**UNEP and IDB GEF PIR Fiscal Year 16**

**(1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016) [[1]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | Testing a Prototype Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executing Agency:** | UNEP CAR/RCU, Government agencies, waste water utilities in participating countries |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project partners:** | Caribbean Environment Health Institute (CEHI) and Caribbean Development Bank (CDB); Caribbean Water and Wastewater Association (CWWA) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Geographical Scope:** | Countries of the Wider Caribbean Region (WCR) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Participating Countries:** | Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF project ID:** | 3766 | **IMIS number\*[[2]](#footnote-3):** | GFL-2324-4A58-2732 |
| **Focal Area(s):** | International Waters | **GEF OP #:** | N/A |
| **GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:** | IW SO1 & 2 – SP2 | **GEF approval date\*:** | 02 December 2010 |
| **IDB and UNEP approval date:** | UNEP: 12 January 2012 *(delays due to dismantling of UNEP Division of GEF and change of internal procedures thereof)* IADB: 11 May 1011  | **Date of first disbursement\*:** | UNEP: 2 February 2012IDB: 29 July 2011 |
| **Actual start date[[3]](#footnote-4):** | 20 June 2011 | **Planned duration:** | 48 months |
| **Intended completion date\*:** | 20 June 2015 *(operational closure)**[for UNEP, the administrative closure is scheduled for December 2015 as reflected in the signed ICA with CAR/RCU]*  | **Actual or Expected completion date:** | Contingent upon mobilisation of addition PM resources with IADB; 31 December 2015 *(operational closure for components 2 and 3 )*26 January 2017 *(operational closure for components 1 )*31 December 2016 *(actual administrative project closure*) |
| **Project Type:** | FSP | **GEF Allocation\*:** | $ 20,000,000 |
| **PPG GEF cost\*:** | $380,000  | **PPG co-financing\*:** | $ 724,500 |
| **Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing\*:** | $251,702,403 | **Total Cost\*:** | $271,702,403 |
| **Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):** | 31 April 2013 | **Terminal Evaluation (planned date):** |  April 2016  |
| **Mid-term review/eval.****(actual date):** | January 2014 | **No. of revisions\*:** | **Two in total**: One for UNEP to enact the inception workshop and PSC1 recommendationsOne to enact PSC2 recommendations |
| **Date of last Steering Committee meeting:** | 7-9 July 2015 | **Date of last Revision\*:** | Completed – Dates TBC |
| **Disbursement as of 30 June 2016\*:** | Total: $18,491,500.80UNEP: $ 3,263,167.31IDB:$15,228,333.31  | **Date of financial closure\*:** | N/A |
| **Actual Completion date[[4]](#footnote-5)\*:**  | N/A | **Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2016[[5]](#footnote-6):** | Total: $18,355,078.72UNEP: $ 3,263,167.31IDB:$15,091,911.41 |
| **Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2016[[6]](#footnote-7):** | $ USD 608,960,652.8 \* | **Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2016\*:** | Total: $18,355,078.72UNEP: $ 3,263,167.31IDB:$15,091,911.41 |
| **Leveraged financing:[[7]](#footnote-8)** | N/A |  |  |

\* The detailed reports on project expenditure and co-financing are found in **Annex I- III**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project summary[[8]](#footnote-9)** | UNEP and IDB jointly requested 20M US$ support from the GEF for the establishment of a Prototype Regional Fund dedicated to wastewater management for the Wider Caribbean. This project ([www.gefcrew.org](http://www.gefcrew.org)) corresponds to the establishment of this regional initiative which comprises five components: i) Component 1:investment and innovative financing for wastewater management; ii) Component 2: reforms for wastewater management; iii) Component 3: communications, outreach and information exchange; iv) Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation; and v) Component 5: Project management |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project status FY12[[9]](#footnote-10)****Project status FY13[[10]](#footnote-11)****Project status FY14[[11]](#footnote-12)****Project status FY15[[12]](#footnote-13)** | The Project Coordination Group (PCG) is fully staffed and operational. Working relationships have been established with the Inter-agency Coordination Group (IACG) and five Executing Agencies (EAs). With regards to **Component 1**, agreements have been signed with three of the four pilot countries (Guyana, Belize and Jamaica) to facilitate disbursements of funds to enable the establishment of the financing mechanisms; and in the case of the fourth pilot, in Trinidad and Tobago, a draft agreement has been developed and is under negotiation. In the meantime, operational manuals have been finalised and Pilot Management Units have been established in Belize, Guyana and Jamaica. In terms of the first generation projects, tendering of the design and works is progressing for Belize, this involves one new facility in Placencia, and for Jamaica 14 existing plants are slated for upgrade. Guyana has developed an outreach programme to help identify its first generation projects targeting the private sector and public/private partnerships. Trinidad and Tobago have identified the upgrade of the Scarborough Waste Water Treatment Plant in Tobago as its first generation project. In terms of **Components 2 and 3** the baseline study is underway. Additionally, direct contact has been made with several of the countries to determine/clarify their needs with respect to wastewater reforms in an effort to determine the best approach to that intervention. A number of communication products have been launched; these include the project website, e-bulletins and the quarterly newsletter along with communication guidelines for the five executing agencies. Capacity building activities are underway with two workshops planned; one on Wastewater Management Technology and the other on Revolving Fund Management. Both these workshops are demand driven, in response to the request of the participating countries. The CReW has also been represented at a number of regional meetings chief among which was the Scientific, Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) on Land Based Sources (LBS) Protocol at which the project’s contribution to pollution reduction issues was outlined. The first year has been challenging and while there has been some slippage, the project remains on track for completion in 2015.**Component 1** - Since the last reporting period, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago (GOTT) became the final of the four demonstration countries to sign an agreement with the Bank, which will enable the establishment of the pilot financing mechanism. The GOTT still have to fulfil the conditions prior to facilitate the disbursement of the US$ 2 M needed to capitalise the revolving fund. In the case of the other three pilot countries who all signed agreements in the preceding year; Guyana and Belize have established Revolving Funds Boards for management of the facility, however, funds are yet to be disbursed. The reasons for the delay capitalising the funds vary in for each of the two countries. Guyana’s revolving fund is based on a model of public private partnerships and the main clients for the Fund were expected to come from the private sector. However, while several inquiries have been made the PEA/PMU has yet to identify a first generation project. To a large degree this is due to the absence of the necessary drivers chief among these are strong environmental regulations. The Belizean Government has been in a series of negotiation with international lenders regarding its national debt and as a result opted to defer requesting the disbursement of the US $ 5M until the debt negotiations had been finalised. The Government of Belize have signalled that they will be requesting disbursement in October 2013. With regard to first generation project, the tendering of the design works in Belize was significant stalled because of an impasse with the Water Boards which delayed the transfer of assets to the Belize Water Services (BWSL). The uncertainty which resulted led to a delay in the tendering of the design, which means that the Placencia Project will not require loan funds before January 2016. In the meantime, a new alternate project has been identified in Belmopan involving the upgrade of the treatment works and extension of coverage. This project will be the first to be funded by the BWRF after which funding will be available and used to fund the Placencia project as originally intended. This means that Belize will benefit by funding more than one project. In the case of Jamaica, a commercial bank has been selected and a commitment letter signed between the bank and the National Water Commission (NWC) to the tune of US$ 12 M to fund the rehabilitation of a total of 13 wastewater treatment plants. As a result, the Bank transferred the GEF CREW US $3 M to a reserve account to be used as collateral. The remainder of the collateral will be provided by the NWC K-Factor fund. The NWC is currently negotiating the contract for the loan. For Jamaica 13 existing plants have been identified. For 2 of the 13 the tendering process has been completed and the other 11 are currently inviting tenders. **Component 2** During the year the baseline study for the English speaking countries was completed. Based on those findings UNEP CAR/RCU began a number of bilateral discussions with countries in order to shape their national capacity building programmes. To date 4 agreements have been finalised and 3 others are in various stages of development. A number of regional workshops have been held these include two wastewater management workshops for English and Spanish Speaking countries held in the Bahamas and Costa Rica in October and November 2012 respectively. These workshops we executed with the support of the Water Center in Monterrey, Mexico. The Water Center is supported by the IDB and there are many areas of their work which are of importance to the project. The Water Center has tremendous capacity and experience in online training and given the need to continue to build capacity at the individual and institutional levels the project has developed an aide memoir with the Center to collaborate in the delivery of on line courses targeting wastewater professionals working in utilities and environmental sector. The first of the courses will be rolled out to Spanish Speaking Countries in November 2013. The project is also working to link the Center with two universities in the English Speaking Caribbean – UTECH and UWI to have exchanges in training and research in order to strengthen the capacity within the sector. These **activities are important to the legacy of the CReW** as it is intended that the current collaboration will continue long after the project is concluded. In addition, the project supported a regional workshop in the management of Revolving Funds; in this case the USEPA provided valuable resource personnel for the workshop. Arguably, the most impactful workshop was the one on facilitation hosted in Jamaica at which all the participating countries were present. The objectives of the workshop were to provide professionals with different tools to be used in building consensus and making decisions. The decision to host this workshop was strategic given the highly political nature of the sector and the diversity and complexity of the issues as a result of which decision making is often paralysed and the sector suffers. The workshop is intended to provide the technocrats with the facilitation tools to remove the barriers to decision making. **Component 3** – A total of 4 newsletters were published (www. gefcrew.org) during the period. The project has also launched a Facebook site intended to widen the outreach. Contracts have been signed to produce a number of videos and the project is working on its visualisation tool. As it relates to replication two contracts have been signed to provide studies of organisation readiness and to capture the experiences to date as part of developing sufficient information to inform the replication strategy.The activities implemented in the first 6 months of 2014 have started incorporating the recommendations of the MTR and decisions of the PSC meeting. **Component 1** **PROJECT OVERALL*** The PSC took place in January 2014, the MTE was presented, also during the committee; a facilitation workshop was carried out to draft the first thoughts/ideas of what could be the second phase of the project.
* The PSC approved a one to one and a half year extension of the project, without incurring in any further expense to GEF. Still to determine the sources of the amount needed for this extension, estimated in US$ 547,674 for one year extension and US$ 806,911 for a one and a half years.

**PCG**Because of personal reasons, the Project Coordinator resigned from the position in May 2014. In the interim the Technical Specialist is working as acting PC. The IDB plans to finalize the procurement of a new PC by July-August 2014.**PILOT PROJECTS**Since the last reporting period, the status of the project by the pilot countries is the following.*BELIZE:****Disbursement:***  *Financing Mechanism funded:* The fund was capitalized with US$ 5M by October 2013 *First Generation Project Design (cost covered by IDB):* For the reporting period there has been no disbursement. The reasons for this are detailed in the pilot project description below. ***Pilot project:*** **Placencia:**The design of the project is ongoing pending decision by the government on the final location of the wastewater treatment plant. Significant potential social and or political impacts and the needs for extensive local community acceptance have caused some delays in the final decision making process hence making site agreement on the final site difficult. As per the planning provided by the PMU, the expected date for the finalization of the design is now April 2015. Disbursements are not expected until August 2015 with the end of the construction scheduled for August 2017.**Belmopan:**The design of the collection system and the upgrade of Belmopan Wastewater Treatment Plan have been finalized. The procurement process will start in September 2014 and should be completed by December 2014. The work shall thereafter commence in January 2015 with completion scheduled for June 2015.The total cost is estimated by the Belize Water Services (BWS) is US$ 1.5 million***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):***Fred Gould, International consultant was hired to act as Design Supervisor for the Placencia and Belmopan wastewater Projects, and to review and comment upon the Nutrient Fate Study and upon the Market Effluent Study.*GUYANA:*Guyana’s revolving fund is based on a model of public private partnerships and the main clients for the Fund were expected to come mostly from the private sector but now will also come from NGO, local community, even governments, etc.***Disbursement:***  Financing Mechanism funded: No disbursement has been done to date due to the fact that a pilot project has yet to be identified. The amount allocated for this pilot project is US$ 2 M.***First Generation Project Design:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Activity* | *Budget Allocated*  *USD ($)* | *Expenditure to date**USD ($)* |
| *40% of Contract sum disbursed for Development of Policy and Operational Framework of GWRF (Contract Terminated with Consultant); remaining funds used to fund participation of GWI Director at CWWA* | *23,358* | *23,358* |
| Consultancy for Development of Policy and Operational Framework of GWRF (1) | 40,000 | *Working in Tors* |
| Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF | 48,125 | *12,500* |
| Other Project Development Support Consultancies to be determined as needed | 138,517 |  |

***Pilot project:***Several proposals were tabled but the PEA/PMU has yet to identify a first generation project. The flagship project Demorara Distillery Ltd has officially informed the Guyana Waste Water Revolving Fund (GWRF) of their non-intention to pursue an investment in a wastewater treatment plant at this time. The PMU continues to engage with the other previous Projects such as Splashmins, Puran Bros Incorporated, Country Wide Disposal Services and Caribbean Containers Incorporated. Further discussion have been initiated with Windsor Estates, a new 65-acre housing establishment, the Guyana Pegasus Hotel and the Gold and Diamond Miners Association as to get their interest in becoming a pilot. ***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):***Development of the Policy and Operational Framework of the GWRF, originally executed by Mr Martin Baker, has been terminated, and a replacement Consultant is in progress. Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF, executed by Shonnet Moore has had a disbursement of 35% of the Consultancy Fee. ***JAMAICA:***The current IMF agreement with the Government of Jamaica and the financial rules applied to Government agencies have impacted the ability of our project to move in a timely manner. During the reporting period the commitment letter was signed between the National Commercial Bank (NCB) and the National Water Commission (NWC). The signature of the Loan agreement for an amount of US$ 12 M has however not yet taken place. Arrangements are being made by NWC and the NCB the agreement to be signed no later than July 2014. There cannot be disbursements to the future Contractor in charge of the works till this signature is secured.***Disbursement:******Financing Mechanism funded:*** The fund was capitalized with US$ 3M during the previous PIR reporting period in February 2013 with funds deposited in the National Commercial Bank account.***First Generation Project Design:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Activity*** | ***Budget Allocated***  ***USD ($)*** | ***Expenditure to date******USD ($)*** |
| *Consulting services for project development & design studies such Topographic Survey* | *40,000* | *39,822.42* |
| Services for Monitoring of Pilot project |  25,000.00  |   |
| Socio-economic analysis survey and report. |  40,000.00  | 36,534.15 |
| Wastewater characterization study (flow & quality) for 14 plants |  20,000.00  |  18,316.10 |
| Wastewater Operator Training Program |  100,000.00  |  |
| Consulting services for environmental Consultant of WWTPs. |  100,000.00  |  |

***Pilot project:***During the reporting period much emphasis was spent administering and/or evaluating several significant procurement exercises which were issued by the PMU. These included the following requests for proposals (RFPs): * **Boscobel Elletson Flats Wastewater Treatment Plant Replacement Project**, Award of Contract to VINCI Construction in the sum of US$4,131,683.01. The Contract is expected to be signed in the next reporting 3rd quarter of this year (July – September 2014).
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Conveyance Systems.** 3 bid proposals were received. These proposals have been evaluated and the Evaluation Report submitted to the IDB and endorsed by the Audit & Finance Committee of the NWC Board on June 16, 2014.
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Treatment Plants (Pond Systems**). Only one responsive bid was received. The Evaluation Report has been finalized since June 27, 2014. Arrangements are being made to forward Evaluation Report to the IDB in July 2014 for their no objection following which presentation to the requisite committees (internal and external) for endorsement of Contract.
* **Design and Build of 5 Wastewater Treatment Plants** **(Mechanical Systems).** 5 Bids were returned and are currently still being evaluated and the technical evaluation report is to be submitted to the IDB for their non-objection to proceed with the opening of the financial proposal in July 2014.
* **Provision of Engineering Consultancy and Works Supervision Services for Rehabilitation of Thirteen (13) Wastewater Treatment Plants.** 3 Bid proposals were received. The Technical Evaluation of the proposals was completed and forwarded to the IDB in the last week in June 2014 to request permission to proceed to the next stage of the evaluation process (opening of the financial bid) before the final evaluation report is completed.

***Other activities (funded by the project development support):**** The environmental consultancy to assist the PMU with technical matters has been awarded to Dr. Nilza Smith. She has submitted her preliminary draft report in May 30, 2014.
* **Auditing Services for the Project funds**. Draft Contract with KPMG (selected in previous period) was issued to IDB for review and approval to proceed with Contract on June 2, 2014. Expected signature with KPMG to happen during the first week in July 2014
* **Wastewater Training Programme for Operators** was organised in partnership with UnivTECH in Jamaica. Draft Contract has been forwarded to the IDB procurement specialist for review and accepted on June 12, 2014. Training Programme was however launched on June 3 2014. Seven (7) NWC personnel are currently participating in the course.

***TT:***Preliminary activities were undertaken by Waste And Sewage Authority (WASA) and discussions are ongoing to ensure effective implementation once planning process is completed. However to-date, the country has not met all of the conditions to enable the disbursement of the US$ 2 M needed to capitalise the revolving fund. An extension has been granted till the 24 September 2014.***Disbursement:*** *Financing Mechanism funded: N/A* *First Generation Project Design: N/A****Pilot Project:*** N/A**.*****Other activities (funded by the project development support):*** *N/A*The following highlights the major progress under the two Components executed by UNEP CAR/RCU.**Component 2**Terms of Reference (TORs) were developed for the redesign and enhancement of the current GEF CReW Project website and visualization tool (which will be embedded in the website). Consultancy began in early-June.Drafts of framework template and toolkit for developing/updating wastewater policies and developing/updating wastewater management plans received from external consultant. They will be made available by end of July 2014.Discussions initiated with Antigua and Barbuda to provide national financial capacity building to the national utility. Due to poor feedback, other activities are now being considered, the pilot testing of reuse of wastewater as a resource in collaboration with the FAO and to be implemented pilot activities in in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Antigua and Barbuda.The consultant’s report: “*Review of the Assess to, Availability of, and Organizational Readiness for Uptake of Funding for the Wastewater Sector in Selected Participating Countries*” was revised and finalized following presentation at the Third Project Steering Committee Meeting and comments from participating countries. Available now through the Web site.Technical advisory group of country focal points established to support the development of an implementation plan for a monitoring, evaluation and reporting system for wastewater management including the design for a wastewater management M&E database. Works will continue next quarter.UNEP CAR/RCU began a number of bilateral discussions with countries in order to shape their national capacity building programmes called Small Scale Funding Agreements. ***SSFAs******SSFA English Speaking countries****:* Ongoing in Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Saint Lucia, Barbados and Guyana. In Jamaica will support National Capacity Building and Policy, Institutional and Legal reforms for Wastewater management has been delayed due to lack of fiscal space to receive funds by the Ministry. Draft SSFA of Suriname was finalized but awaiting input of banking information and additional budget details before signature. Discussions continued with officials in St. Vincent on possible areas of support to be developed by end of July 2014.SSFA with Suriname NGO for rural communication strategy on sanitation (Under discussion with Government)***SSFA Spanish Speaking countries****:*Baseline Assessments for Belize, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama were edited formatted and was posted on GEF CReW website. Final versions were also provided the GEF PCG.Final report for LBS Compliance in Spanish-speaking countries was received from RAC/CIMAB and posted in April. This report will form the basis for developing Small Scale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) with Panama, Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala which will be coordinated by RAC/CIMAB in Cuba. Discussions involving RAC CIMAB, CReW Focal Points from the four countries, Acting Project Coordinating of the GEF CReW Project and UNEP CAR/RCU are ongoing to define in details the areas of support for each country. Signature of the SSFAs which each of the four countries expected no later than August 2014.SSFA with RAC CIMAB to provide technical support and oversight on capacity building to CReW Spanish Speaking Countries including hosting of training workshop on lab analysis (July)***SSFA Others:******SSFA Water Center****:* to provide training for Spanish-speaking CReW countries for online courses in various aspects of wastewater management, respectively. 125 persons from four countries in the Wider Caribbean Region (WCR) will receive training in water and wastewater management from the Water Center. Courses being covered are: a Diploma in Strategic Management for Water Utilities; a Diploma in Energy and Water Efficiency for Water Utilities, and; shorter courses in Wastewater Treatment Fundamentals and Commercial Management of Water Utilities. The courses will be conducted online via Internet portal between June and November 2014.***SSFA Resource valuation***: aiming to identify infrastructure options for wastewater management; value costs and benefits of possible wastewater options; develop greater understanding and capacity on valuing coastal ecosystems and wastewater management options and improve regional understanding of the connection between wastewater treatment and coastal ecosystems. The SSFA were initiated with the World Resources Institute (already signed and first disbursement made), the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago (to be finalized by the end of July 2014) and Panama (already finalized but not signed). **SSFA Discussions with Caribbean Development Bank and the World Bank** to organize an online course to provide capacity building for utilities in the area of institutional and financial reform. The launch of the course planned for September and October 2014.  **SSFA with CWWA and/or GWP** C to support CWWA Constitutional Reform, CWWA Conference and Ministerial High Level Session 2014. Final Reports from CWWA were received following support provided to the 2013 CWWA Conference and High-Level Session **SSFA with CXC** re: curriculum development (Under discussion) **SSFA with UWI** to provide online training (Under Discussion - not much progress)**Component 3**UNEP-CAR/RCU represented the GEF CReW Project at the CLME ProDoc Core Development Team Meeting and the 19th Latin America and the Caribbean Ministers Meeting and High-Level Ministers Forum.Discussions were held with the Caribbean Examinations Council’s Senior Assistant Registrar, Syllabus and Curriculum Development, Dr. Carol Granston, towards the inclusion of materials on wastewater management and related issues in the CSEC and CAPE syllabi, and/or the provision of supporting learning resources. Possible areas of collaboration were identified, examples of material shared and UNEP-CAR/RCU is awaiting confirmation of modalities through which support for specific activities could be implemented through an SSFA. Given the lack of response to date, follow up discussions are scheduled for July 2014 to determine the best way forward.SSFA was developed with the Global Water Partners-Caribbean to convene a two days Regional Partners meeting in the Water and Wastewater Sector in April 2014. Objectives: to strengthen collaboration amongst agencies working in the wastewater sector; identify mechanisms to raise the profile of water and wastewater in the Caribbean, Assess how the LBS Protocol and other protocols/initiatives can be used to advance the water and wastewater agenda for the English-speaking Caribbean. Quarterly newsletters for September/October 2013, December 2013, January-March 2014. Preparation of the June 2014 issue began and it is expected to be finalized by the end of July 2014.The GEF CReW Project was featured at the Partnership in Sustainable Development Exhibition on March 21 to commemorate World Water Day, International Day of Forests and World Meteorological Day at Devon House in Kingston. The CReW Media Toolkit was completed in June and sent for layout and formatting. It is to be published electronically in mid-July. Video documentary no 1 "Wastewater Report Card" was released, no. 2, “Wastewater and Health” will be finished in early-July. The manuscript for video documentary no. 3. “Policy and Wastewater Management Reforms” is being produced. A media release about the online training courses being offered through the Water Center was prepared and distributed in early-June. Regular articles relating to wastewater and the GEF CReW Project were posted to the CReW and UNEP-CAR/RCU Facebook pages.The knowledge management platform proposal from IDB was reviewed and comments provided. Establishment of the Community of Practice (CoP) by the IDB with input from UNEP CAR RCU, and initial review. The CoP official launch will take place by late-September. The CoP is a key project forum and mechanism for knowledge sharing and capture of lessons learned and good practice from all project components.An experience note on the value of Facilitation in the GEF CReW project was finalized during the reporting period and will be shared on the website and with GEF IW Learn in July 2014.New stories and articles that relate to the work of the GEF CReW Project and of wastewater management issues in general are posted to the CReW Facebook page as well as UNEP-CAR/RCU’s Facebook and Twitter pages.Replication strategy consultancy is ongoing.The activities implemented in the first 6 months of 2014 have started incorporating the recommendations of the MTR and decisions of the PSC meeting.**PROJECT OVERALL*** The 4th and last PSC was held at the beginning of the second half of the year 2015, thus no recommendations have been given for the current PIR period.
* The 18-month project extension mentioned in the last PIR period was approved. The source of financing will be an IDB Technical Cooperation already approved, in the amount of US$ 547,674. The new finalization date is now January 2017

