP's niche/focus, expertise and country and regional impacts within SPC, to countries, and to donors and partners (recognising that form and content of communication needs to be fit-for-purpose and -audience), to minimise the risk of being crowded out by the proliferation of projects and providers.
- 6.2. Develop/implement a more structured approach to retention of key staff/expertise, to reduce the risk to successful project delivery.
- 6.3. Nurture the prospering partnerships between WSP and SPC-SOPAC programmes and SPC Divisions, to realise the value and impact of presenting integrated solutions.