**PCG**The former CReW Technical Specialist and interim Project Coordinator was appointed to the position of Project Coordinator in November 2015 following an IDB competitive process. Also using a competitive hiring process, a new Technical Specialist was hired by December 2015.**Component 1****PILOT PROJECTS**Since the last reporting period, the status of the project in the pilot countries is as follows.*BELIZE:****Disbursement:***  *Financing Mechanism funded:* The fund was capitalized with US$5M by October 2013.***Financing mechanisms funded:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Retroactive Financing of the Belmopan Sewer Lagoon | *739,333.33* | *739,333.33* |
| Belmopan Sewer System Expansion- Phase 1 | *1,521,300.00* | *0.00* |
| Belmopan Sewer System Expansion- Phase 2 | *2,739,366.67* | *0.00* |

 *First Generation Project Design*: For the reporting period US$37,250 by IDB and US$2,180 of Co-financing has been disbursed for the Establishment of the Operational Framework for a Wastewater Revolving Fund in Belize.***First Generation Project Design:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Establishment of the Operational Framework for a Wastewater Revolving Fund in Belize | *0.00* | *37,250.00* |
| Establishment of the Operational Framework for a Wastewater Revolving Fund in Belize**CO-FINANCING** | *0.00* | *2,180.00* |
| Advisor and Mentor (Fred Gould) | *90,000.00* | *0.00* |
| Project Engineer | *60,000.00* | *0.00* |
| Nutrient Fate and Transport Study | *115,000.00* | *0.00* |
| Others Project Development Support Consultancies to be determined as needed | *72,750.00* | *0.00* |

***Pilot project:*** **Placencia:**To date, the Government of Belize has not decided the final location of the wastewater treatment plant, mainly because more studies of the lagoon are needed, for the significant potential social and/or political impacts and the need for extensive local community acceptance. In addition, the current estimated cost of the works is more than double the initial provision of 10 million; 5 of which come from the CReW Project and the other 5 from an IDB loan.Due tof all of the above, on the 27th of April 2015 the Government of Belize and IDB agreed to the cancellation of the above mentioned Placencia Loan; the construction of the Placencia WWTP was therefore postponed. With the support of IDB, the government will continue the studies to reach sound conclusions on where to locate the plant in Placencia. In the meantime, the GEF CReW Project will focus in the Belmopan project. **Belmopan:**The project is broken down into 3 parts:Belmopan Retroactive Finance – US$739,333.33 – to build three lagoons – completed* December 2013 – Signature of Financial Agreement for Retroactive Financing for the Belmopan Lagoons by the Belize Water Services Limited and the Ministry of Finance. US$739,333.33 was disbursed from the Revolving Fund Account to the Belize Water Services Account. The repayment of the loan started in April, 2015 and the repayment period is 2 years.

Belmopan Sewer Expansion phase 1 – US$1,137,292.91 – Under Construction* The project consists of: (i) Procurement and installation of a sewage pumping station. (ii) Procurement and installation of a sewage force mains and gravity sewers mains. (iii) Rehabilitation of a Primary Treatment System: Installation of a flow monitoring and measurement devices; Retrofitting of the return liquor pumping station; Construction of a 6 foot high perimeter fence; and Restoration and rehabilitation of existing roads and driveways. (iv) Construction of a new anaerobic pond. (v) Procurement and installation of a tertiary UV treatment
* The construction phase started on the 9th February 2015
* The estimated completion date is 15th August 2015

Belmopan Sewer Expansions phase 2 – Under design Phase* The project will consist in: (i) Design of a 2nd anaerobic pond. (ii) Procurement and installation of a collecting system
* Design will be finish by the end of July 2015
* Propose start date for the construction: January 2016
* Propose completion date for the construction: July 2016

At the end of the Project - Full build-out* Wastewater treatment plant: 5 Lagoons + UV treatment
* Wastewater flow: 3,054 m3/day
* Households: 3,262

***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):***Fred Gould, International consultant, was hired by BWSL to provide support in the development of the Placencia and as the Design Supervisor for the Belmopan Wastewater Projects. Some of the activities include: (i) Advisor and Mentor (Fred Gould), (ii) Project Engineer, and (iii) Nutrient Fate and Transport Study for the Placencia lagoon.*GUYANA:*Guyana’s revolving fund is based on a model of public private partnerships, thus the main clients for the Fund were expected to come mostly from the private sector. However, currently the PMU is working on the development of a project with GWI. The proposal is to install a constructed wetlands wastewater treatment facility in the area of the sanitary landfill site at Haags Bosch located behind Eccles Village, East Bank Demerara, approximately 4 miles outside Georgetown, (or alternatively at the small landfill site located at Lusignan, or at the recently closed Le Repentir landfill site located in Georgetown). This facility would be used for the discharging of the septage collected by the septage haulers.***Disbursement:***  Financing Mechanism funded: No disbursement has been made to date because the first generation pilot project has yet to be identified. The amount allocated for this pilot is US$2M. *First Generation Project Design*: For the reporting period there has been a disbursement of US$22,933.83, by IDB, for the Development of the Policy and Operational Framework of the GWRF and the consultancy for the Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF.***First Generation Project Design:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Consultancy for Development of Policy and Operational Framework of GWRF | *32,740.00* | *27,092.03* |
| Consultancy for the Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF |  | *4,353.60* |
| Technical Design (GWI) | *15,000.00* |  |
| Financial proposal (GWI) | *15,000.00* |  |
| PDS Consultancy (Waste-to-Revenue) to be properly defined | *40,000.00* |  |
| Support the PEA/PMU Project Coordinator for a Monitoring and Evaluation Training in Canada. | *1,500.00* | *0.00* |
| Others Project Development Support Consultancies to be determined as needed | *89,894.67* | *0.00* |

***Pilot project:***Several proposals were tabled but the PEA/PMU has yet to identify a first generation project. To date, the PEA/PMU has worked with the following projects: The flagship project Demorara Distillery Ltd, Splashmins, Puran Bros Incorporated, Country Wide Disposal Services, Caribbean Containers Incorporated, Windsor Estates, the Guyana Pegasus Hotel and the Gold and Diamond Miners Association to determine their interest in becoming a pilot. One new project was added to the list, the GWI Pilot Project involving the construction of a septage treatment plant. Currently the work is focussed on the three most feasible options: * Splashmins: is working on the finalization of an agreement with a commercial bank that guarantees the repayment of the amount requested from the GWRF for the construction of the WWTP
* Country Wide Disposal: IDB and PEA/PMU are revising the financial information of the project.
* GWI Pilot Project: The proposal will be presented to the GWI board on August 27, 2015.

***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):**** The development of the Policy and Operational Framework of the GWRF is ongoing.  Mr Olaiz will finalize the work started by Mr. Martin Baker. The consultancy will be finished by July 31, 2015. The Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF, executed by Shonnet Moore has disbursed so far 35% of the Consultancy Fee.
* Support to the PEA/PMU Project Coordinator for a Monitoring and Evaluation Training in Canada, held on June 22 - July 3, 2015.

***JAMAICA:***The current IMF agreement with the Government of Jamaica and the financial rules applied to Government agencies has impacted the ability of the Pilot r project to advance in a timely manner. During the reporting period the commitment letter was signed between the National Commercial Bank (NCB) and the National Water Commission (NWC). The signature of the US$12M loan agreement has not taken place yet, but the Ministry of Finance has already endorsed the new terms of the agreement and currently the lawyers of NCB and NWC are finalizing the last details previous to the signature, which is expected to be done by July 2015. There cannot be disbursements to the Contractors in charge of the works until this signature is secured.***Disbursement:******Financing Mechanism funded:*** The fund was capitalized with US$3M in February 2013 with funds deposited in the National Commercial Bank account. *First Generation Project Design*: To date, the disbursement amount is of US$94,672.67 by IDB and US$58,624.68 of Co-financing for the Socio-Economic Survey, Topographic Surveys and Wastewater Characterization Studies.***First Generation Project Design:***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Socio-economic analysis survey and report |  | *36,534.15* |
| Consulting services for project development & design studies such Topographic Survey |  | *39,822.42* |
| Consulting services for project development & design studies such Topographic Survey**CO-FINANCING** |  | *58,624.68* |
| Wastewater characterization study (flow & quality) |  | *18,316.10* |
| Wastewater Operator Training Program | *100,000.00* |  |
| Project Manager for Works Supervision Services (or "top-up to in house staff") | *55,327.33* |  |

***Pilot project:***During the reporting period, the PMU has been working on the procurement process for the requests for proposals (RFPs), and the progress is as follows:* **Boscobel Elletson Flats Wastewater Treatment Plant Replacement Project**. Award of Contract to VINCI Construction in the sum of US$4,131,683.01. The procurement has been completed. The signing on the contract will be done upon the signing of the loan agreement with NCB.
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Conveyance Systems.** The NWC presented the documentation to Cabinet for final approval on June 1, 2015. The recommended contract award sum is US$3,716,311.17.
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Treatment Plants (Pond Systems**). The evaluation report obtained the penultimate approving body on May 4, 2015. On June 1, 2015 it was presented to the Cabinet for the final approval. On early July was approved by the Cabinet. The recommended Contract award sum is US$4,711,297.
* **Design and Build of 5 Wastewater Treatment Plants** **(Mechanical Systems)**. Due to NWC’s financial constraints the procurement process was annulled at the beginning of 2015.
* **Provision of Engineering Consultancy and Works Supervision Services for Rehabilitation of eight (8) Wastewater Treatment Plants.** The process was annulled because the high cost was deemed to be exorbitant.

The supervision will be done differently, in- house and a procurement process will be opened to hire one or more professional engineer consultants able to review the design. The TORs for these consultancies has been completed and currently work is being done to obtain a list of competitive resumes to start the selection process.***Other activities (funded by the project development support):**** **The environmental consultant to assist the PMU.** on March 17, 2014Dr. Nilza Smith was awarded a JMD$9,936,000.00 contract. The following work has been carried out:
* Wastewater characterization and flow measurements associated with Boscobel and Elletson Flats WWTPs were completed on December 18, 2014 (having started on December 4, 2014).
* NEPA pre-approval for the environmental permit and License application needed to start the works at Boscobel and Elletson Flats WWTPs.
* **Auditing Services for the Project funds.** A JMD$950,000.00 (exclusive of GCT) contract was signed by KPMG on July 17, 2014 to prepare the financial Auditing services on the CReW Project for the period 2013-2014 (first audit). Final payment was made in September 2014 for a final sum (JMD$945,600.00 plus GCT)

This company will also work on the audit for the 2014-2015 period.* **Wastewater Training Programme for Operators.** The Training Programme was officially launched with the first cohort of seven students on June 3, 2014 and ended on August 21, 2014. The second cohort of five students began on October 16, 2014 and ended on December 19, 2015. The third cohort of students began on February 19, 2015 and ended on May 7, 2015.

There have been delays in the drafting of the contract between NWC & UTECH thus, the disbursement from IDB to NWC will have to be done retroactively. The contract was finalized in November 2014 and received the Banks no-objection in December 2014 and finally signed by UTECH and NWC in January 30, 2015.***Trinidad and Tobago:***Preliminary activities were undertaken by the Water and Sewage Authority (WASA) and discussions are ongoing to ensure effective implementation once the planning process is completed. On the other hand, the Government has met all conditions prior to enable the disbursement of the US$2M allocated to this Pilot. The disbursement was made in December 17, 2015. At the moment, there is not a loan agreement between the Ministry and WASA ensuring the mechanism of replenishment from WASA to the revolving fund and therefore the funds cannot be transferred to WASA to start the construction works. Mr Brad Johnson was hired to run a consultancy to support the development of such an agreement and the first official mission to T&T by the consultant to work on this matter took place in June 2015; the work is ongoing. ***Disbursement:*** *Financing Mechanism funded: The fund was capitalized with US$ 2M by December 17, 2014* *First Generation Project Design: To date there has been no disbursement.****Pilot Project:* The** Water And Sewage Authority (WASA) has been working on the development of the Pilot Project in Scarborough, which encompasses the Refurbishment of the Scarborough Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Construction of Property Connections to the Scarborough Sewerage Network. * The Scarborough WWTP contract was signed, but until the loan agreement is completed the project cannot be funded. The CReW funds allocated for this project is US$1,328,281.
* The Scarborough Connections Bid Evaluation process is still in progress, expected to be completed by the end of June 2015. The amount allocated by CReW for this project is US$671,719. The IDB is currently working in the socio-economic analysis of this proposal.

***Other activities (funded by the project development support):*** *N/A*The following highlights the major progress under the two Components executed by UNEP CAR/RCU.**Component 2**Wastewater Policy Templates and Toolkits were developed to help participating countries develop effective wastewater management policies and plans. A “ Regional Wastewater Management Policy Template and Toolkit” and “Regional Guidelines for Developing, Reviewing and/or Updating National Wastewater Management Plans” were finalized in 2015 Final versions of these documents will be available on the CReW website.UNEP CAR/RCU continued number of bilateral discussions with countries in order to shape their national capacity building activities through SmallScale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) ***SSFAs******SSFA English Speaking countries****:* Capacity building activities were completed in Antigua and Barbuda and Guyana. Activities are ongoing in Belize, Saint Lucia, and Barbados. In Jamaica activities were delayed due to lack of fiscal space to receive funds by the Ministry. Discussions were held in June 2015 with GOJ to decide on other ways/mechanisms to proceed with their Capacity Building activities. The SSFA for Suriname was finalized in 2014 but project implementation was delayed as a result of an error in bank transfer of project funds. Implementation of project activities is however expected to commence by July 2015***Country activities include:**** *Development of water quality monitoring and analysis programme*
* *Updating and strengthening of national standards and regulations for wastewater management*
* *Developing guidelines for wastewater permitting and licensing system*
* *Development of national wastewater management strategy*
* *National training workshops for operators and regulators of wastewater facilities*
* *Development of national communication strategy and public awareness programme for wastewater issues*
* *Development and dissemination of communication products, press releases, articles relating to wastewater management*
* *Development/Amendment and Harmonization of legislation and regulations for and related to wastewater*
* *Review of legislation with regards to utility regulations*
* *Development of template for parliamentary counsel to prepare wastewater regulations*
* *Workshop to foster private sector engagement for wastewater management*
* *Drafting of board paper for national wastewater management improvement*

Discussions continued and were completed with officials in St. Vincent on areas of Capacity Building support , however the finalization of the SSFA has been delayed because of non reporting by Saint Vincent on funds previously received under a Project of the SPAW sub-programme. Once this issue has been resolved , the SSFA will be finalised to allow implementation to begin.A second SSFA was developed and finalized with Antigua and Barbuda in 2015. Implementation is expected to commence by July 2015. This new project aims to enhance national capacity for wastewater management in Antigua and Barbuda through the development and implementation of water reuse infrastructure and management measures, a water monitoring programme, water re-use policy, cost of service report and tariff review, and awareness raising on the reuse of water.***SSFA Spanish Speaking countries****:*SSFAs were developed and finalized for Honduras and Costa Rica for capacity building activities. Discussions are still ongoing with Panama and Guatemala for the finalization of their SSFAs.A SSFA was developed and finalized with RAC CIMAB in October 2014 to provide technical support and assistance for capacity building activities for CReW’s Spanish Speaking Countries ( Costa Rica, Honduras and Guatemala). ***SSFA Others:******SSFA Water Center****:* The Water Center in Monterrey, Mexico, signed an SSFA with UNEP CAR/RCU to provide training for the Spanish-speaking CReW countries (Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama) via online and blended courses in various aspects of wastewater management. The courses were conducted between June and November 2014, reaching a total of 125persons from the four countries. Courses offered were: diplomas in Strategic Management for Water Utilities; Energy and Water Efficiency for Water Utilities, and shorter courses in Wastewater Treatment Fundamentals and Commercial Management of Water Utilities.***SSFA Resource valuation***: SSFAs on resource valuation were developed with the World Resources Institute (WRI) and the Governments of Trinidad & Tobago and (being finalized) for Panama. The GEF CReW Project, through WRI, is conducting pilot resource valuation studies in Trinidad &Tobago and Panama. In Trinidad & Tobago, WRI is working with local agencies. The Environmental Management Authority (EMA) is the lead agency in Trinidad &Tobago. The project aims to identify infrastructure options for wastewater management; to value costs and benefits of possible wastewater options; to develop greater understanding and capacity on valuing coastal ecosystems and wastewater management options and improve regional understanding of the connection between wastewater treatment and coastal ecosystems.**SSFA with CWWA was finalized** to support the CWWA Conference and Ministerial High Level Session in October 2014. Another SSFA will be developed to support the CWWA Conference and Ministerial High Level Session in August 2015.**Component 3**The GEF CReW project hosted a regional media sensitization workshop on wastewater for journalists from its Spanish speaking countries in Panama in July 2014. This workshop aimed to deepen the knowledge and expertise of environmental journalists on wastewater issues and management in the WCR. This is part of the Project’s efforts to increase media coverage about wastewater and related issues. The workshop was attended by Journalists from Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama.At this workshop, as in the previous media workshop in November 2013 for English-speaking journalists, a KAPS, (Knowledge Attitudes and Practices Survey) was distributed and completed by participants. Results of the KAPS were written up in a report which is available on the project website. A CReW Media Wastewater Toolkit was developed to address the needs of the media in the region as identified from the media KAPs study conducted by GEF CReW and is available in English and Spanish on the project website.UNEP-CAR/RCU represented the GEF CReW Project at the Wastewater and Reefs Strategy Development Workshop, convened by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Florida, USA in March 2015. TNC sought to gather input for the development of a Wastewater Management Strategy.UNEP-CAR/RCU and the GEF CReW Project collaborated with the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) and the Caribbean Water and Sewage Association Inc. (CAWASA) to convene a workshop on Governance and Sanitation in Antigua and Barbuda in February 2015. The workshop aimed to build additional capacity in areas such as Gender: Climate change; use of wastewater as a resource; and monitoring and evaluation.Quarterly newsletters were developed and published for September 2014, December 2014, and March 2015; with the June 2015 issue currently in production. The GEF CReW Project was featured at the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) Open Day, June 2015 to commemorate World Environment Day .GEF CReW partnered with the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), the World Bank Group, the Caribbean Water and Sewerage Association Inc. (CAWASA) and the Global Water Leaders Group to deliver water utility reform training for CEOs and Managers between September and November 2014.The ten-week training programme consisted of an e-learning course, two workshops and a leadership summit. The programme aimed to increase the capacity of managerial and technical staff in water utility companies to design and implement reforms and to build the awareness of the water utility executives of the importance and benefits of utility reform. This would also assist utilities in coping with the increased demands of not only water supply but wastewater treatment. **The E-Learning Course**–The e-learning course, which began on September 29, 2014 was presented by the World Bank Leadership, Learning and Innovation Institute. It provided participants with the knowledge, tools and skills to initiate and sustain reform in their respective utility companies. It included lessons, case studies, exercises and assessments that support the planning and execution of reform programmes in water utility companies. **The CEO Workshop** – Sixteen public sector and three private sector, water utility CEOs attended the first workshop on November 27-28, 2014 in Barbados. They were provided with a fresh perspective of key topics on the utility reform agenda and a better understanding of their role in the reform process. **The Mid-level Managers Workshop**– Twenty-four mid-level managers from public sector water utility companies who had successfully completed the online water utility reform course participated in this workshop in Barbados on December 1-5, 2014. It aimed to build on that course by expanding awareness of the approaches to improving service delivery and to increase awareness of the importance of gender mainstreaming and climate change in the utility’s operations. The GEF CReW Project participated in the Caribbean Water and Wastewater Association’s 23rdAnnual Conference and Exhibition which took place in The Bahamas, October, 2014. The conference theme was “Water, Waste and Energy in the Caribbean”.Four technical presentations were given based on the Project’s work in the previous year: * “Wastewater Policy Development in the Caribbean: The Way Forward” –Christopher Corbin
* “Regional Media and Wastewater- Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices”- Donna Sue Spencer
* “Complexities of Designing a Revolving Fund for Investment in Improved Wastewater Management that is Exclusive to the Private Sector – the case of Guyana and the GEF CReW Project”- Marlon Daniels
* “Review of the Access to, Availability of, and Organizational Readiness for Uptake of Funding for the Wastewater Sector in Selected Caribbean Countries” – Christopher Corbin

GEF CReW and UNEP CAR/RCU collaborated with CWWA and the Global Water Partnership-Caribbean (GWP-C), to host the 10thAnnual High Level Session (HLS) Ministerial Forum on October 9-10 under the theme “Caribbean Water Security – Risks and Opportunities”. The HLS is a forum in which countries can share progress towards a water secure region that is resilient to climate change, share their experiences and initiatives and help identify priorities for further action at both national and regional levels. It was attended by Caribbean Ministers of Government with responsibility for water from eleven countries. A consultant was contracted to develop and redesign the GEF CReW Project websitein July 2014. The new GEF CReW project website was designed and populated between August 2014 and launched in January 2015. The new website includes maps and pages featuring the thirteen participating countries as well as each of the Pilot Projects.The Media section of the new GEF CReW website features all public education resources produced by the GEF CReW project, including the video documentaries produced by the project:Caribbean Wastewater ReportWastewater Warning: Health Hazard Wastewater Policy: A Caribbean PriorityThe CReW Community of Practice (CoP) based on the Inter-American Development Bank’s platform was officially launched in September 2014. The CoP is a key project forum and mechanism for knowledge sharing and capture of lessons learned and good practice from all project components amongst members. A series of three training webinars for the moderator (the Communications Specialist) and the Knowledge Editors (one selected person from each participating country) took place between July and August, prior to launch of the CoP in late September. The CoP is a key project forum and mechanism for knowledge sharing and capture of lessons learned and good practice from all project components.An experience note on the value of Facilitation in the GEF CReW project was finalized and shared on the website and with GEF IW Learn in July 2014.New stories and articles relating to the work of the GEF CReW Project and on wastewater management issues in general continued to be posted to the CReW Facebook page as well as UNEP-CAR/RCU’s Facebook and Twitter pages.Various Briefing sheets as listed below were developed under the GEF CReW Project:No1. Access to Wastewater FundingNo2. Reforms for Wastewater ManagementNo 3. Revolving Funds for Wastewater Management No.4. GEF CReW Lessons LearnedA Replication workshop for the GEF CReW project was convened in May 2015 to provide initial input to the development of a proposal for a follow-on project.. This followed the report : “Elaboration of a Replication Strategy and Project Design Concept” based upon inputs form PSC 3 in January 2014 and finalized in November 2014, |
| **Project status FY16[[13]](#footnote-14)** | **PROJECT OVERALL*** The last and 4th PSC was held in July 2016 where the review of last year and approve of next year budget and planning of activities was done. A highlight of this PSC were the facilitated knowledge sessions carried out by the IDB KNL department supported by the PCG where 8 lessons learnt were discussed among all participating countries
* During the second half of this year, efforts will be done to have a close ceremony by convening resources and taking advantages of others conferences in the region e.g. LBS stack or IWeco inception meeting
* The 18-month project extension is really helping to achieve the CReW outcomes and targets; it is also helping to increase awareness and understanding of the project throughout the region.
* Jamaica and Belize have started to repay to the funds
* UNEP will carry on with activities till the end of 2016
* The Terminal evaluation will be divided in two part, the main part which is the first one will be drafted by July 2016 and the second by the end of the year.
* Replication Strategy: back up by the countries, the CReW team has prepared a new GEF initiative call CReW+, which will be posted officially to the GEF in July 2016

 **PCG**Amendment from last year: both the new Technical Specialist and the new Project coordinator were hired in December and November of 2014 respectively and not in 2015 as mentioned in previous year report.**Component 1****PILOT PROJECTS**Since the last reporting period, the status of the project in the pilot countries is as follows.*BELIZE:****Disbursement:***  *Financing Mechanism funded:* The fund was capitalized with US$5M by October 2013.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Retroactive Financing of the Belmopan Sewer Lagoon | *739,333.33* | *739,333.33* |
| Belmopan Sewer System Expansion- Phase 1 | *1,521,300.00* | *827,251.62* |
| Belmopan Sewer System Expansion- Phase 2 | *3,541,500.00* | *0.00* |

 *First Generation Project Design*: For the reporting period US$147,934 by IDB and US$2,180 of Co-financing has been disbursed for the Establishment of the Operational Framework for a Wastewater Revolving Fund in Belize.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Establishment of the Operational Framework for a Wastewater Revolving Fund in Belize | *40,000.00* | *37,250.00* |
| Advisor and Mentor (Fred Gould) | *90,000.00* | *56,684.00* |
| Project Engineer | *60,000.00* | *54,000.00* |
| Bentley's SewerCAD | *9,386.00* |  |
| Quality Energy & Energy Efficiency | *5,075.00* |  |
| Procurement of videos for wastewater collection system operators | *3,000.00* |  |
| Esri's ArcGIS | *49,500.00* |  |
| ISO Lab Technician Certification | *30,000.00* |  |
| ArcGIS Software | *7,000.00* |  |
| Financing Mechanism workshop | *30,000.00* |  |

***Pilot project:*** **Belmopan:**The project is broken down into 3 parts:Belmopan Retroactive Finance – US$739,333.33 – to build three lagoons – completed* December 2013 – Signature of Financial Agreement for Retroactive Financing for the Belmopan Lagoons by the Belize Water Services Limited and the Ministry of Finance. US$739,333.33 was disbursed from the Revolving Fund Account to the Belize Water Services Account. The repayment of the loan started in April, 2015 and the repayment period is 2 years.

Belmopan Sewer Expansion phase 1 – The estimated budget was US$1,137,292.91 but the final cost of this phase was US$827,251.62 – The construction was completed on the 17th of April 2016.* The project consisted of: (i) Procurement and installation of a sewage pumping station. (ii) Procurement and installation of a sewage force mains and gravity sewers mains. (iii) Rehabilitation of a Primary Treatment System: Installation of a flow monitoring and measurement devices; Retrofitting of the return liquor pumping station; Construction of a 6 foot high perimeter fence; and Restoration and rehabilitation of existing roads and driveways. (iv) Construction of a new anaerobic pond. (v) Procurement and installation of a tertiary UV treatment
* The construction phase started on the 9th February 2015
* The estimated completion date is 15th August 2015

Belmopan Sewer Expansions phase 2 – this phase is under procurement. 85% of the materials have been delivered and the bidders for the procurement of works are being evaluated * The project will consist in: (i) Procurement and installation of a collecting system ii) Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade iii) ISO Certified Wastewater Lab
* Propose start date for the construction: August 2016
* Propose completion date for the construction: September 2017

At the end of the Project - Full build-out* Wastewater treatment plant: 4 Lagoons + UV treatment
* Wastewater flow: 3,054 m3/day
* Households: 3,262

***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):**** Fred Gould, International consultant, was hired by BWSL to provide support in the development of the Placencia and as the Design Supervisor for the Belmopan Wastewater Projects.
* A project Engineer was hired by BWSL to provide supervision the construction.
* Different trainings have been proposed to take place in the second half of the year as Bentley's SewerCAD; Quality Energy & Energy Efficiency; Procurement of videos for wastewater collection system operators; Esri's ArcGIS; ISO Lab Technician Certification; ArcGIS Software, financing mechanism course

**Auditing Services for the Project funds:**A no-objection waive was granted to cancel the audit covering the year until 2013 and 2014 as there had been no expenditure. The audit conducted for the year ending March 2015 (covering the period from inception) did not highlight any issues. The audit fot the period April 2015 to March 2016 will be reported in July 2016 and a final audit is expected after January 2017.*GUYANA:*Guyana’s revolving fund is based on a model of public private partnerships, thus the main clients for the Fund were expected to come mostly from the private sector. However, currently the PMU is working on the development of a project with GWI. The proposal is to install a constructed wetlands wastewater treatment facility in the area of the sanitary landfill site at Haags Bosch located behind Eccles Village, East Bank Demerara, approximately 4 miles outside Georgetown, (or alternatively at the small landfill site located at Lusignan, or at the recently closed Le Repentir landfill site located in Georgetown). This facility would be used for the discharging of the septage collected by the septage haulers.***Disbursement:***  Financing Mechanism funded: A first generation pilot project has been identified and the US$3M have been disbursed into the Guyana Wastewater Revolving Fund on October 2015

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Ashmins Fun Park and Resort  | *300,000.00* | *0.00* |
| Others Project  | *2,700,000.00* | *0.00* |

 *First Generation Project Design*: For the reporting period there has been a disbursement of US$61,754 by IDB and US$5,150 of co-financing for the Development of the Policy and Operational Framework of the GWRF; the consultancy for the Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF; Support the PEA/PMU Project Coordinator for a Monitoring and Evaluation Training in Canada.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Consultancy for Development of Policy and Operational Framework of GWRF | *32,740.00* | *47,388.03* |
| Consultancy for the Targeted Promotional Campaign for First Generation Projects of the GWRF | *5,000.00* | *4,353.60* |
| Support the PEA/PMU Project Coordinator for a Monitoring and Evaluation Training in Canada. | *2,000.00* | *1,500.00* |
| CReW Related Overseas Travel | *15,000.00* | *13,662.37* |
| Updating of National Water Quality Regulations | *40,000.00* |  |
| Limited Baseline Study in Support of the Updating of the Commercial and Industrial Effluent Discharge Standards | *40,000.00* |  |
| Technical Design (GWI) | *15,000.00* |  |
| Financial proposal (GWI) | *15,000.00* |  |
| PDS Consultancy (Waste-to-Revenue) to be properly defined | *40,000.00* |  |

***Pilot project:***During the final quarter of 2015, the PEA/PMU was successful in signing a Loan Agreement with the Asmins Fun Park and Resorts Incorporated (Splashmins and Madewini Villas) for the construction of a wastewater treatment plant valued at approximately US$ 300,000. This signalled a readiness for the commencement of the Pilot Financing Mechanism and, as a consequence, the Bank successfully disbursed the PFM resources (US$ 3 million) into the Foreign Currency Bank Account of the GWRF. The loan agreement between MoC and Asmins Fun Park and Resorts Incorporated was signed on September 2015, however the PEA/PMU is still waiting for the submission of the Bank Guarantee in order to disburse the funds.The PEA/PMU continue the work in identify more first generation projects. The following projects are possible first generation projects: The flagship project Demorara Distillery Ltd, Puran Bros Incorporated, Country Wide Disposal Services, Caribbean Containers Incorporated, Windsor Estates, the Guyana Pegasus Hotel and the Gold, Diamond Miners Association, Cevons Waste Management and GWI Pilot Project . Currently the work is focussed on the two most feasible options: * **Cevons Waste Management** – talks with this entity continue. However, the GWRF was unable to move past the stage of assessing the submitted technical and financial information. Requests for re-submission did not materialise in documents that could prove useful in determining the suitability of the entity to receive funding from the GWRF.
* **The Guyana Water Incorporated (GWI)** – talks with this entity have revolved around the possibility of using CReW resources to construct one or multiple pilot wastewater treatment plants. This will be done in collaboration with the Central Housing and Planning Authority. At the time of reporting, talks haven not advanced beyond the preliminary stages.

***Other activities (funded by the project development support budget allocation assigned to each country):**** **The development of the Policy and Operational Framework of the GWRF** was completed by July 31, 2015 and is intended to institutionalise the policy and operational requirements for the medium to long-term operation of the fund. Key considerations included the leveraging of additional financing to increase the size of the fund beyond the initial and al GEF grant and policy decisions to protect the corpus of the fund during its operations.
* **Support to the PEA/PMU Project Coordinator for a Monitoring and Evaluation Training** in Canada, held on June 22 - July 3, 2015.
* **Collaboration with EPA for Updating of National Water Quality Regulations**: In order to improve the enabling environment for wastewater management in Guyana, the GWRF intends to use a portion of the Project Development Support funds to partner with the EPA to update the Water Quality Regulations of Guyana, dealing specifically with the collection and disposal of septic sludge. At the time of this report, the GWRF is awaiting an indication from the Evaluation Committee as to the status of the winning bidder. Thereafter, a contract price will be negotiated prior to the signing of the Consultancy contract. A formal contract should be in place by mid-July, 2016.
* **Collaboration with the EPA/GNBS on the Conducting of a Limited Baseline Study in Support of the Updating of the Commercial and Industrial Effluent Discharge Standards**: The GWRF is collaborating with the EPA and the Guyana National Bureau of Standards to update the Commercial and Industrial Effluent Discharge Standards. Part of the process envisages the conduct of a Limited Baseline Assessment of select parameters. Through the use of the Project Development Support Funds, the GWRF will offer support to this process. To date, the draft Terms of Reference for this activity is being finalised. The tender process should commence by mid-July, 2016

**Auditing Services for the Project funds.**Audits have been completed for the years ending December 2013, 2014 and 2015 by the state auditor. No issues of concern were identified.***JAMAICA:***The current IMF agreement with the Government of Jamaica and the financial rules applied to Government agencies has impacted the ability of the Pilot r project to advance in a timely manner. During the reporting period the commitment letter was signed between the National Commercial Bank (NCB) and the National Water Commission (NWC). The signature of the US$12M loan agreement has not taken place yet, but the Ministry of Finance has already endorsed the new terms of the agreement and currently the lawyers of NCB and NWC are finalizing the last details previous to the signature, which is expected to be done by July 2015. There cannot be disbursements to the Contractors in charge of the works until this signature is secured.***Disbursement:******Financing Mechanism funded:*** The fund was capitalized with US$3M in October 2012 with funds deposited in the National Commercial Bank account and the US$12M Loan Agreement was officially signed on July 29, 2015.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Boscobel & Elletson Flats WWTP | *4,131,683.01* | *3,511,930.56* |
| Wastewater Conveyance Systems | *3,716,312.17* | *1,486,524.87* |
| Wastewater Treatment Plants (Pond Systems) | *4,711,296.96* | *1,665,499.29* |

***First Generation Project Design*:** To date, the disbursement amount is of US$124,807.00 by IDB and US$60,546.79 of Co-financing for the Socio-Economic Survey; Topographic Surveys; Wastewater Characterization Studies and Wastewater Operator Training Program.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Budget Allocated US$** | **Expenditure to dateUS$** |
| Socio-economic analysis survey and report | *40,000.00* | *36,534.15* |
| Consulting services for project development & design studies such Topographic Survey | *40,000.00* | *39,822.42* |
| Consulting services for project development & design studies such Topographic Survey**CO-FINANCING** | *60,000.00* | *60,546.79* |
| Wastewater characterization study (flow & quality) | *20,000.00* | *18,316.10* |
| Wastewater Operator Training Program | *100,000.00* | *30,134.33* |
| Consulting services for Design Supervision Services | *40,000.00* |  |
| Purchase of Wastewater Design Softwares | *18,800.00* |  |
| Trainer for Wastewater Design Software | *5,000.00* |  |
| Purchase of Wastewater related equipment  | *20,000.00* |  |

***Pilot project:***During the reporting period, the design and construction works have been started and the progress is as follows:* **Boscobel Elletson Flats Wastewater Treatment Plant Replacement Project**. Award of Contract to VINCI Construction in the sum of US$4,131,683.01. The overall design phase of the project was approximately 95% and in regards to the construction phase the overall progress is estimated at 72.5% with Boscobel calculated at 80% complete and Elletson Flats at 65%. The estimated completion date is January 2017.
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Conveyance Systems.** Award of Contract to Surrey Paving & Aggregate Co in the sum of US$3,716,312.17. The preliminary design reports for the 3 facilities were submitted during May 2016 and are being reviewed by the NWC. It is estimated to start the works in September 2016 and finalize by April 2017.
* **Design and Build of 3 Wastewater Treatment Plants (Pond Systems**). . Award of Contract to Surrey Paving & Aggregate Co in the sum of US$4,711,296.96. The preliminary design reports for the 3 facilities were submitted during May 2016 and are being reviewed by the NWC. It is estimated to start the works in September 2016 and finalize by May 2017.
* **Design and Build of 5 Wastewater Treatment Plants** **(Mechanical Systems)**. Due to NWC’s financial constraints the procurement process was annulled at the beginning of 2015.
* **Provision of Engineering Consultancy and Works Supervision Services for Rehabilitation of eight (8) Wastewater Treatment Plants.** The process was annulled because the high cost was deemed to be exorbitant.

The supervision will be done differently, in- house and a procurement process will be opened to hire one or more professional engineer consultants able to review the design. The CV’s has been presented to the NWC Procurement Committee for endorsement as at the end of June 2016, and it is expected however that report will be presented to the Procurement Committee by second week of July 2016 for an award of contract by first week in August 2016.***Other activities (funded by the project development support):**** **The environmental consultant to assist the PMU** on March 17, 2014Dr. Nilza Smith was awarded a JMD$9,936,000.00 contract. The following work has been carried out:
* Wastewater characterization and flow measurements associated with Boscobel and Elleston Flats WWTPs were completed on December 18, 2014 (having started on December 4, 2014).
* NEPA approval for the environmental permit and License application for the works at Boscobel and Elleston Flats WWTPs and the monthly reports relating to the construction of Boscobel & Elleston Flats required by NEPA and the Ministry of Health.
* The preparation of the Closure Plans for the 3 WWTPs which will be decommissioned and conveyance systems constructed were finalized in April 2016 and the requisite submissions made to NEPA in first week of April 2016. In addition to the necessary licensure and permit application documents were finalized during the same period and also forwarded to NEPA for the requisite approvals.
* **Wastewater Training Programme for Operators.** The Training Programme was officially launched with the first cohort of seven students on June 3, 2014 and ended on August 21, 2014. The second cohort of five students began on October 16, 2014 and ended on December 19, 2015. The 3 and 4 cohort took place form March 5, 2015 to October 15, 2015 (cohort 3 and cohort 4) which saw 50 students participating from various entities. There was a delay to the start of the 5 cohort of the programme which was scheduled for January 28, 2016. However due to preparations by UTech for the launching Waste Management Centre for Monday, March 14, 2016 as part of our Faculty Week 2016 celebrations the programme was resumed on May 26, 2016 and was to ends on July 29, 2016.
* A different activities have been proposed to take place the second half of the year as the Purchase of Wastewater Design Software; Trainer for Wastewater Design Software; Purchase of Wastewater related equipment.

**Auditing Services for the Project funds.** Audits have been completed for the year ending March 2015 and 2016 and no issues of concern were identified. As a result of the 18 months extension an additional financial audit would be needed. A request for proposal was submitted to auditing firm KPMG in February 2016. To execute the additional Audited Financial Statements for the Project for the periods April 1, 2015- March 31, 2016 and April 1, 2016 to January 26, 2017 KPMG offered a price proposal in the total sum of J$4,263,900.00 (i.e.J$2,306,700.00 and J$1,957,200.00 respectively). ***Trinidad and Tobago:***The fund was capitalized with US$ 2M by December 17, 2014. Last year elections and the consequent change in government was a milestone for the future development of the project, details of changes are summarize below.***Disbursement:*** *Financing Mechanism funded*: After continuous discussions previous to the 2015 elections among the Ministry of Finance (MOF), WASA and the IDB no agreement was achieved on how to operate the fund, in particular, the MOF indicated that it is unable to repay a loan on behalf of WASA and has not advised on a mechanism to achieve the objective of the financing for it to revolve.Followed to the election period, the new Government (GORTT) informed the IDB of its plan to change the Executing Agency from the MOF to the Ministry of Public Utilities (MPU), in addition, the MPU is currently working on the mechanism for the operation of the Revolving Fund.  *First Generation Project Design: To date there has been no disbursement.*-***Pilot Project:*** The Water And Sewage Authority (WASA) has been working on the development of the Pilot Project in Scarborough, which encompasses the Refurbishment of the Scarborough Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Construction of Property Connections to the Scarborough Sewerage Network. * The Scarborough WWTP contract was signed and WASA. Currently, the contract for the Rehabilitation of the Scarborough WWTP has been executed and only awaits the allocation of the financing. The IDB sent a letter to the GORTT informing of an extension up to September 2016 for the GORTT to demonstrate commitment to the change of executing agency as the trigger to start of works. The CReW funds allocated for this project is US$1,328,281.
* The Scarborough Connections Bid Evaluation process was completed by the end of June 2015. The amount allocated by CReW for this project was US$671,719. The IDB carried out a socio-economic analysis of this proposal too but high internal rate of return prevented the IDB to give the non-objection, as a result this project was eventually rejected and WASA advised to propose others projects, something that WASA is currently working on.

***Other activities (funded by the project development support):*** *N/A*The following highlights the major progress under the two Components executed by UNEP CAR/RCU.**Component 2**Capacity BuildingGEF CReW continued to provide national capacity building through Small Scale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) that supported capacity building and policy, institutional and legal reforms for wastewater management at the national and local levels. Contracts (SSFAs) were developed with Antigua and Barbuda, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, St Vincent and the Grenadines during the reporting period. Several problems were encountered with the initial disbursement of funds to these partners following the implementation of a new administrative/accounting platform (UMOJA) in mid-2015. This resulted in delays of payments to all of these partners. Others issues affecting payments were incorrect/incomplete banking information provided by partners which further compounded the problem resulting in some payments being rejected. The following is a status of the progress of SSFA Capacity Building Contracts.Capacity building in Wastewater Management – Antigua and Barbuda * The contract was signed and first payment disbursed in the second half of 2015 to facilitate activities promoting wastewater reuse and financial tariff reform. Activities were completed in the first half of 2016 and a final report is expected by August 2016.

Capacity development in sanitation for water and sewage system managers – Costa Rica* The contract was signed in the second half of 2015 but suffered from significant delays. Payment was eventually facilitated through UNDP Costa Rica due to the Ministry’s inability to receive funds. This took place in the first half of 2016 and activities are expected to be completed by December 2016.

Municipal strengthening for the treatment and management of wastewater - Guatemala* The contract was signed in the first half of 2016 and disbursement made to allow capacity building activities to start and are expected to be completed by December 2016.

Establishment of environmental baseline for domestic wastewater that affect the coastal areas – Honduras* The contract was signed in the second half of 2015 but delayed due to unresolved banking issues. These issues were resolved in the first half of 2016 and activities to be completed by December 2016.

Increased capacity for wastewater Management within Jamaica* The SSFA contract was signed in the second half of 2015 and following an initial delay was processed through the local UNDP office and payment made. Capacity building activities to be completed by December 2016.

Resource Valuation Training – Panama The valuation studies aim to improve local and national capacity for wastewater management. * Contract finalization was initially delayed due to inability to identify a partner to assist with the activities and receipt of funds resulting from the Ministry’s inability to receive funds. This was resolved in the first half of 2016 and disbursement made to allow completion of all activities by December 2016.

Enhance local awareness and national capacity for wastewater management – St Vincent and the Grenadines* The contract drafted but never signed due to unresolved issues between UNEP and the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines over a previous contract. These funds were reallocated to the development of CReW+ and promotion and awareness of the results of the GEF CReW Project.

Economic Resource ValuationUnder a contract between UNEP and the World Resources Institute, Pilot Resource Valuation Studies were conducted at three (3) sites in two participating countries – Panama and Trinidad and Tobago involving local agencies in both countries.The experiences from the development and application of this resource valuation methodology for use in wastewater management planning were shared with the GEF CReW participating countries at the Regional Resource Valuation Workshop held in August 2015 within the framework of the Caribbean Water and Wastewater Conference.. The study examined the trade-offs between ecosystem and human health and the costs of investing in improved domestic wastewater management for three (3) pilot sites which were selected from within Trinidad and Tobago and Panama, based on input from the in-country executing focal points (Environment Management Agency - EMA in the case of Trinidad and Tobago and the Ministry of Environment in the case of Panama). The study sites were as follows:1. Trinidad and Tobago – the Buccoo Reef/Bon Accord area (Southwestern Tobago) and the Borough of Chaguanas (near the Caroni Swamp in Trinidad)
2. Panama – Isla Colon in Bocas del Toro Province

The overall aim of the valuation studies was to improve the regional understanding of the connections between wastewater treatment and human and ecosystem health and to enhance the capacity within the Wider Caribbean Region for conducting economic resource valuations related to wastewater management investments and to use the findings to develop a general economic resource valuation approach which could be applied in any Caribbean country.CARPHA Environmental Health ConferenceThe Conference was held in Trinidad and Tobago from 18-20 November 2015 in Saint Lucia and the GEF CReW Project supported participation of representatives from UNEP CAR/RCU and the national CReW focal point from Saint Vincent and the Grenadines at this Conference. The objective of the conference was to discuss Environmental Health issues in the context of a range of social and economic pressures and climate change. A strong theme of this Conference was also developing partnerships and collaborative approaches to addressing Environmental Health problems. Presentations were delivered on the results of CReW and the development of the CReW+ project.GEF CReW National Wastewater Management Workshop (Jamaica)This workshop was organized by the GEF CReW Project on behalf of Jamaica and in collaboration with the National Environment Planning Agency (NEPA), the national CReW Focal Point. It was held 23-24 November 2015 in Kingston, Jamaica. Seventy-seven (77) persons from different sectors participated in the workshop; this included UNEP-CEP staff and project personnel.The objectives of the Workshop were to:1. Share information on the status on the pilot project being implemented in Jamaica,
2. Conceptualize a replication strategy for the pilot project,
3. Involve public and private sector stakeholders in the formulation of relevant projects for further GEF funding.

**Component 3:****The fourth and final Project Steering Committee Meeting** was held 7-9 July 2015 in Antigua Guatemala in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. The objective of this meeting was to review the activities and achievements of the project for 2014 and to consider the workplan and budget for 2015. It also included two Knowledge Exchanges in which country expriences and lessons learnt in implementation of the Project were shared. The recommendations of the GEF CReW Replication Workshop (May 4-8, 2015) were also considered. Thirty-eight (38) persons participated in the meeting. **The Regional Resource Valuation Workshop** was held 23-24 August 2015 in Miami, USA. The objective of this workshop was to discuss and disseminate the results of resource valuation studies conducted in Panama and Trinidad and Tobago. The main research question was *“What are the benefits to ecosystems and human health compared to the costs of investing in improving domestic wastewater management?”.* The methodology used was presented and discussed and participating countries began work on national planning exercises that could apply the methodology to decision making.. The report is available at <http://www.gefcrew.org/index.php/resources#resources6>. Thirty-one (31) persons including project personnel participated in the workshop. GEF CReW participated in and supported the **24th Conference of the Caribbean Water and Wastewater Association (CWWA)** was held 24-26 August 2015 in Miami, USA. The theme was *“Improving the Quality of Life through Water and Waste Management Solutions”.* Eight GEF CReW (8) funded persons participated in the Conference. Five (5) technical presentations were made at the Conference based on the Project’s work in the past year as follows: 1. Wastewater Management Plans: Can we improve the sector without them? – Christopher Corbin, AMEP Programme Officer
2. The Enemy within – Development without Treatment: Making a case for Improved Wastewater Management in Guyana – Guyana Rensforde Joseph, Guyana Pilot Project Technical Specialist
3. Economic Valuation of the Benefits of Improved Wastewater Treatment in the Caribbean – Lauretta Burke, World Resources Institute (WRI)
4. Improving the Water Quality in the Waterways of Guyana: The Lasting Legacy of the GEF CReW Project – Angela Franklin, Senior Environmental Officer, Water Quality Unit, Environmental Protection Agency, Guyana
5. Innovative Financing Mechanisms – Why the CReW is not only about Constructing Wastewater Treatment Plants – Marlon Daniels, Guyana Pilot Project Coordinator

 The Project’s exhibit highlighted key lessons learned in Components 2 and 3: Reforms for Wastewater Management and Communications, Outreach and Training. The need to put wastewater on the national agenda and to pay more attention to the enabling environment have been named by participating countries as key issues to be addressed and this was highlighted. **The 11th High-Level Forum (HLF)** which was held 27-28 August 2015 and saw collaboration among GEF CReW, UNEP-CAR/RCU, CWWA and the Global Water Partnership-Caribbean (GWP-C). The theme of the forum was *“Connecting Water to Climate, Economic Growth and Development Within the Post-2015 Development Agenda”.* Caribbean Ministers with responsibility for water resources management from several countries participated. Christopher Corbin addressed the Ministers on challenges and opportunities for improving wastewater management in the region on the behalf of the GEF CReW and UNEP’s Caribbean Environment Programme. GEF CReW held its **Final Regional Policy and Enforcement Workshop,** 15 – 19 February in Trinidad and Tobago. This focused on the sharing pf experiences related to the development and implementation of policies, laws and regulations concerning wastewater management. It was attended by 12 participating countries. Activities included review and discussion of both the “Regional Wastewater Management Policy Toolkit and Template” and the “Guidelines for Developing, Reviewing and/or Updating National Wastewater Management Plans”, and consideration of Treated Wastewater as a Resource. The GEF CReW Project participated in the **Eighth GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (GEF IWC 8)**, 9 – 13 May 2016 in Sri Lanka. IWC8 is organized under the theme *Scaling Up GEF IW Investments from Source to Sea and Beyond in the Context of Achieving the SDGs*. CReW was represented in several aspects of the Conference, including: * **The IWC8 Film Festival:** “The Value of Action” a 12-minute long short video documentary which introduces the methodology of Resource Valuation developed for use in wastewater decision making. It was one of the five films selected for festival screening.
* **The Innovation Marketplace:** GEF CReW’s poster displayed results, unique approaches and catalytic outcomes, taking replication and sustainability into consideration.
* **Portfolio Solutions Exchange:** TheProject Coordinator made a short presentation on GEF CReW and CReW+.
* **Panel Discussion participation: Mobilizing Finance and Scaling up Investment:** Good Practices towards meeting the SDGs: The Project Coordinator participated.
* **Panel Discussion participation:** The AMEP Programme Officer participated.

  **Publications** Three (3) Quarterly newsletters, “CReW’s Lines”, were completed: September and December 2015, and March 2016 issues; the June 2016 issue is in preparation. Three new briefing sheets were published and disseminated in July: 1) Putting Wastewater on the National Agenda; 2) Rethinking Wastewater for Drought Relief/Mitigation, and 3) CReW Lessons Learned: Components 2 and 3.A new four (4) poster series titled *“Changing for Better”* was produced in August for the CWWA exhibit, along with supporting handouts. Promotional t-shirts, pins and cards with educational messages were also designed, produced and disseminated at CWWA and the High Level Session held in late August. Project challenges, achievements and lessons learnt were summarized in a document titled *“Charting a New Course for Wastewater Management in the Wider Caribbean Region: GEF CReW’s Journey”.***Media releases:** Between July 2015 and June 2016, the following media releases were prepared and distributed:* GEF CReW highlights Lessons Learned through the establishment of Sustainable Financial Mechanisms and Capacity Building for better Wastewater Management at the 24th Annual CWWA Conference and Exhibition, August 2015
* Resort company first to take advantage of low interest rates offered by the Guyana Wastewater Revolving Fund, September 2015
* First generation of wastewater projects to benefit as Jamaica Credit Enhancement Facility is set in motion, October 2015
* Valuing the Costs and Benefits of Improved Wastewater Management: Introducing a Pilot Study and Resources for use in the Wider Caribbean Region, October 2015
* Challenges and Progress shared by participating countries at GEF CReW’s Final Regional Workshop, February 2016
* GEF CReW participates in the 8th Global Environmental Facility Biennial International Waters Conference, May 2016.

 **Websites and Knowledge Management Platform:** Maintenance and updating of the Project website continued, and the process of conversion of the website to the Drupal platform, as required by UNEP to enable their continued hosting of it, was initiated. All final information products produced in the reporting period were published on the website. The project’s Facebook page, saw steady growth in popularity. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets[[14]](#footnote-15)** | The project is wholly consistent with the International Waters Focal Area Strategy of GEF-4. It contributes to Strategic Objective 1 (**SO 1** – To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority water concerns). It also contributes to the initiation of actions consistent with its Strategic Objective 2 (**SO-2** – to play a catalytic role in addressing trans boundary water concerns by assisting countries to utilize the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed). The proposed project is compiled under **Strategic Program 2** (reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA) through: (1) the design and execution of financial innovative mechanism(s) for supporting stakeholders to establish or expand domestic wastewater management systems based on realistic, cost-effective and environmentally sound measures therefore reducing stress onto coastal and marine environments and improving ecosystems functioning for increased livelihood of participating nations; as well as (2) through supporting national and local policy, legal and institutional reforms to reduce land-based pollution. |

# ****PROJECT OBJECTIVE****

*State the global environmental objective(s) of the project[[15]](#footnote-16)*

|  |
| --- |
| In the context of the Cartagena Convention and its Protocol on Marine Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities. The objectives of the project are: (1) To establish innovative, financing mechanisms for cost-effective and sustainable financing of wastewater management in the WCR; (2) to facilitate policy discussions, strengthen legislative frameworks; and (3) to facilitate regional dialogue and knowledge exchange with the key stakeholders in the WCR.  |

*Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s).* ***Describe any significant environmental or other changes (results) attributable to project implementation.*** *Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the* ***objectives*** *or specific project* ***outcomes*** *(not more than 300 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| The key issues with regards to project performance still remain the same: (i) effectiveness of the national pilot PMUs, (ii) inordinate delays in finalising the Trinidad and Tobago agreement (iii) political considerations delaying decision making, (iv) Inadequate engagement and performance of NFPs and (v) readiness of first generation projects for funding and (v) delays in finalizing agreement on national capacity building activities in all countries. Based on the original projections at the commencement of the project, it seems there are delays in meeting some performance targets. However, in most case activities have commenced and can be regarded as work in progress. Because the management of wastewater involves so many national agencies, agreement of priorities is often difficult and this further delays implementation at the national level. As a result of all the different regional activities under components two and three, there is visible increase in awareness and advocacy for improving wastewater management in the participating countries.The project has strengthened institutional collaboration throughout the region. The Midterm evaluation was carried during the second half of 2013; the findings were presented during the third Project Steering Committee Meeting in January 2014. The PSC agreed to possibly extend the project by one year to one year and a half contingent on the identification of additional budget resources which will allow the project to achieve its main objectives including the demonstration of the financing mechanisms. The funds needed are estimated to be US$ 547 674 for one year extension or US$ 806 911 for a one and a half years.  |

*Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document [[16]](#footnote-17)(not more than 200 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| The project is progressing towards supporting the GEF Strategic Program 2 for reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal through the design and execution of financial innovative mechanism(s) and through supporting national wastewater management reforms and strengthening institutional capacity. An at least on year extension is needed to demonstrate the financing mechanisms. In terms of waste water management reforms, while it is unlikely that many reforms will be completely implemented – the templates to achieve same will be fully in place. In addition resource economic studies which will inform and strengthen the policy dialogue will be in place. The project remains unable able to play any significant role in influencing Strategic Objective 2 (SO-2) – which deals with addressing trans boundary water concerns.  |

# RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[17]](#footnote-18) and IDB Team Leader will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager and IDB Team Leader will subsequently enter their own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. 2.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Description of indicator[[18]](#footnote-19)** | **Baseline level[[19]](#footnote-20)** | **Mid-term target[[20]](#footnote-21)** | **End-of-project target** | **Level at 30 June 2016** | **Progress rating [[21]](#footnote-22)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[22]](#footnote-23)**In the context of the Cartagena Convention and its LBS Protocol , to pilot revolving financing mechanisms and their related wastewater management reforms that can be subsequently established as feasible instruments to provide sustainable financing for the implementation of environmentally sound and cost-effective wastewater management measures. | 1. Pilot Financial Mechanisms Tested (PFM)
 | 0 PFM |  | 4 PFM | 4 PFM | S |
| 1. National legal, institutional and policy reforms adopted and implemented.
 | 0 Countries( Limited wastewater management reforms) |  | 5 Countries adopt wastewater management reforms. | 5 Countries with improved policy  | S |
| **Outcome 1:**Improved access to financing for wastewater management | Number of Pilot Financing Mechanisms created | 0 PFMs |  | 4 PFMs* Belize
* Guyana
* Jamaica
* Trinidad and Tobago
 | 4 PFMs* Belize
* Guyana
* Jamaica
* Trinidad and Tobago
 | HS |
| Projects generate repayments into the Pilot Financing Mechanisms | 0 PFMs generating repayments |  | 3 PFMs generating repayments | 2 PFMs generating repayment* Belize and Jamaica

Although the project has not been achieved the target, many lessons learnt have been gathered  | S |
| **Outcome 2:**Successful development of first generation projects. | Increase in populations with access to improved wastewater treatment facilities (Final baseline and target to be determined in the first year) | 0 Households |  | Population with improved access to wastewater treatment:Belize – 14,679Jamaica – 10,318T&T – 12,044Guyana – 385 | Population with improved access to wastewater treatment:Belize – 14,679Jamaica – 10,318  | S |
| **Outcome 3:**Improvements in technical capacity for project implementation. | PEAs develop and apply Operation Manuals(OM) | 0 OM |  | 4 OMs | 4 OMs* Belize
* Guyana
* Jamaica
* T&T
 | S |
| **Outcome 4:**Reduced land based pollution to terrestrial and coastal waters from untreated wastewater | Volume: total annual volume (m3) of wastewater treated (compliance with national discharge standards) | Belize - 0 m3Jamaica – 0m3T&T 0m3Guyana – 0m3 |  | Belize - 3,054 m3/d Jamaica –3,723 m3/dT&T – 2,909 m3/dGuyana– 64 | Belize - 3,054 m3/d Jamaica –3,723 m3/d | S |
| Number of countries that have developed reforms to support implementation of the LBS Protocol. | 0 countries |  | 8 countries. | 3 – baseline studies were completed and capacity support is being provided to enable reforms to take place.  | MS |
| Number or plants complying with effluent standards. (Improvements in the effluent quality indicators) (biological oxygen demand (BOD) levels, nutrient levels, faecal coliforms, and suspended solids) | 0 plants |  | 7 plantsNational standards and where absent LBS protocol usedfor domestic wastewater effluent limits for the appropriate class of water, where appropriate. [[23]](#footnote-24)Class 1 Waters:BOD5 – 30 mg/LTSS – 30 mg/LpH – 5-10Faecal Coliforms – 200 mpn/100 mlClass 2 Waters:BOD5 – 150 mg/LTSS – 150 mg/LpH – 5-10Faecal Coliforms – n/a | 9 plants 1 Wastewater treatment plant in Belize8 Wastewater treatment plant in Jamaica  | S |
| **Outcome 5:**Improved local and national capacity for wastewater management. | Number of institutions participating in capacity building activities for wastewater management | 0 Institutions |  | 7 institutions | 8 institutions | HS |
| **Outcome 6:**Improved stakeholder awareness about acceptable, sustainable and cost-effective wastewater management solutions | Number of participating organizations in awareness building activities | 0 organizations |   | 40 organizations. | 40 organizations | S |
| **Outcome 7:**Increased demands for piloting FMs in the WCR. | Requests for establishment for FMs in WCR. | 0 Requests |  | 3 Requests  | 4 (from Costa Rica, Saint Lucia, Panama, Antigua) | HS |
| **Outcome 8:**Increased use and management of information on wastewater management in the WCR. | Percentage of workshops participants that perceive that their knowledge has increased. | 0 % |  | 75% | 75% | HS |
| Establishment of new information sharing mechanism. | No mechanism. |  | 1 mechanism | A new website developed and launched & currently enhanced with visualization tools  | S |
| Number of hits on the web site. | 0 hits/year |  | 800 hits/year | 5,135 hits/year | HS |
| **Outcome 9:**Effective project monitoring and oversight | Timely submission of M&E reports by the EAs | N/A |  | 75% submitted on time |  75% | S |
| Members of the Steering committee participating in the meetings | 0 % |  | 75% | 93% - PSC meetings are well attended  | HS |
| **Outcome 10:**Effective project management and coordination | Grade obtained at medium and terminal evaluation. | 0 |  | Positive at medium and terminal |  Overall Satisfactory  | S  |
| **Outcome 11:**Improved policy, legal and institutional frameworks | Number of countries with improved policy, legal and/or institutional frameworks | 0 |  | 5 countries | 5 Countries with improved policy  | S |
| **Outcome 12:**Strengthened Capacity for wastewater management in the WCR | Numbers of persons trained on selected wastewater management issues | 0 |  | 500 | Over 500 | HS |
| **Outcome 13:**Increased awareness of wastewater and sanitation issues by selected target groups | Awareness of wastewater issues. | TBD (2013) |  | TBD | KAP baseline surveys done for 2 different groups (Media, Regional Waste Water fraternity (e.g. CWWA) pending identification of a rural community  | S |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager and IDB Team Leader. Please add columns to reflect all prior year ratings)*

| **FY2012 rating** | **FY2013 rating** | **FY2014 rating** | **FY2015 rating** | **FY2016 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S | MS | S | S | **HS** | The project has experienced slight delays due to external factors which were not in the direct control of the PCG. These were in the main due to the underestimation by the pilot countries of the level of in-kind commitments and efforts to get the project going. Although there is clear evidence that the project will meet its set objective, the project timeframe is still working against us. The MTE therefore suggested at least one year extension to meet the project set objectives.2016The rating has been upraised from S to HS: During the last 5 year of implementation, there has been a change in how governments in the region approach wastewater management, in general, the profile of wastewater management has been raised and therefore Governments are taking this issue more seriously, this by itself is enough to go for an overall HS rating but in addition, the main objective of the project has been achieved, given the pilot nature of the CReW this can also be considered a great achievement  |

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating

| **Action(s) to be taken** | **By whom?** | **By when?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Based on the findings of the MTE, the PCG developed a revised plan of work for which additional financial resources are currently being secured. However, it must be noted that while targets and outputs may be revised the key outcome of the project will be achieved. 1. improved access to financing for wastewater management;
2. successful development of first generation projects; and
3. improvements in technical capacity for project implementation
 | PCG | December 2016 |
| **Outcome 1:**Improved access to financing for wastewater management |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:**Successful development of first generation projects. |  |  |
| **Outcome 4:**Reduced land based pollution to terrestrial and coastal waters from untreated wastewater |  |  |

* 1. Project implementation progress

| **Outputs [[24]](#footnote-25)** | **Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)** | **Expected completion date [[25]](#footnote-26)** | **Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2016 (%)** | **Comments if variance[[26]](#footnote-27). Describe any problems in delivering outputs** | **Progress rating[[27]](#footnote-28) 12-13** | **Progress rating[[28]](#footnote-29) 13-14** | **Progress rating[[29]](#footnote-30) 14-15** | **Progress rating[[30]](#footnote-31) 15-16** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1:** *(SC. I.1)* Financing mechanisms established |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| Activity 1: Financing mechanisms established. | 100% | October 2015 | 100% | Guyana - the US$3M have been disbursed into the Guyana Wastewater Revolving Fund on October 2015. | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 2:** (SC I.2.1) First generation projects designed |  |  |  |  | MS | MS | S | S |
| Activity 2: First generation projects designed | 50% | October 2015 | 100% | Guyana has selected a first generation project. | MS | MS | S | S |
| **Output 3:** (SC I.3.1) Technical capacity provided |  |  |  |  | HS | HS | HS | HS |
| Activity 3: Technical specialists hired | 100% | 31 December 2011 | 100% |  | HS | HS | HS | HS |
| **Output 4:** (SC II.1.1) Documented policy & legal reforms & institutional strengthening for wastewater management at national and local levels |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.1.1 Activity 4: Policy templates and tools kit developed. | 100% | March 2014 | 100% |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.1.2 Activity 5: Template for Wastewater management plan developed. | 90% | March 2015 | 100% |  | S | S | S | S |
| Activity 6 : Assess national capacity of participating countries for wastewater management through baseline assessment | 100% | December 2012 | 100% |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.1.3 Activity 7: National capacity development plans implemented. | 75% | June 2016 | 100% | Plans implemented in Costa Rica, Guatemala and Honduras during the first half of 2016. | S | S | S | S |
| SC N/A II.1.1.4 Activity: Regional Experience Sharing Workshop held | 0% | December 2015 | 0% |  | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Output 5:** (SC II.1.2) Country reports demonstrate improved implementation of the LBS Protocol, and in particular its Annex III on domestic wastewater |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.2.1 Activity 8: Report on compliance of LBS protocol prepared for English and Spanish speaking Countries. |  100 % | February 2014 | 100% | Report in English and Spanish Speaking countries completed. | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.2.2 Activity 9: Guidelines for compliance with LBS protocol developed. | 100% | December 2013 | 100% |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC N/A II.1.2.3 Activity: Regional workshop on wastewater treatment technology held |  |  |  | Removal of this activity/output was approved during 3rd PSCM January 2014. But done under Activity number 19  | N/A  | N/A (HS in Activity 19)  | N/A (HS in Activity 19) | N/A (HS in Activity 19) |
| Activity 10 : Implement national capacity building activities for LBS Protocol compliance in selected countries | 70% | December 2015 | 70% | This is being done through national capacity building SSFAs. | N/A | S | S |  |
| Activity 11 : Regional Workshop on compliance with LBS Protocol | 100% | June 2014 | 100% | Done Through the second LBS STAC World Bank Technical Work Shop | N/A | S | S | S |
| **Output 6:** (SC II.1.3) Valuation for selected coastal resources in two pilot countries developed |  |  |  |  | MS | MS | S | S |
| SC II.1.3.1 Activity 12: Resource valuation reports  | 50% | December 2015 | 100% | Resource valuation for three areas, one in Panama and two in Trinidad and Tobago. | MS | MS | S | S |
| SC II.1.3.2 Activity 13: Regional training workshops on resource valuation held | 0% | August 2015 | 100 % | Workshop held in August 2015 and support was provided to the High-Level Forum of the Caribbean Water and Waste-water Association in August 2015. | N/A | N/A | N/A | S |
| **Output 7:** (SC II.1.4) Documented improvements in financial capacity of wastewater management utilities and service providers |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC N/A II.1.4.1 Activity: Survey on best practices for funding wastewater utilities completed |  |  |  | Removal of this activity/output was approved during 3rd PSCM January 2014Baseline assessment and work of UNEP intern provided much of this information, so additional consultancy no longer required. Funds to be used to support Revised activities 14 and 15 | S | S | N/A | N/A |
| Activity: Cost recovery models tested |  |  |  | Removal of this activity/output was approved during 3rd PSCM January 2014 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Activity: Regional workshops on cost recovery models held |  |  |  | Removal of this activity/output was approved during 3rd PSCM January 2014 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SC II.1.4.2 Activity 14 Revised: Financial management rate and tariff setting  | 30% | June 2016 | 100% | The activity was done in Antigua and was completed by June 2016. | N/A | MS | MS | S |
| SC II.1.4.3 Activity 15 Revised: Targeted training courses for utilities held | 100% | December 2014 | 100% | Being done in collaboration with CDB and United Nations Institute for on-line courses. | N/A | MS | S | S |
| **Output 8:** (SC II.1.5) Guidelines and best practice modalities for civil society involvement in wastewater management |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.5.1 Activity 16: Workshop for training of facilitators. | 100% | December 2013 | 100% | Completed in May 2013. | HS | HS | HS | HS |
| SC II.1.5.2 Activity 17: Stakeholder consultation workshop held. | 75% | December 2015 | 100% | Three (3) workshops done in 2015 in Jamaica, Panama and Trinidad and Tobago. | S | MS | S | S |
| **Output 9:** (SC II.1.6) Detailed implementation plan (resources, budget & timetable) for a Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (ME&R) system |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | MS | S |
| SC II.1.6.1 Activity 18: Wastewater ManagementM&E database developed. | 10 % | June 2016 | 100% | The activity was done together with activity 39.  | N/A | N/A | MS | S |
| SC N/A II.1.6.2 Activity: National systems demonstrated. | 10% | December 2015 |  | Removed in PSCM 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Output 10:** (SC II.1.7) Training programmes for wastewater professionals |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.7.1 Activity 19: Number of regional and National workshops on different aspects of wastewater management held. | 80% | December 2015 | 100% | Includes also activity 10, removed from output 5 above as per 3rd PSC decision. Three (3) workshops achieved in December 2015: Governance and Sanitation / CARPHA / CAWASA. | S | HS | HS | HS |
| SC II.1.7.2 Activity 20: Number of partnerships for delivery of training. | 100% | December 2014 | 100% | Partnerships with Water Center and CDB established. Sanitation and Governance Training held Antigua Feb 2015 Discussion ongoing with UWI.  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.7.3 Activity 21: Number of courses outline adapted. | 75% | December 2015 | 100% | Course adapted with Water Center and CBD.Activity was merged with activity 7: National capacity development plans implemented. | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.1.7.4 Number of online courses developed | 100% | December 2014 | 100% | Water Center courses1. Wastewater Treatment Fundamentals2.Commercial Management 3. Diploma in Energy and Water Efficiency for Water Utilities | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 11:** (SC II.2.1) Regional toolkit of templates for wastewater management drafting instructions |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.2.1.1 Activity 22: Drafting instructions template developed. | 100% | December 2014 | 100% | Activity was merged with activity 7: National capacity development plans implemented. | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.2.1.2 Activity 23: Wastewater regulations drafted in Selected Countries. | 60% | December 2015 | 100% | Indicator to be based on demands and readiness of countries to draft new legislation and regulations. The activity was completed in Antigua and in St Vincent and the Grenadines.  | N/A | MS | MS | S |
| **Output 12:** (SC II.2.2) Training workshops for enforcement personnel |  |  |  |  | S | S | MS | MS |
| SC II.2.2.1 Activity 24: No. of training workshops provided for enforcement personnel | 40% | December 2016 | 66% | These are National Workshop being done through SSFAs. Two (2) remaining workshops, one for the Spanish countries and one for Jamaica | S | S | MS | MS |
| Activity 25: Conduct Training workshop for Judiciary | 100% | December 2013 | 100% |  | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 13:** (SC II.2.3) Regional training on enforcement of wastewater management legislation |  |  |  |  | S | S | MS | S |
| SC II.2.3.1 Activity 26: Design and Conduct 2 regional training seminars for legal officers, drafters and policy makers (1 in English and 1 in Spanish). | 5% | February 2016 | 100% | The 2 workshops will be joined for English and Spanish countries based on PSC decision and IACG. Held in February in Trinidad and Tobago  | S | S | MS | S |
| **Output 14:** (SC II.3.1) Increased focus on wastewater management issues by national leadership from improved awareness of wastewater issues. |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.3.1.1 Activity 27: KAP Regional surveys performed | 100% | December 2014 | 100% | KAP surveys done at CWWA and for the media | N/A | S | S | S |
| SC II.3.1.2 Activity 28: Communication products developed. | 85% | December 2015 | 100% | New communication products – videos, newsletter, brochures | S | S | HS | HS |
| **Output 15:** (SC II.3.2) Increased coverage of wastewater and sanitation issues in the media from improved awareness of wastewater issues |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC II.3.2.1 Activity 29: Number of stories in the media published. | 75% | December 2016 | 90% | The activity is achieved but because of the extension period of the project, the number of stories will be published until the end of the project. | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 16:** **(**SC II.3.3) Increased awareness of wastewater and sanitation issues in selected communities |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | MS | S |
| SC II.3.3.1 Activity 30: Communication strategy for rural communities developed. | 10% | June 2016 | 100% | Done in Antigua and St. Vincent | N/A | N/A | MS | S |
| SC II.3.3.2 Activity 31: Rural communication campaign on sanitation implemented. | 5% | June 2016 | 100% | Activity achieved in only one country (Antigua). St Vincent to be reallocated for promotion in CReW+ | N/A | N/A | MS | S |
| **Output 17:** (SC II.3.4) Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. |  |  |  | Scaling down of the output based on PSC recommendation – now in the process of dialogue with CXC | S | S | MS | MS |
| SC N/A II.3.4.1 Activity 32: Inventory of wastewater education in selected countries conducted. | 20% | December 2015 |  | Removed in PSCM 4 | S | S | MS | N/A |
| SC II.3.4.2 Activity 33: Guidelines for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into curricula developed. | 5% | December 2015 | 5% | Ongoing dialogue with CXC. It was moved to the second half of 2016 because there were another priorities, said in the PSC | S | S | MS | MS |
| SC N/A II.3.4.3 Activity: Teaching modules in support of wastewater education for use on-line developed and tested. |  | December 2015 | 5% | Eliminated in January 2014 PSCM 3 | N/A | S | N/A | N/A |
| **Output 18**: (SC III.1) PFMs, **demos** and overall project activities, documented through lessons learned, experience notes, and feature articles, that highlight the potential for replication of the CREW project |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC III.1.1.1 Activity 34: Templates used to document the pilots, demos and overall project | 100% | 31 December 2013 | 100% | Completed in previous PIR  | S | S | S | S |
| SC N/A III.1.1.2 Activity: Workshops on how to use templates and selections of lessons learned | 0% |  |  | Removal of this activity/output was approved during 3rd PSCM January 2014Now under output 18 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Output 19:** (SC III.1.2) Replication strategy developed |  |  |  |  | S | S  | S | S |
| SC III.1.2.1 Activity 35: Replication strategy developed | 70% | June 2016 | 100% | Replication workshop held Kingston Jamaica May 2015. PIF submitted on the 25th June 2016 | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 20:** (SC III.1.3) Increased dialogue among regional wastewater stakeholders through a series of stakeholder consultations. |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC III.1.3.1 Activity 36: Annual regional meetings with stakeholders (CWWA). | 75% | August 2016 | 100% | Support to the Caribbean Water and Waste-water Association annual conference and the high level forum during the conference in August 2015. | S | S | S | S |
| SC III.1.3.2 Activity 37: Presentations on the implementation of the CReW at regional and international conferences | 75% | December 2015 | 100% | The target has been hugely exceeded | S | S | S | S |
| SC III.1.3.3 Activity 38: Professional exchanges conducted. | 75% | December 2016 | 75% | Florida Key exchange with BWS. Professional exchange to be held between Barbados and Jamaica  | S | S | S | S |
| **Output 21:** (SC III.2) Increased access to and use of information related to wastewater management through development of a ‘Clearing House Mechanism’ (CHM) for the WCR |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |
| SC III.2.1.1 Activity 39: IT based regional information management system developed | 65% | June 2016 | 100% | CReW new Website and Visualization tool in place | S | S | S | S |

Overall project implementation progress [[31]](#footnote-32)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FY12 rating** | **FY13 rating** | **FY14 rating** | **FY15 rating** | **FY16 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
| S | S | S | S | **HS** | This is a complex innovative project which requires a lot of consultation and prerequisite agreements before being able to proceed with actual execution. There have thus been delays and some activities should have been further along in execution. However, the activities which have been executed have by and large been done well and can create meaningful impact if fully embraced by the participating countries. Some of the activities including those that had not commenced were revisited during the midterm review and work plan amended and approved by decision of PSC. While project implementation continue to take place the rate of implementation is slower than predicted and a project extension will be required to enable all project outputs to be realised and set objectives met. IDB is currently reviewing ways to secure additional funding to support a project extension.2015: The S rating is maintained, but is it worth mentioning that several improvements have been noticed. In particular there has been a qualitative improvement in the way that participating countries perceive and understand the CReW. For the region this is a quite an innovative approach to financing wastewater thus, it has taken time and effort from all stakeholders to understand and fully embrace the concept. Now government officials, CReW National and GEF Focal Points are more engaged in most of the countries.  In addition, the partnership between UNEP and IDB has matured to a level of greater understanding so that collaboration and coordination between the two Implementing Agencies is significantly improved and more effective. This is resulting in greater efficiency and productivity in all the activities.2016:The S rating is elevated to HS, during the last PIR period, the project entered into the extension period; steady advances as previously foreseen have been done in Component I II and III. The Project is expected to accomplish the majority of targets by the end of the extension period January/ February 2017.As explained above in the outcome section, during the last 5 year of implementation, there has been a change in how governments in the region approach wastewater management, in general, the profile of wastewater management has been raised and therefore Governments are taking this issue more seriously, this by itself is enough to go for an overall HS rating but in addition, the main objective of the project has been achieved, given the pilot nature of the CReW this can also be considered a great achievement This success and the overwhelming support from the participating countries to develop a follow on project was realized during the last PSCM, as a result, the CReW is actively pursuing the development of a new PIF the CReW+ which will be submitted to GEF officially for comments by the end of July 2016. |

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating.

| **Action(s) to be taken** | **By whom?** | **By when?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 9:** (SC II.1.6) Detailed implementation plan (resources, budget & timetable) for a Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (ME&R) system | UNEP | Last part of the year 2015 |
| SC II.2.1.2 Activity 23: Wastewater regulations drafted in Selected Countries. |  |  |
| **Output 12:** (SC II.2.2) Training workshops for enforcement personnel | UNEP | January 2015 |
| **Output 13:** (SC II.2.3) Regional training on enforcement of wastewater management legislation | UNEP  | January 2015 |
| **Output 16:** **(**SC II.3.3) Increased awareness of wastewater and sanitation issues in selected communities | UNEP | Last quarter 2015 |
| **Output 17:** (SC II.3.4) Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. |  |  |

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation.

| **Problem(s) identified in previous PIR** | **Action(s) taken** | **By whom** | **When** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

3.3. Risk

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated* ***Substantial*** *or* ***High*** *and who is responsible to for it.*

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK FACTOR TABLE** |
| ***Project Managers*** *will use this table to summarize risks identified in the* ***Project Document*** *and reflect also* ***any new risks*** *identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project,* ***as relevant****. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (****PM)*** *and one for the UNEP Task Manager and IDB Team Leader (****TM)****. If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The* ***UNEP Task Manager*** *and* ***IDB Team Leader*** *should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.* |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager/Team Leader Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **INTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project management** |
| Management structure | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Some PEAs/PMUs have indicated that the decision making process is unclear with respect to the line of authority between PCG and the Bank. The PCG is currently executing a facilitated session to clarify roles and to seek ways to improve project performance.[[32]](#footnote-33) PM: The technical Specialist is now also the Acting Project Coordinator after the previous PC resignation. Procurement selection process will be opened in the second half of 2014[[33]](#footnote-34).PM 2015: the former Technical Specialist is now the new Project Coordinator. There is a new Technical Specialist, in both positions a competitive hiring process was carried out to fulfill the positions.PM 2016: nothing new to informed about the low internal risk is maintained.  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Governance structure | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body (ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM : | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Internal com­munications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good  | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Work flow | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: The project has experienced significant delays in planned work flows for several reasons: (i) delay in fully staffing PMUs, (ii) failure to adhere to AOPs and (iii) long elapse times in implementing agreed actions by PMUs. While there has been significant support provided to the PMUs in terms of training and technical support – however, delays continue to be issues and are now considered a substantial risk. The midterm will be an opportunity to revisit activities and outputs.[[34]](#footnote-35) PM:1 or 1.5 years Project extension granted by the SC during the third SCM January 2014[[35]](#footnote-36) |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM:2015 an extension has been approved for component I and funds made available through an IDB Technical Cooperation to run the operation till January 2017.UNEP is planning to finish the activities under Components 2 and 3 by the end of 20152016: difficulties to make payments due to the introduction of a new internal management system forced UNEP to extend the period of implementation to December 2016. |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The challenge of effective reporting is on-going.  | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: But CF is on target and even exceeded. It is just a headache to get parties to report however the PCG is doing a great job in tracking it |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM:  | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The timeliness of reporting has become a significant concern over the last year. As seen by the 33% achieved to date. The PCG has provided templates, reminders, and continue to work closely with the PEAs/PMU on this issue. However, there seems to be an overall lack of appreciation of the value of the reports and therefore the timeliness and quality of reports remain a challenge. Going forward as a lesson learnt it is essential that Government’s be aware of this requirement in assessing the capabilities needed in their PMUs. [[36]](#footnote-37) PM: SC January 2014 approved elimination of quarterly reports, only annual reports are now contractual[[37]](#footnote-38) | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The reports submitted by the PEAs are normally not up to date and the PCG has to review and request updating.CAR/RCU is late too and this needs to be addressed and reviewed at midterm. Reports too often lack of analysis although they are useful project management tools and should not be treated solely as an administrative burden >>>should look at ways to incentive the quality of the process [[38]](#footnote-39)2015: for most of the PMUs, the reporting quality has improved over the years.2016: Similar to last year but still some improvements have been shown, Getting the Belize´s reports on time is still a challenge, mainly due to the high level of workload of the Belize PMU PM. |
| Stakeholder involvement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Maintaining effective dialogue with all stakeholders is challenging. A communication strategy is in progress, communication products are being developed. However, many countries are slow in responding to inquiries etc. The challenge of effective engagement is real and avenues are being explored to have quarterly “Skype type’ meetings over and above annual PSC meeting. 2015 It is sometimes a challenge to engage CReW National Focal Points, in part because their high work load, changes in government and in a few cases lack on engagement.2016 No change from last year | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| External com­munications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand­ings concerning objectives and activities evident | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The project continues to be challenged in maintaining and sustaining a public face. Reliance on National Focal Points (NFPs) from participating countries has not yielded the results expected as many NFPs are not fully engaged and perhaps underestimate the importance of this activity nor do they see this as part of their role. Assistance has been sought from interested parties but ultimately this activity has to be driven by the PCG and UNEP CAR/RCU but the resources allocated to achieve a public presence across the participating countries remains an issue.[[39]](#footnote-40)  | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Public awareness is under [[40]](#footnote-41)resources and even in the project even more so thus the project does not currently have a public phase nor does it have a marketing strategy which causes an issue for the long term sustainability. It is recommended the project looks at how to address such situation with the midterm reviewer – the communication and outreach component has little resources though/under resources. Partner agencies should be encouraged to use their own resources to palliate to this situation. IW-Eco is looking in a marketing strategy and one should perhaps join force with that other GEF project. [[41]](#footnote-42)TM 2015: the CReW Project is much more understood now than just one year ago. The innovation factor has made it difficult but understanding of needs, processes and eventually the results are catching upTM 2016:Countries have shown during the last PSC full understanding of the project and as a result supported the development of a new initiative which is now called the CReW+ |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The project will address some short term needs. Its long term impact will depend on the performance of the PFMs, strategies to grow the Funds, effective policy reforms, an effective replication strategy and political will. All of which are yet to be determined and many of which will be difficult to assess within the life of the project | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The project is addressing short term needs without losing the long term perspective. It is critical that the PFMs are successful for the success of the project, but that has never been ignored.TM: from January 2014 into mid 2015 the team has been working on developing a sustainable replication strategy.2016: All pilot countries have shown interest in continuing developing their respected funds, ways to do so are under study and will continue till the end of the project. |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM:  | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Already a number of political considerations have hindered the project‘s performance and progress. For example, the transfer of Water Boards from the community group to BWSL in Belize is still not done. This was not done before the elections and remains a critical issue which will affect the tariff payments and ability to repay loan to revolving fund. PM: Location of WWTP in Placencia (Belize Pilot project) has become a political risk. Decision on location is uncertain.[[42]](#footnote-43)PM 2015: Placencia project has been postponed, due partly to political issues that prevented a decision on the location of the WWTP. The project in Belize however has not been jeopardized due to the work that is being doing in Belmopan (adaptive management).PM 2016Changes in the GORTT has triggered a change in the location of the fund to the MPU instead of the MOF. | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Testing a revolving fund mechanism in connection to wastewater management and creating innovative financing mechanisms can represent risks. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: The delays in project execution, finalising first generation projects and the delays in establishing the Trinidad and Tobago revolving fund places consideration constraints with regards to fully testing the revolving fund mechanisms in the time that remains. Nevertheless, the lessons learnt are valuable as part of the testing of the PFMs. [[43]](#footnote-44)PM: Extension Granted (see above) will allow the testing in Belize (Belmopan project) and Jamaica to certain extend. T&T has still to comply with CP’s and Guyana still must find a first generation project.[[44]](#footnote-45) |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The testing will not be completed although it does not mean it will not work on the longer term but now given the June 2015 deadline the risk of non complying is H.Funds will be revolving if there is a demand but as of now it is not certain the demand will be there – we are currently gaining traction but it might take 10 years hence the risk within the timeframe of the project. It might then just boil down to what we define as testing. Institutionalisation is critical as to show it was not a standalone experiment but something which is likely to be sustainable.>>>do we need to extend the project so that we are certain it will survive post GEF and can we afford an extension. [[45]](#footnote-46)TM: 2015 so far one country has started to repay into the fundTM: 2016 so far two countries has started to repay into the fund |
| Lack of loans repayment can put the PFMs financial sustainability at risk. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: Legal framework should ensure tariffs are in place |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: a delay in the implementation of the construction works might affect the timing of the repayment, and they might begin after the project has ended.TM: 2015 the extension of 18 months will help to reduce the riskTM: 2016 so far two countries has started to repay into the fund |
| The numbers and diversity of participating countries in the project may limit (1) the effective and efficient participation and active involvement of stakeholders, and (2) the development of appropriate regional guidelines that respond to different policy, legal and institutional country frameworks.  |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: The project is challenged by the question ‘What is in it for me’ posed by Non Pilot countries. Involvement and benefit from Components 2 & 3 can help but resources are limited. Leveraging resources from related activities will have to be an approached tried by the project.  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM 2015: This is one of the important lessons learnt of the project: in order, to reduce risk the project should have allocated more resources to the non-pilot countries. The risk still remains medium |
| Weak institutional capacity in participating countries. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: This is a real and on-going concern, which already being experienced. The management approach will be based on ‘the contingency theory; that is, it depends on the situation – given resource constraints of the project. The PCG is mindful of the challenge and has instituted monthly VC and generally increased communication to support the PEAs.PM: 2016 Still remain a concern, the majority of countries in the CReW can be classified as small in regard to the population amount thus making difficult to find qualify personnel  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Potential issues arising from inadequate communication between UNEP and the IDB. |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| TM: |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager/Team Leader Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **EXTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project context** |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Elections in three of four pilot countries have already delayed project and the ability of some governments to make decisions or implement decisions already made.  | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Changes brought about by elections have resulted in delays in the implementation of UNEP Small scale funding agreement, the risk however remains medium |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM:  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The beneficiary countries are in a region with a lot of hurricanes. |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Each of the projects financed through the PFM are affected by social issues. |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners  | Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: There will be a need to access capability of project partners wherever possible.  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Limited political will of participating governments to push the implementation of the necessary pollution reduction measures at both national and local levels. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| Domestic wastewater management is not a priority shared by all stakeholders in the region. In fact wastewater treatment is often outranked by water supply and wastewater collection and hence there is a low environmental consciousness as it related to wastewater management. Therefore there is a risk that this will limit consensus-building on regional principles for wastewater management. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Inputs from the national governments required for the regional and national databases are not provided in a timely manner. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Cultural resistance to accept new wastewater management measures. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM:Reluctance from Private Sector Companies in Guyana to request loan for the construction of WWTP´s exists due to lack of regulation in the sector[[46]](#footnote-47)  |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: At the pilot level, there needs to be a lot of communication with the beneficiaries, especially in places where there is no wastewater management system. |
| Incompatibility of national interests. At the national level, there is a risk that competing political priorities could hinder the implementation and sustainability of the project and national interests could prevail over regional efforts.  |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| In some WCR member countries, the legal competencies of wastewater management agencies are not properly defined and/or fall within different sectors and/or institutions, often with conflicting interests. If not addressed properly, this could undermine broad national agreement and obstruct implementation of activities. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Lack of government counterpart resources. From the financial point of view, a possible risk is the lack of availability or effective integration of counterpart resources to co-finance various activities. |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | × |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Negative impact of governmental changes in one or more countries. Often a political change at government level leads to changes of technical leadership and discontinuation in an on-going project or process. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: Elections in three of four pilot countries have already delayed project and the ability of some governments to make decisions or implement decisions already made. |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Hazard and climatic events, especially hurricanes are threats to the project. For example, hurricanes could delay project start up, impact on construction of facilities especially when located in low lying or coastal areas. |  |  |  |  | × |  |  |  |  | PM: The project is taking place in a region where there are many natural hazards hurricanes, earthquakes – these threats could impact construction activities. The Belize and Trinidad and Tobago projects are located in a coastal zone and potentially could be affected by climate change concerns (sea level rise). The design will have to take these issues into account if and where possible. |  | × |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| TM: |

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager and IDB Team Leader rating, an explanation by the Task Manager and IDB Team Leader should be provided below*

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN N/A** |
| Rank – importance of riskRisk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the riskWho – person(s) responsible for the actionDate – date by which action needs to be or was completed  |

| **Rank** | **Risk Statement[[47]](#footnote-48)** | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
| **N/A** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FY12 rating** | **FY13 rating** | **FY14****rating** | **FY15****rating** | **FY16****rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
| Medium | Medium | Medium | Low | **Low** | Identification of risks from its design stage and management of those risk as well as emerging issues has continued into the implementation of project activities. The mitigation measures identified in the design phase have been implemented and as ‘new’ risks emerge or ‘old’ risks are seen as more significant than originally estimated interventions to mitigate the risks have been actively undertaken in close consultation with the IACG and Executing Agencies at the national and regional levels.2015Improve coordination between UNEP and IDB and better understanding of the Project has in overall decrease the risk rating from Medium to Low2016The extension period has proved to be key in helping to tie loose knots and attain targets that otherwise could not had been achieved, the rating remain low.  |
|  |  |  |  | **If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation** |
|  |  |  | N/A |

# ºRATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

*Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the* **UNEP Task Manager and IDB Team Leader** *will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:*

*(i) Overall* ***quality*** *of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan*

*(ii) Performance in the* ***implementation*** *of the M&E plan*

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

* Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes **√**□ No □
* SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes **√**□ No □
* A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes **√**□ No □

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

* Mid-term review/evaluation Yes **√**□ No □
* Terminal evaluation Yes **√**□ No □
* Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators’

related information Yes **√**□ No □

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): **S**

4.3 Has the project:

* Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress

in meeting the project objectives; Yes **√**□ No □

* Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including

on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes **√**□ No □

* Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project

implementation mid-point;\*[[48]](#footnote-49) Yes □ No □**√**

* Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes **√**□ No □
* Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes □ No □**√**

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): **S**

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period[[49]](#footnote-50)

|  |
| --- |
| The Third Project Steering Committee meeting was held from January 28-30, 2014 in St Lucia. At that meeting the Annual Plan and Budget (2014) and the elimination of quarterly reports were endorsed, also the Mid Term evaluation was presented. All National PEAs except Belize have submitted the reports. The PCG continues to work closely with the PEAs/PMUs in providing comments and guidance regarding the reports. All PEAs have been provided with a reporting template. The PCG has been using the Bank’s Project Monitoring Report (PMR) for planning, execution and evaluation (See Annex 4). This tool has also been very useful in providing an overview of project performance.  |

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

|  |
| --- |
| The results framework was updated and endorsed by the PSCM, As a result of the MTE, some outputs were eliminated and others rename to match more accurately the reality and needs of the project, in addition a new output was created. Check question 4.8 for more information |

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

|  |
| --- |
| We are not yet able to fully respond to this question |

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

|  |
| --- |
| The ability to track indicators is a significant issue especially for Component 2 where there is a dependence on NFPs to assist with data gathering. Where SSFAs have been signed with countries there is a reporting requirement that should yield data. Some reports has been received with different quality data depending on the country. A lot of information is to be received. In the case of Component 1 although some of the targets are yet to be finalised however, there are sufficient resources to conduct the studies and to gather sufficient data.  |

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions[[50]](#footnote-51) are still valid

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Eliminated Outputs/indicatorsII.1.1.4 Regional evaluation workshop heldII.1.2.3 Regional workshop on wastewater treatment technology heldII.1.4.1 Survey on best practices for funding wastewater utilities completedII.1.6.2 National systems demonstrated.Rename Outputs/indicators

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **From** | **To** |
| II.1.4.2 | Cost recovery model tested | Financial management rate and tariff setting |
| II.1.4.3 | Targeted training courses for utilities held | Regional workshops on cost recovery models held" |
| II.1.6.1 | Wastewater Management information sharing platform established | Framework for the development of a Regional M&E Effluent Discharge Database |
| II.2.1.2 | Wastewater regulations drafted | Wastewater regulations enacted |
| II.3.4.2 | Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. | Guidelines for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into curricula developed |

New Output/indicatorsII.1.7.4 Number of online courses developed |

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

|  |
| --- |
| While the project has provided some resources for M&E under Component 1. In the case of Component 2 & 3 the reliance on responses from NFPs on behalf of each participating country is not the most efficient nor reliable method of garnering data for monitoring and evaluation. This activity needs to be adequately resourced.  |

# PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

*5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design. Please select relevant areas from the list below:*

* **Institutional arrangements, including project governance**;
1. One of the major challenges for the project has been the timely establishments of National Project Management Units (PMUs) including fully staffing these Units with appropriately skilled or experienced persons. In the main the project did not provide funding to establish these Units although for Component 1 there was some provision for partially covering the cost of project staff. The result is that in many cases PMUs took a long time to be established and in some cases it was difficult to attract suitably skilled staff. The result is (has can be seen by a review of all the AOPs) deadlines were missed, activities stalled and reports delayed all of which have adversely affected project execution

Additionally, the PCG has been charged with day to day operational responsibility of these Units but with none of the tools to encourage/demand responsibility, accountability and performance. - The PCG has therefore been operating by developing close working relationships with all Units, providing as much technical guidance as is possible, encouraging and ‘cajoling’. This approach is normal for managing teams and is not at issue. What is an issue is the absence of mechanisms usually part of the project management armoury to push performance when influence fails. In this project, there are no penalties of any kind for failing to meet deadlines or delivering on any output. In the future the organisation of project management and governance needs revisit these kinds of issues along with providing the resources needed to establish effective PMUs.

1. The role and performance of National Focal Points (NFPs) remain key issues in the execution of the project. Mid way the project some have remained relatively disengaged. Gaining access to organisations and people with a country is expected to be accomplished through NFPs who are often named from Environment Departments but do not necessarily see the issues of the project as spanning a number of other organisations in both the public and private sectors. Thus there is the risk of not having full participation and input of utilities, fisheries, public health and tourism as part of any country’s response not only to the baseline study but to the development of national programmes. More focus should be given to outlining the process by which the project should interact will the Governments. Additionally, the role and ‘power’ given to NFPs should be re-examined in future projects. When NFPs understand their role the current modality works. However, our experience shows that these cases are few and far between adversely affecting project performance because of the less than optimal engagement of governments.

2014: The MTE recommended that documentation of the experiences and lessons learned surrounding the pilot financing mechanisms should begin as soon as possible before institutional memory begins to fade, and that this should include factors that contributed to delays and how they were, or were not resolved. All four pilot countries have had experiences which when analysed and distilled have implications for replication. Documentation and discussion should include strategic issues such as the building of political will to move forward, maintaining inter-institutional coordination.

2014: The process of documenting experiences and lessons learned is ongoing and the formats of GEF International Waters Experience Notes as well as case studies are being used. In addition an online CReW Community of Practice (CoP) has been created to facilitate the exchange of ideas, discussion and the gathering of lessons learned.

2014: The Project’s highly constructed Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) reporting system was found by the MTE to be burdensome and not to inform decision-making. Even with 270 reports over 4 years, there is little emphasis on the quality of outcomes. Consolidation and simplification of the reporting is desirable. While all participating countries were found to have good buy-in to the Project, the creation of national committees was recommended. This would reduce the reliance upon a single National Focal Point, which has proved to be risky in the past.

2014: The MTE found that actual relationships which exist in the project are not as hierarchical as shown in the project organogram. He recommended that the project develop relationship and organizational charts using the *de facto* structure.

2014: In recognition of the importance of engaging all participating countries, greater effort has been made to ensure that the four Central American countries participate as full beneficiaries in the second half of the Project. Under Component 2, following the Regional Workshop hosted by CIMAB in December 2013, the Technical Specialist has worked more closely with each of the countries and with UNEP CAR RCU towards defining the SSFAs to ensure that they address the priority needs of the countries. As a result there has been greater inclusion of these countries in several activities, including the online training being delivered by the Water Center between June and December 2014, the CoP and awareness raising activities.

2014: The MTE recommended, and the Third Project Steering Committee endorsed, extension of the project until June 2016 to enable completion of activities by the end of 2015. This acknowledged that given the innovative nature of the project, the realities of working with different government agencies etc. the pilots in particular have taken much longer than anticipated to begin implementation.

* **Capacity building;**

The issue of capacity building is always an area of focus in most projects. During the CReW project while there has been a focus on training at the national and regional levels there has been recognition that these are one off activities which are unlikely to have a lasting impact or solve the capacity building problem at the institutional levels. In this regard, the PCG is working along with UNEP CAR/RCU to build partnership with training institutions for the development of online professional development courses, which will outlive the project and be a legacy of the project. In this regard, work is being undertaken with universities at the tertiary level and at the CXC at the secondary level. Particularly at the secondary level infusing ‘wastewater’ topics in the curriculum is a long term exercise the seeds of which will be planted during the project with the hope that the work will continue after its closure.

2014: Due to the number and diversity of stakeholders, and conflicting schedules, targeted for wastewater management and other training, at national level e.g. challenge cited by Saint Lucia, it has been difficult to schedule training sessions, so that some capacity building activities have fallen behind.

2014: The importance of raising awareness of the linkages between wastewater management and its benefits for public health, quality of life and economic opportunities cannot be underestimated. The media is an essential primary audience because of its ability to reach the wider public. Media sensitization workshops were convened at both regional and national levels between November 2013 and July 2014. The format of each of these workshops was slightly different. In addition to exposing journalists to wastewater and related issues, the regional sessions focused upon helping them to find relevant, up-to-date information, to find new story lines and angles and sought feedback from them through their participation in facilitated sessions and their completion of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Surveys (KAPS). Lessons learned include:

* The issues and challenges faced by journalists interested in covering environmental issues in participating countries are similar, mainly these issues are not prioritized by the media houses, and wastewater and sanitation issues are often the most shunned issues of all.
* Recognition of the challenges is essential to creating resources and opportunities which are useful to them. The interaction between experts and journalists begun at these workshops has helped them to be more available and open even after the workshops, and provided the journalists with useful contacts among experts as well as with fellow journalists in neighbouring countries interested in similar issues.
* The inclusion of field visits to wastewater treatment plants provides first-hand experience in what wastewater treatment involves and a better understanding of the issues and challenges involved.

2014: Partnerships have been essential to enable the GEF CReW Project to meet its objectives. In the period under review these included regional partnerships with: the Caribbean Water and Wastewater Association and the Global Water Partnership-Caribbean to host the 9th High Level Session Ministerial Forum in an effort to influence the regional wastewater policy agenda; the Water Center in Monterrey to deliver on-line training programmes, and; the Global Water Partnership – Caribbean to convene a meeting on Regional Partnerships in water and wastewater management. In addition to enabling the project to do more, partnerships assists with uptake and increase the chances of replication.

* **Wastewater Management Reforms;**

Policy and legal reforms are a key output of the project. However, the region’s track record on implementing policy and legal reforms in the environment and wastewater sectors is not the best. It requires not only political buy in but skills within legal drafting area of Governments of which there are a dearth of practitioners. The resources allocated in time, human resources and financing to achieve this change through the region even at the pilot level are not sufficient to achieve actual implementation before the project conclusion. While building blocks will be laid the continuity will be of concern. Wastewater management reforms are critical success factor and financing mechanisms will not be sustainable without the drivers which are provided by policy and legal reforms. In this regard, new approaches need to be taken to achieving this output. As a result it may be necessary to directly link implementing these reforms with resources for establishing financial mechanisms.

2014: The MTE recommended that as a condition for endorsing a project like CReW, governments should have an explicit agenda for moving towards compliance with the LBS Protocol; that non-reimbursable funding for sanitation infrastructure investments should be conditioned on verifiable progress on strengthening the policy, legal and regulatory framework.

2014: A review of the access to, availability of and organizational readiness for uptake of funding for the wastewater sector in selected participating countries, commissioned by the GEF CReW Project in August 2013, and reviewed by all participating countries, confirmed that:

* Governments need to make the wastewater sector a higher priority on their agendas if they are to increase collection and treatment of wastewater and improve the quality of wastewater effluent;
* While countries may have access to funding for wastewater infrastructure from development banks, they do not have the organizational reediness and absorptive capacity to effectively use the available funding opportunities;
* The challenges of implementing institutional strengthening components of loans have proven difficult to surmount;
* Access to finance is only one of the important elements needed. The existence of an appropriate legal and regulatory framework, a comprehensive, integrated and targeted action plan and participation by civil society are also needed.

These findings support earlier findings of the baseline studies conducted under Component 2 and upon which capacity building activities included in the SSFAs are based. The Project’s Third Steering Committee Meeting (January 2014) subsequently agreed that the greatest challenge for the region is not financing but capacity and further endorsed this approach. The importance of long-term planning, with plans being broken down into specific steps, for implementation by successive governments was determined to be essential if progress is to be made.

* **Demonstration of Pilot Financial Mechanisms/Replication Strategy**

One of the key issues for testing the pilot mechanisms has been the availability of projects, which are ready for funding. During project design for 3 of the 4 pilots there was the identification of one first generation project. During project execution 2 of the pilots have run into difficulties with the projects, which were originally identified for varying reasons. In the case of Belize the original project has been delayed by political reasons while in Guyana the current policy and legal framework is relatively weak so private companies are not compelled to construct wastewater treatment plants and the external drivers have not been sufficiently strong. In the future a pipeline of smaller scale projects should be one of the prerequisites for demonstration countries.

2014: Local stakeholders need to be involved early on in the process to assure that local concerns are taken into consideration and to help avoid delays in implementation. Such has been the case in Belize where failure to adequately consult the Water Boards of Seine Bight and Placencia led to their opposition to the project.

2014: The case of Belize also illustrates the use of adaptive management as it became necessary to find a short-term alternative – the Belmopan City Wastewater Treatment Plant – without compromising the eventual completion of the principal and longer term, project on the Placencia Peninsula.

2014: Wastewater revolving funds are new sustainable financing mechanisms and as such need to be marketed if potential clients from the private sector are to apply to use the facility. The Guyana experience underscores the importance of identifying champions early and focusing on public outreach to build awareness and demand for the facility of the revolving fund amongst the private sector. Hence, the Guyana Pilot Project, which to date has not been able to identify a suitable first generation project, embarked on a targeted marketing campaign in June 2014 with the objectives of highlighting the benefits and importance of wastewater management and to attract the attention of policy makers, potential borrowers and the general public.

2014: The MTE stressed that public-private partnerships form a unique sub-set of local development financing that requires skills and tools which are not usually available in the public sector. As such, Executing Agencies require specifically adapted technical assistance and operating policies. It acknowledged that private sector wastewater initiatives require strong external drivers and regulatory enforcement.

2014: The MTE noted that an important lesson from the Jamaica experience is how setting up a guarantee account with the revolving fund mechanism, together with the K factor, led to the National Water Commission acquiring its first private sector loan, without a sovereign guarantee, that quadrupled the pool of investment resources.

**YEAR 2015 Component I Lessons learnt**

(As documented following interviews and shared in the Knowledge Exchange sessions, PSC 4, July 2015)

**Belize Pilot Project:**

* The development of a project portfolio that could channel projects into the revolving fund proved extremely successful, as well as the rapid selection of the Belmopan project as the backup pilot, illustrating a good example of adaptive management.
* A clearer definition of the project scope, including detailed environmental studies needed to support the case of project location and greater buy-in from affected communities would have facilitated implementation. Such detailed technical studies would also have signaled earlier on the technical challenges ahead and provided a more precise estimate of budget needs, revealing that the resources needed for the Placencia project exceeded greatly the funds available.
* The lack of a communication specialist with experience in developing strategies to approach communities and stakeholders and deal proactively with their concerns, including interest groups such as the shrimp farmers and the water boards, would have helped to address stakeholder issues early.
* In the case of the Belmopan system upgrade, the availability of a skilled technical consultant during the complete design phase helped the team in charge of the project to define a clear scope and technical needs in order to advance implementation quickly.
* The use of retroactive financing for the Belmopan system upgrade proved to be a suitable alternative to expedite activation of the revolving fund mechanism. It also provided some time to concurrently advance the technical preparation of the next candidate projects to be implemented under the revolving fund mechanism.

**Guyana Pilot Project:**

* The inability, thus far, to secure a first generation borrower is seen as directly related to the state of the enabling environment, specifically the weaknesses in the regulatory framework that does not encourage or provide an incentive to private sector involvement. Strengthening the enabling environment through policy and institutional reform has therefore become a priority.
* It has also been recognized that in trying to market the pilot financial mechanism, the focus has been on trying to convince the private sector to invest in a wastewater treatment plant as a means of reducing the pollution of the environment, instead of promoting the self-interests of the companies, which mightbe more productive given the fact that presently there is no requirement to do so. In particular, there has been little emphasis on integrated wastewater management and considerations of links to alternative energy or generation of value-added byproducts.
* There is a need to increase public and societal awareness about wastewater management. It is felt that the pilot financing mechanism currently lacks visibility.
* There is not enough information available to members of the private sector and the public at large on the project, its objectives and the medium- to long-term benefits of investing with the fund. Increasing visibility of the GWRF and education of the private sector in concert with strengthening of the enabling environment are both necessary for change in order to improve the quality of effluent produced by their processes.

**Jamaica Pilot Project:**

* Jamaica’s success in establishing a source of funding for wastewater projects via collection of customer fees proves to be a best practice example. This was facilitated by the statutory obligation for developers to connect new developments to the wastewater systems of the NWC; and also due to the political will of the government which has ensured funding through the establishment of the K‑factor tariff component used to cover the NWC’s financial charges for new investments in 2008, and a corresponding X‑factor component representing the efficiency gains and credited to customers’ bills simultaneously. In spite of the establishment of the K-factor, delays in procurement and project implementation have implications for the testing of the sustainable financing aspect of the Credit Enhancement Facility with regard to its replicability and sustainability, the main project objective, and these aspects will not be tested unless there is fast progress in project implementation.
* In hindsight, having more clarity about the projects that were going to be implemented through the financial mechanism, including ready designs and procurement of projects, would have enabled a quick engagement and signing of the commercial loan facility, avoiding renegotiations and fatigue and ensuring financing is ready when it is really needed
* Getting all stakeholders involved and fully on board with some upfront communication regarding the objectives of the CReW project and the financial mechanism could have increased their understanding and facilitated later their involvement during the approval phase of the procurement processes, as well as built general awareness of the pilot project, particularly given its innovative nature.
* Beware of the trade-offs involved in the design-and-build contract modality, in particular for rehabilitation works. While it was convenient to reduce contracting time by avoiding the need to have two separate successive procurement processes, it was difficult for NWC to assess the real scope of the works needed since the contractors themselves were presenting dissimilar proposals. This can also have implications in terms of budget planning. In hindsight, a prior objective assessment delinked from the procurement of actual works would have reduced uncertainties for the contractors, budget planning, and the tender evaluation and selection process.
* The time devoted to preparation and review of procurement processes should be generously estimated into project timelines; even small tasks can take considerable time and may cause delays later.

**Trinidad and Tobago Pilot Project:**

* In order to aid in the implementation and accelerate response times, greater clarity on roles and responsibilities of the participating entities as well as identification of supporting champions with authority at early stages could have helped
* More information on the concept of a revolving fund and how it would operate would have contributed to a better start. A lack of familiarity with , and no previous experience, with revolving fund mechanisms made the pilot project hard to understand. This appears to reflect missed opportunities for sharing and learning across the four project countries. Some actors emphasized that there might be common challenges across pilot countries and that implementers would benefit from sharing others’ experiences and ideas on how similar situations could be addressed.
* In the absence of a robust utility fee system in T&T, there is a risk to the sustainability of the revolving fund. WASA is not financially self-sustainable; approximately 60% of its operating costs are direct transfers from the central government. The issue of how the funds will be repaid has re-emerged recently without a clear solution envisioned. When discussing financial sustainability a key informant said “*the same Ministry of Finance would have to give us the funds to repay themselves*”. The pilot could benefit from broad dialogue and more clarity regarding repayment and sustainability issues, drawing on relevant experiences from other CReW countries.
* An extensive list of conditions could be a disincentive to countries for sourcing funds to establish Revolving Funds mechanisms from development banks. The list of conditions appears to be directly related to the state of readiness of the countries, and countries suggested planning a period of preparedness focused on developing capacity to execute the projects before selection of countries for the pilot (CReW Replication Strategy Report, 2014)

**YEAR 2015 Components II and III and Lessons learnt**

(As documented following country interviews and shared in the Knowledge Exchange sessions, PSC 4, July 2015)

**Bridging the gap between country expectations and project realities, and between country realities and project expectations:**

* Early consultation with key stakeholders and decision-makers in countries is necessary in planning of projects. Understanding of, and agreement on, objectives, targets, outputs and outcomes are necessary.
* In planning and discussions with participating countries, the role of the NFPs should be considered and the type of support they would need to be able to handle project requests and act as project champions effectively.
* The allocation of resources must be seen to be equitable or there is the risk of disengagement. National level interventions are also important for continued engagement.
* Good communication between the PCG and the team working in each country, supported by strategic missions when needed, is key to success.
* Repeated reference to briefing and guideline documents prepared by the PCG would keep NFPs better informed, particularly as NFPs sometimes change.
* Stakeholders value frequent updates on key activities, in the case of CReW, the Pilot projects, regardless of status.
* Wider awareness of the project amongst stakeholders and key decision makers is important for engagement and effective participation.
* The formation of small committees, whether formal or informal, may help the NFPs or relevant agency to get things done.
* Agreements (whether SSFAs or other types) with specific countries for agreed activities are an important mode for enabling national level activities and their importance, in terms of galvanizing local support for the project should not be underestimated.
* Legacy issues, i.e. outstanding historic issues beyond control of the project can have a profound impact upon project implementation; prior knowledge may be the only way to plan for these.
* Project outputs should be more actively promoted to all stakeholders and partners during the project by both agencies and countries.
* Institutions and agencies executing SSFAs and other project initiated activities should internalize these in their work plans and budgets.

**The importance of an enabling environment (Policy, Legislative and Institutional readiness)**

* Raising the awareness of wastewater issues amongst decision-makers in government is a fundamental and necessary aspect of strengthening the enabling environment and, as expressed by more than one country, *“…could perhaps have preceded the financial.”*
* In countries that did not have some efforts already ongoing to develop or strengthen existing wastewater management institutions, policy and laws, additional efforts were needed at country level to raise the awareness among both technocrats and policy makers that these were even needed.
* It is important to identify and establish links with key national institutions that support and help fulfil the objectives of the project; and take time and make efforts in implementing compliance activities.
* It is very important to, firstly, have committed project partners prior to commencement of a project like the CReW which involves both the public and private sector.
* Getting the enabling environment right includes strengthening institutions to improve data collection and analysis for decision-making as well as enforcement, as well as communicating information to violators in away that demonstrates the impact they are having.
* Inter-sectoral committees, or similar mechanisms, can help to provide oversight to the water and wastewater sector. Completion of a national policy for wastewater management or a strategic plan is a first step; the country must then ensure adoption of the plan and support it with regulations.
* In many countries, data and information collection to inform decision-making did not exist, was outdated and often not used in national planning processes.  Therefore, while operational assessments were useful at the utility level - systems for using data compiled even from the baseline assessments seemed lacking.  The value of baseline assessments or any kind of data compilation is increased if we need to think through what national decision-making, reporting or awareness raising efforts and processes this data/information will contribute to.
* Consistent or coherent identification of what was needed in terms of policies, strategies, action plans and/or training was sometimes lacking.  Feedback from the Utilities, Regulatory Agencies, Environment/Health were sometimes different.
* CReW Focal Points should ideally lobby and lobby and/or inform their Ministers on relevant Policy, Institutional and Legislative issues on wastewater as well as opportunities.
* Regional agencies, including CARICOM, CAWASA, CWWA, CDB, IDB, and UNEP can assist in setting that enabling environment.
* Regional project outputs are not being used to inform or guide national activities to the extent that they could be.

**Putting wastewater on the national agenda – what helps?**

The establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms to improve wastewater management provides an opportunity to turn the spotlight on wastewater issues, particularly for decision-makers. While implementation of the PFM’s is a major objective of the project, and there will be many lessons to be learned as a result, they also serve to highlight the fact that more affordable financing is being made available for wastewater management projects, signaling that wastewater management is a national priority. Some of the main lessons and reflections are listed below:

* The need to have a certain amount of political will in the country to bring wastewater to the forefront of the national agenda.
* Changing the message to focus more on effluent quality is needed to encourage greater investment by the private sector in particular.
* Making the linkage between wastewater and human health as well as to the fundamental health of marine ecosystems is fundamental to attracting attention.
* Engaging the media by conducting study tours to various waste water management sites as well as sites where wastewater can be seen to have detrimental effects, helps to increase awareness of the linkages and of the pervasiveness of negative effects of poor wastewater management.
* The process of consultation is necessary for meaningful and appropriate intervention. It can also lead to future initiatives and more sustained benefits.

**Capacity building – prioritizing in the face of many needs and making it sustainable.**

* Training was targeted at multiple levels - utilities, regulatory agencies, focal points, media etc. and it is important that focal points get an appreciation of the feedback from all persons who benefited.
* Some of the capacity building was not for formal training but rather exposure to issues relating to the LBS Protocol and the work of CEP.  This was particularly useful for some countries while others such as Suriname did not participate fully in these opportunities. Likewise some countries benefited more than others in activities developed through our regional partners like CDB, CAWASA, depending on expressed interest.
* The blended online and face to face sessions received very positive feedback, as did the laboratory training done by CIMAB.
* Uneven allocation of resources affects country engagement from both a practical standpoint (physical presence in a country) and availability of resources and technical assistance. Both the PCG and UNEP CAR RCU tried to counter this (missions to affected countries as well as careful consultation in design of SSFAs).
* Opportunities for exchange of experience and knowledge in the form of meetings, exchanges, and workshops are greatly valued by the countries.
* The provision of administrative support in addition to technical support in some instances may result in better results, due to the fact that administrative factors or challenges are what often impede progress.
* The importance of language should not be underestimated – in regular communication and delivery of training; the most effective trainings were offered in both English and Spanish; as far as possible provision should be made for this.
* The long wish-list of subjects related to wastewater management for future training, given by the participating countries tells us how great the capacity building needs are. Projects like CReW must work with the countries to agree the most efficient and effective ways to provide the requested support. At the same time however, the support and opportunities for capacity building offered by Projects like CReW need to be supported by countries if they are to be effective and sustainable. As such integration of project activities into existing programmes as far as possible is vital.

**YEAR 2016 Component I Lessons learnt**

**2016:**

* Implementation of CReW needed a longer time frame – the additional year of extension was granted in recognition of the key lessons learned in the first phase on the up-take of loans etc.
* Experiences and lessons learned in the pilots are being shared across the region and beyond with respect to financing for wastewater infrastructure. The Jamaica pilot project, in particular, provides an example of how implementation of an innovative financial mechanism can be sustainable in the region. Jamaica’s financing mechanism, a Credit Enhancement Facility utilized a tariff, the K-factor, which ensures some level of sustainability. NEPA, the regulator, is looking at replication (scaling up) and plans formation of a committee to evaluate and make recommendations regarding its institutionalization. It is also looking at developing a policy to support this. Critical success factors have been identified by NEPA: availability of funds; cost of funds; wide stakeholder participation; (fiscal space); political commitment. Each of the pilots had relative strengths and weaknesses and the lessons learnt are being documented for wider consideration.
* The CReW has only begun to tackle the issues involved in meeting the increasing demand for cost-effective, appropriate solutions to wastewater management at regional as well as national levels. Hence, a follow-on project to CReW is being proposed – ‘CReW+’. Development of CREW+ is taking into account lessons learnt in the CReW Project as well as the concerns and needs expressed by all countries which have participated in it. CReW+ will propose a more multi-focal approach and include more countries. It will expand geographical scope in particular for national pilots; increasing the number of pilots to projects in all countries.
* Wider participation from WCR countries is being sought for this new project as well as the expansion of core partnerships. Involvement of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) from planning stages is meant to enable provision of financing modalities for those countries that are not borrowing members of the IDB.
* Early consultation with countries will be held to broaden the range of alternative financing sources and solutions. For example, where countries are not borrowing members of e.g. the IDB, mechanisms will be established through the Caribbean Development Bank or other partners.
* CReW+ will also move beyond the testing of pilots to finding more context-specific solutions which address the challenges of wastewater management in a more holistic manner using integrated approaches and aiming to create value out of “reclaimed water”, and based on the protection of water sources through wastewater treatment.

**YEAR 2016 Components II and III and Lessons learnt**

**2016:**

* The synergy between the implementing agencies, UNEP and IDB, has grown during implementation of the CReW.
* Complexity, multi-sectorial nature and number of stakeholders already involved and those impacted by the sector must be given greater consideration; there should be broader and deeper engagement with a wider range of stakeholders.
* Given the small size and nature of the economies of many of the Small Island Developing States (SIDs) in particular, more specific country/local waste water solutions (dependent on size, culture, capacity) are needed.
* Improvements in wastewater management are often driven by public health concerns and resulting legislation, e.g. Suriname and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; this at least keeps it in the public eye and can lead to some action.
* Decision-making tools such as Resource Valuation studies are useful, even in situations where data is insufficient, to weigh the benefits of investment in improved wastewater management against the costs of inaction. Preliminary studies, such as those conducted under CReW, can point to more robust analysis and, can help to describe the benefits to ecosystems and human health if investing in improving domestic wastewater management.
* The impetus gained from ratification of the LBS Protocol, in Jamaica, the only country to do so during the life of CReW, presented an opportunity to raise awareness and increase discussion about the country’s wastewater management challenges amongst national stakeholders.
* Greater recognition of emerging risk associated with vector borne diseases and emerging contaminants is needed in the design and choice of solutions.
* There was consensus at the Project’s Regional Policy and Enforcement Workshop that monitoring programmes need to be strengthened. The adoption of standards and guidelines is vital and the strengthening and certification of both public and private laboratories is necessary if enforcement is to be strengthened.

Budget and Expenditure Annexes

 Annex 1: Budget for July 2015- June 2016

Description: Annual project statement of allocation, budget and variance (in US$)

Period: July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016

Project number: RG-X1011

Project title: Testing a Prototype Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW)

Project commencing (date): July 2011

Project ending (date): January 2017

Overview: The report highlights all components in the project, and shows details for IDB Account # GRT/FM-12723-RG operated by the Project Coordinating Group (PCG) and UNEP Project No. GFL 2324-4A58-2732 operated by United Nations Environmental Programme Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP CAR/RCU)

| Activities | IADB | UNEP | Total GEF Financing | Allocated Budget July 2014- June 2015 | Actual July 2015-June 2016 | Variance July 2015-June 2016 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   | 20,000,000.00 |   |   |   |
|   | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ |
| **Component 1 Investment and innovative financing for wastewater management** |  14,960,000.00  |   |  14,960,000.00  |  3,979,416.91  |  3,240,332.19  |  (739,084.72) |
| **1.1 Pilot Financing Mechanisms (PFM)** |  13,000,000.00  |   |  13,000,000.00  |  3,000,000.00  |  3,000,000.00  |  -  |
| **1.2 Project Development Support** |  1,111,684.00  |   |  1,111,684.00  |  631,214.50  |  49,219.77  |  (581,994.73) |
| **1.3 Capacity Building for Pilot Implementation** |  848,316.00  |   |  848,316.00  |  348,202.41  |  191,112.42  |  (157,089.99) |
| I.3  Technical specialists hired   |  473,316.00  |   |  473,316.00  |  94,738.39  |  84,795.80  |  (9,942.59) |
| I.4  Project Management Units with technical support hired |  375,000.00  |   |  375,000.00  |  253,464.02  |  106,316.62  |  (147,147.40) |
| **Component 2 Reforms for Wastewater Management** |   |  2,550,000.00  |  2,550,000.00  |  749,150.12  |  1,113,114.94  |  363,964.82  |
| **II.1 Capacity Building - Policy and Institutional Strengthening** |   |  1,604,999.52  |  1,604,999.52  |  339,029.43  |  521,325.09  |  182,295.67  |
| II.1.1.1 Policy templates and tools kit developed. |   |  14,400.00  |  14,400.00  |  (5,300.00) |  -  |  5,300.00  |
| II.1.1.2 Template for Wastewater management plan developed. |   |  25,000.00  |  25,000.00  |  8,000.00  |  16,000.00  |  8,000.00  |
| II.1.1.3 National capacity development plans implemented. |   |  381,076.58  |  381,076.58  |  146,271.29  |  176,491.78  |  30,220.49  |
| N/A II.1.1.4 Regional evaluation workshop held |   |   |  -  |  0.00  |  -  |  (0.00) |
| II.1.2.1 Report on compliance of LBS protocol prepared. |   |  55,680.72  |  55,680.72  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.2.2 Guidelines for compliance with LBS protocol developed |   |  39,326.05  |  39,326.05  |  (6,079.98) |  -  |  6,079.98  |
| N/A II.1.2.3 Regional workshop on wastewater treatment technology held |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.3.1 Resource valuation reports |   |  120,000.00  |  120,000.00  |  12,500.00  |  25,000.00  |  12,500.00  |
| II.1.3.2 Regional training workshops on resource valuation held |   |  180,167.00  |  180,167.00  |  90,083.50  |  170,931.24  |  80,847.74  |
| N/A II.1.4.1 Survey on best practices for funding wastewater utilities completed |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.4.2 Financial management rate and tariff setting |   |  50,000.00  |  50,000.00  |  25,000.00  |  40,000.00  |  15,000.00  |
| II.1.4.3 Targeted training courses for utilities held |   |  6,699.00  |  6,699.00  |  (29,582.00) |  -  |  29,582.00  |
| II.1.5.1 Workshop for training of facilitators. |   |  174,562.17  |  174,562.17  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.5.2 Stakeholder consultation workshop held. |   |  72,000.00  |  72,000.00  |  10,069.04  |  17,989.75  |  7,920.71  |
| II.1.6.1 Wastewater Management information sharing platform established |   |  40,767.00  |  40,767.00  |  40,767.00  |  30,600.00  |  (10,167.00) |
| N/A II.1.6.2 National systems demonstrated. |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.7.1 Number of regional and National workshops on different aspects of wastewater management held.  |   |  365,000.00  |  365,000.00  |  33,175.53  |  15,631.65  |  (17,543.88) |
| II.1.7.2 Number of partnerships for delivery of training. |   |  14,318.27  |  14,318.27  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.7.3 Number of courses outline adapted. |   |  21,110.35  |  21,110.35  |  (1,944.83) |  -  |  1,944.83  |
| II.1.7.4 Number of online courses developed |   |  44,892.38  |  44,892.38  |  16,069.87  |  28,680.67  |  12,610.80  |
| **II.2 Legislative Reform** |   |  660,000.48  |  660,000.48  |  309,745.71  |  524,208.12  |  214,462.42  |
| II.2.1.1 Drafting instructions template developed. |   |  8,313.48  |  8,313.48  |  (11,511.74) |  -  |  11,511.74  |
| II.2.1.2 Wastewater regulations drafted |   |  247,687.00  |  247,687.00  |  143,027.07  |  215,620.13  |  72,593.07  |
| II.2.2.1 Number of training workshops provided for enforcement personnel |   |  254,000.00  |  254,000.00  |  89,010.78  |  158,587.99  |  69,577.21  |
| II.2.3.1 Design and Conduct 2 regional training seminars for legal officers, drafters and policy makers (1 in English and 1 in Spanish). |   |  150,000.00  |  150,000.00  |  89,219.60  |  150,000.00  |  60,780.40  |
| **II.3 Awareness Raising** |   |  285,000.00  |  285,000.00  |  100,374.99  |  67,581.73  |  (32,793.26) |
| II.3.1.1 Regional baseline studies performed. |   |  55,277.06  |  55,277.06  |  (4,861.47) |  -  |  4,861.47  |
| II.3.1.2 Communication products developed. |   |  134,722.94  |  134,722.94  |  26,952.54  |  15,797.81  |  (11,154.73) |
| II.3.2.1 Number of stories in the media published.  |   |  20,000.00  |  20,000.00  |  5,783.92  |  5,783.92  |  -  |
| II.3.3.1 Communication strategy for rural communities developed. |   |  10,000.00  |  10,000.00  |  10,000.00  |  5,000.00  |  (5,000.00) |
| II.3.3.2 Rural communication campaign on sanitation implemented.  |   |  50,000.00  |  50,000.00  |  50,000.00  |  26,000.00  |  (24,000.00) |
| II.3.4.1 Inventory of wastewater education in selected countries conducted.  |   |   |  -  |  (2,500.00) |  -  |  2,500.00  |
| II.3.4.2 Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. |   |  15,000.00  |  15,000.00  |  15,000.00  |  15,000.00  |  -  |
| N/A II.3.4.3 Teaching learning toolkit developed and tested. |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| **Component 3 Communications, Outreach and Information Exchange** |   |  760,000.25  |  760,000.25  |  209,884.85  |  304,014.15  |  94,129.31  |
| **Project Document Development & Training** |   |  465,000.25  |  465,000.25  |  103,568.44  |  149,038.15  |  45,469.72  |
| III.1.1.1 Templates used to document the pilots, demos and overall project |   |  24,350.00  |  24,350.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| N/A III.1.1.2 Workshops on how to use templates and selections of lessons learned |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| III.1.2.1 Replication strategy developed  |   |  108,976.29  |  108,976.29  |  38,723.60  |  49,623.72  |  10,900.12  |
| III.1.3.1 Annual regional meetings with stakeholders |   |  185,650.25  |  185,650.25  |  24,057.45  |  48,114.89  |  24,057.45  |
| III.1.3.2 Presentations on the implementation of the CReW at regional and internal conferences |   |  65,000.00  |  65,000.00  |  10,662.68  |  13,650.94  |  2,988.27  |
| III.1.3.3 Professional exchanges conducted. |   |  81,023.71  |  81,023.71  |  30,124.72  |  37,648.60  |  7,523.89  |
| **Integrated Information System** |   |  295,000.00  |  295,000.00  |  106,316.41  |  154,976.00  |  48,659.59  |
| III.2.1.1 IT based regional information management system developed |   |  295,000.00  |  295,000.00  |  106,316.41  |  154,976.00  |  48,659.59  |
| **Component 4 - M&E** |  695,170.00  |  90,000.00  |  785,170.00  |  292,786.46  |  16,345.35  |  276,441.11) |
| IV.1 Development of a standarized M&E approach |  695,170.00  |  90,000.00  |  785,170.00  |  292,786.46  |  16,345.35  |  (276,441.11) |
| **Component 5 - Project Management** |  922,000.00  |  35,000.00  |  957,000.00  |  40,687.16  |  89,142.81  |  48,455.65  |
| V.1 Project Management |  922,000.00  |  35,000.00  |  957,000.00  |  40,687.16  |  89,142.81  |  48,455.65  |
| **Grand Total** |  **16,577,170.00**  |  **3,435,000.25**  |  **20,012,170.25**  |  **5,271,925.49**  |  **4,762,949.44**  |  **(508,976.05)** |

 Annex 2: Expenditure as at June 30, 2016

Description: Annual project statement of allocation, expenditure (in US$)

Period: July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016

Project number: RG-X1011

Project title: Testing a Prototype Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW)

Project commencing (date): July 2011

Project ending (date): January 2017

Overview: The report highlights all components in the project, and shows details for IDB Account # GRT/FM-12723-RG operated by the Project Coordinating Group (PCG) and UNEP Project No. GFL 2324-4A58-2732 operated by United Nations Environmental Programme Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP CAR/RCU)

| Activities | IADB | UNEP | Total GEF Financing | Actual July 2011-June 2012 | Actual July 2012-June 2013 | Actual July 2013-June 2014 | Actual July 2014-June 2015 | Actual July 2015-June 2016 | Accumulated expenditure as at June 30, 2016 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   | 20,000,000 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ |
| **Component 1 Investment and innovative financing for wastewater management** |  14,960,000.00  |   |  14,960,000.00  |  96,062.24  |  3,229,195.92  |  5,268,365.31  |  2,243,889.10  |  3,240,332.19  |  14,077,844.76  |
| **1.1 Pilot Financing Mechanisms (PFM)** |  13,000,000.00  |   |  13,000,000.00  |  -  |  3,000,000.00  |  5,000,000.00  |  2,000,000.00  |  3,000,000.00  |  13,000,000.00  |
| **1.2 Project Development Support** |  1,111,684.00  |   |  1,111,684.00  |  -  |  74,500.00  |  100,292.10  |  110,483.13  |  49,219.77  |  334,495.00  |
| **1.3 Capacity Building for Pilot Implementation** |  848,316.00  |   |  848,316.00  |  96,062.24  |  154,695.92  |  168,073.21  |  133,405.97  |  191,112.42  |  743,349.76  |
| I.3  Technical specialists hired   |  473,316.00  |   |  473,316.00  |  96,062.24  |  114,116.28  |  125,473.34  |  97,778.52  |  84,795.80  |  518,226.18  |
| I.4  Project Management Units with technical support hired |  375,000.00  |   |  375,000.00  |  -  |  40,579.64  |  42,599.87  |  35,627.45  |  106,316.62  |  225,123.58  |
| **Component 2 Reforms for Wastewater Management** |   |  2,550,000.00  |  2,550,000.00  |  75,067.59  |  469,109.84  |  547,254.26  |  292,536.37  |  1,113,114.94  |  2,497,083.00  |
| **II.1 Capacity Building - Policy and Institutional Strengthening** |   |  1,604,999.52  |  1,604,999.52  |  37,720.35  |  441,584.77  |  370,404.33  |  210,047.98  |  521,325.09  |  1,581,082.52  |
| II.1.1.1 Policy templates and tools kit developed. |   |  14,400.00  |  14,400.00  |  -  |  -  |  14,400.00  |  -  |  -  |  14,400.00  |
| II.1.1.2 Template for Wastewater management plan developed. |   |  25,000.00  |  25,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  9,000.00  |  -  |  16,000.00  |  25,000.00  |
| II.1.1.3 National capacity development plans implemented. |   |  381,076.58  |  381,076.58  |  -  |  60,000.00  |  101,534.00  |  29,300.80  |  176,491.78  |  367,326.58  |
| N/A II.1.1.4 Regional evaluation workshop held |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.2.1 Report on compliance of LBS protocol prepared. |   |  55,680.72  |  55,680.72  |  20,000.00  |  35,680.72  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  55,680.72  |
| II.1.2.2 Guidelines for compliance with LBS protocol developed |   |  39,326.05  |  39,326.05  |  -  |  26,583.64  |  10,000.00  |  2,742.41  |  -  |  39,326.05  |
| N/A II.1.2.3 Regional workshop on wastewater treatment technology held |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.3.1 Resource valuation reports |   |  120,000.00  |  120,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  95,000.00  |  -  |  25,000.00  |  120,000.00  |
| II.1.3.2 Regional training workshops on resource valuation held |   |  180,167.00  |  180,167.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  9,235.76  |  170,931.24  |  180,167.00  |
| N/A II.1.4.1 Survey on best practices for funding wastewater utilities completed |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.4.2 Financial management rate and tariff setting |   |  50,000.00  |  50,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  10,000.00  |  -  |  40,000.00  |  50,000.00  |
| II.1.4.3 Targeted training courses for utilities held |   |  6,699.00  |  6,699.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  6,699.00  |  -  |  6,699.00  |
| II.1.5.1 Workshop for training of facilitators. |   |  174,562.17  |  174,562.17  |  -  |  126,194.60  |  48,367.57  |  -  |  -  |  174,562.17  |
| II.1.5.2 Stakeholder consultation workshop held. |   |  72,000.00  |  72,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  54,010.25  |  17,989.75  |  72,000.00  |
| II.1.6.1 Wastewater Management information sharing platform established |   |  40,767.00  |  40,767.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  30,600.00  |  30,600.00  |
| N/A II.1.6.2 National systems demonstrated. |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.7.1 Number of regional and National workshops on different aspects of wastewater management held.  |   |  365,000.00  |  365,000.00  |  17,720.35  |  178,807.54  |  77,200.28  |  75,640.18  |  15,631.65  |  365,000.00  |
| II.1.7.2 Number of partnerships for delivery of training. |   |  14,318.27  |  14,318.27  |  -  |  14,318.27  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  14,318.27  |
| II.1.7.3 Number of courses outline adapted. |   |  21,110.35  |  21,110.35  |  -  |  -  |  4,902.48  |  16,207.87  |  -  |  21,110.35  |
| II.1.7.4 Number of online courses developed |   |  44,892.38  |  44,892.38  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  16,211.71  |  28,680.67  |  44,892.38  |
| **II.2 Legislative Reform** |   |  660,000.48  |  660,000.48  |  -  |  10,000.00  |  107,525.49  |  18,266.87  |  524,208.12  |  660,000.48  |
| II.2.1.1 Drafting instructions template developed. |   |  8,313.48  |  8,313.48  |  -  |  -  |  8,313.48  |  -  |  -  |  8,313.48  |
| II.2.1.2 Wastewater regulations drafted |   |  247,687.00  |  247,687.00  |  -  |  -  |  20,600.00  |  11,466.87  |  215,620.13  |  247,687.00  |
| II.2.2.1 Number of training workshops provided for enforcement personnel |   |  254,000.00  |  254,000.00  |  -  |  10,000.00  |  78,612.01  |  6,800.00  |  158,587.99  |  254,000.00  |
| II.2.3.1 Design and Conduct 2 regional training seminars for legal officers, drafters and policy makers (1 in English and 1 in Spanish). |   |  150,000.00  |  150,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  150,000.00  |  150,000.00  |
| **II.3 Awareness Raising** |   |  285,000.00  |  285,000.00  |  37,347.24  |  17,525.07  |  69,324.44  |  64,221.52  |  67,581.73  |  256,000.00  |
| II.3.1.1 Regional baseline studies performed. |   |  55,277.06  |  55,277.06  |  22,500.00  |  12,625.33  |  -  |  20,151.73  |  -  |  55,277.06  |
| II.3.1.2 Communication products developed. |   |  134,722.94  |  134,722.94  |  14,847.24  |  4,899.74  |  69,324.44  |  29,853.71  |  15,797.81  |  134,722.94  |
| II.3.2.1 Number of stories in the media published.  |   |  20,000.00  |  20,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  14,216.08  |  5,783.92  |  20,000.00  |
| II.3.3.1 Communication strategy for rural communities developed. |   |  10,000.00  |  10,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  5,000.00  |  5,000.00  |
| II.3.3.2 Rural communication campaign on sanitation implemented.  |   |  50,000.00  |  50,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  26,000.00  |  26,000.00  |
| II.3.4.1 Inventory of wastewater education in selected countries conducted.  |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.3.4.2 Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. |   |  15,000.00  |  15,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  15,000.00  |  15,000.00  |
| N/A II.3.4.3 Teaching learning toolkit developed and tested. |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| **Component 3 Communications, Outreach and Information Exchange** |   |  760,000.25  |  760,000.25  |  94,752.18  |  83,201.10  |  116,784.21  |  136,269.49  |  304,014.15  |  735,021.13  |
| **Project Document Development & Training** |   |  465,000.25  |  465,000.25  |  6,606.90  |  76,316.55  |  110,830.45  |  105,469.49  |  149,038.15  |  448,261.54  |
| III.1.1.1 Templates used to document the pilots, demos and overall project |   |  24,350.00  |  24,350.00  |  -  |  6,800.00  |  6,800.00  |  -  |  -  |  13,600.00  |
| N/A III.1.1.2 Workshops on how to use templates and selections of lessons learned |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| III.1.2.1 Replication strategy developed  |   |  108,976.29  |  108,976.29  |  -  |  -  |  53,576.52  |  5,776.05  |  49,623.72  |  108,976.29  |
| III.1.3.1 Annual regional meetings with stakeholders |   |  185,650.25  |  185,650.25  |  152.00  |  62,097.51  |  32,312.49  |  42,973.36  |  48,114.89  |  185,650.25  |
| III.1.3.2 Presentations on the implementation of the CReW at regional and internal. conferences |   |  65,000.00  |  65,000.00  |  6,454.90  |  7,419.04  |  18,141.44  |  19,333.68  |  13,650.94  |  65,000.00  |
| III.1.3.3 Professional exchanges conducted. |   |  81,023.71  |  81,023.71  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  37,386.40  |  37,648.60  |  75,035.00  |
| **Integrated Information System** |   |  295,000.00  |  295,000.00  |  88,145.28  |  6,884.55  |  5,953.76  |  30,800.00  |  154,976.00  |  286,759.59  |
| III.2.1.1 IT based regional information management system developed |   |  295,000.00  |  295,000.00  |  88,145.28  |  6,884.55  |  5,953.76  |  30,800.00  |  154,976.00  |  286,759.59  |
| **Component 4 - M&E** |  695,170.00  |  90,000.00  |  785,170.00  |  16,544.71  |  9,239.22  |  5,093.98  |  81,593.73  |  16,345.35  |  128,816.99  |
| IV.1 Development of a standarized M&E approach |  695,170.00  |  90,000.00  |  785,170.00  |  16,544.71  |  9,239.22  |  5,093.98  |  81,593.73  |  16,345.35  |  128,816.99  |
| **Component 5 - Project Management** |  922,000.00  |  35,000.00  |  957,000.00  |  186,242.73  |  236,373.04  |  304,337.29  |  100,216.97  |  89,142.81  |  916,312.84  |
| V.1 Project Management |  922,000.00  |  35,000.00  |  957,000.00  |  186,242.73  |  236,373.04  |  304,337.29  |  100,216.97  |  89,142.81  |  916,312.84  |
| **Grand Total** |  **16,577,170.00**  |  **3,435,000.25**  |  **20,012,170.25**  |  **468,669.45**  |  **4,027,119.12**  |  **6,241,835.05**  |  **2,854,505.66**  |  **4,762,949.44**  |  **18,355,078.72**  |

Annex 3: Co-financing Report

Description: Annual project statement of co-financing in cash from the pilot countries and UNEP (in US$)

Period: July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016

Project number: RG-X1011

Project title: Testing a Prototype Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW)

Project commencing (date): July 2011

Project ending (date): January 2017

Overview: The report highlights all components in the project, and shows details for IDB Account # GRT/FM-12723-RG operated by the Project Coordinating Group (PCG) and UNEP Project No. GFL 2324-4A58-2732 operated by United Nations Environmental Programme Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP CAR/RCU)

| Activities | IADB | UNEP | Countries Governments | Others Organizations | TOTAL | Actual July 2011-June 2012 | Actual July 2012-June 2013 | Actual July 2013-June 2014 | Actual July 2014-June 2015 | Actual July 2015-June 2016 | Accumulated expenditure as at June 30, 2016 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ |
| **Component 1 Investment and innovative financing for wastewater management** |  -  |  -  |  12,060,804.68  |  -  |  12,060,804.68  |  -  |  60,804.68  |  -  |  5,770.00  |  6,665,876.91  |  6,732,451.59  |
| **1.1 Pilot Financing Mechanisms (PFM)** |   |   |  12,000,000.00  |   |  12,000,000.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  6,663,954.80  |  6,663,954.80  |
| **1.2 Project Development Support** |   |   |  60,804.68  |   |  60,804.68  |  -  |  60,804.68  |  -  |  5,770.00  |  1,922.11  |  68,496.79  |
| **1.3 Capacity Building for Pilot Implementation** |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |   |  -  |
| I.3  Technical specialists hired   |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| I.4  Project Management Units with technical support hired |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **Component 2 Reforms for Wastewater Management** |   |  -  |   |   |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| **II.1 Capacity Building - Policy and Institutional Strengthening** |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.1.1.1 Policy templates and tools kit developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.1.2 Template for Wastewater management plan developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.1.3 National capacity development plans implemented. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| N/A II.1.1.4 Regional evaluation workshop held |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.2.1 Report on compliance of LBS protocol prepared. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.2.2 Guidelines for compliance with LBS protocol developed |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| N/A II.1.2.3 Regional workshop on wastewater treatment technology held |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.3.1 Resource valuation reports |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.3.2 Regional training workshops on resource valuation held |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| N/A II.1.4.1 Survey on best practices for funding wastewater utilities completed |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.4.2 Financial management rate and tariff setting |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.4.3 Targeted training courses for utilities held |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.5.1 Workshop for training of facilitators. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.5.2 Stakeholder consultation workshop held. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.6.1 Wastewater Management information sharing platform established |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| N/A II.1.6.2 National systems demonstrated. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.7.1 Number of regional and National workshops on different aspects of wastewater management held.  |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.7.2 Number of partnerships for delivery of training. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.7.3 Number of courses outline adapted. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.1.7.4 Number of online courses developed |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **II.2 Legislative Reform** |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.2.1.1 Drafting instructions template developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.2.1.2 Wastewater regulations drafted |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.2.2.1 Number of training workshops provided for enforcement personnel |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.2.3.1 Design and Conduct 2 regional training seminars for legal officers, drafters and policy makers (1 in English and 1 in Spanish). |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **II.3 Awareness Raising** |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| II.3.1.1 Regional baseline studies performed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.1.2 Communication products developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.2.1 Number of stories in the media published.  |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.3.1 Communication strategy for rural communities developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.3.2 Rural communication campaign on sanitation implemented.  |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.4.1 Inventory of wastewater education in selected countries conducted.  |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| II.3.4.2 Recommendation for enhancing incorporation of wastewater management issues into CXC curricula developed. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| N/A II.3.4.3 Teaching learning toolkit developed and tested. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **Component 3 Communications, Outreach and Information Exchange** |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  10,750.00  |
| **Project Document Development & Training** |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  10,750.00  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  10,750.00  |
| III.1.1.1 Templates used to document the pilots, demos and overall project |   |  10,750.00  |   |   |  10,750.00  |   |  10,750.00  |   |   |   |  10,750.00  |
| N/A III.1.1.2 Workshops on how to use templates and selections of lessons learned |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| III.1.2.1 Replication strategy developed  |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| III.1.3.1 Annual regional meetings with stakeholders |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| III.1.3.2 Presentations on the implementation of the CReW at regional and internal conferences |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| III.1.3.3 Professional exchanges conducted. |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **Integrated Information System** |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |  -  |
| III.2.1.1 IT based regional information management system developed |   |   |   |   |  -  |   |   |   |   |   |  -  |
| **Component 4 - M&E** |  -  |  -  |  576,000.00  |  -  |  576,000.00  |  -  |  8,743.51  |  -  |  (1,500.00) |  -  |  7,243.51  |
| IV.1 Development of a standarized M&E approach |   |   |  576,000.00  |   |  576,000.00  |  -  |  8,743.51  |  -  |  (1,500.00) |  -  |  7,243.51  |
| **Component 5 - Project Management** |  -  |  489,250.00  |  1,316,000.00  |  -  |  1,805,250.00  |  185,990.36  |  716,898.49  |  434,823.07  |  267,324.82  |  40,160.00  |  1,645,196.74  |
| V.1 Project Management |   |  489,250.00  |  1,316,000.00  |   |  1,805,250.00  |  185,990.36  |  716,898.49  |  434,823.07  |  267,324.82  |  40,160.00  |  1,645,196.74  |
| **Grand Total** |  **-**  |  **500,000.00**  |  **13,952,804.68**  |  **-**  |  **14,452,804.68**  |  **185,990.36**  |  **797,196.68**  |  **434,823.07**  |  **271,594.82**  |  **6,706,036.91**  |  **8,395,641.84**  |

Description: Annual project statement of co-financing in kind from Governments, IDB, UNEP and other partners (in US$)

Period: July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016

Project number: RG-X1011

Project title: Testing a Prototype Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW)

Project commencing (date): July 2011

Project ending (date): January 2017

Overview: The report highlights all components in the project, and shows details for IDB Account # GRT/FM-12723-RG operated by the Project Coordinating Group (PCG) and UNEP Project No. GFL 2324-4A58-2732 operated by United Nations Environmental Programme Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP CAR/RCU)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Co-financier (source)** | **Type** | **Proposed Co-financing (US$M)** | **Accumulated Co-financing contribution as of June 30, 2012** | **Accumulated Co-financing contribution as to June 30, 2013** | **Accumulated Co-financing contribution as of June 30, 2014** | **Accumulated Co-financing contribution as to June 30, 2015** | **Accumulated Co-financing contribution as of June 30, 2016** | **Percentage of co-financing contribution (%)** | **Notes** |
|   |   |   | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ | US$ |   |   |
| Government | Grant and in-kind | 75,823,443 | 15,627,216 | 57,931,698 | 73,558,914 | 73,919,737 | 73,919,737 | 97.49% |   |
| Government | Loans | 15,000,000 | 5,000,000 |  -  | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 33.33% |   |
| IDB  | Loans | 131,500,000 | 107,900,000 | 234,900,000 | 342,800,000 | 484,623,529 | 484,623,529 | 368.54% | Based on IDB Report |
| IDB | Grant | 27,506,960 | 29,139,323 | 6,205,677 | 35,345,000 | 35,345,000 | 35,345,000 | 128.49% | Based on IDB Report |
| IDB | In-Kind | 772,000 | 165,215 | 165,215 | 330,430 | 495,645 | 495,645 | 64.20% | Based on IDB Report |
| UNEP CAR/RCU | In-Kind | 600,000 | 350,000 | 150,000 | 500,000 | 613,500 | 613,500 | 102.25% | Based on UNEP CAR/RCU Report |
| Other Organizations | Grant and in-kind | 500,000 | 563,600 | 2,400 | 566,000 | 567,600 | 567,600 | 113.52% |   |
| **Total** |  | **251,702,403** | **158,745,354** | **299,354,990** | **458,100,344** | **600,565,011** | **600,565,011** | **129.69%** |  |

Annex 4 - PROJECT MONITORING REPORT (PMR)
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1. Although using the UNEP format, this report has been prepared and cleared by the PCG and both IAs, and will be submitted by both agencies to the GEF Sec. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Fields with an \* sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. If there was a “Completion Revision” please use the date of the revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations during FY12 should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format. See Annex 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See above note on co-financing [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. As in project document [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Or immediate project objective [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Final target for each project to be determined based on local standards, LBS protocol and other environmental factors. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. As per latest work plan (latest project revision) [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Incorporated in 2013 report [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Incorporated in 2014 report [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. Incorporated in 2013 report [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. Incorporated in 2014 report [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Incorporated in 2013 report [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. Incorporated in 2014 report [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. Incorporated in 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. Incorporated in 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. Incorporated in 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Incorporated in 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. Incorporated in 2014 report

+ [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. Incorporated in 2013 report [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. Incorporated in 2014 report [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. Incorporated in 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Incorporated in 2014 report [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. MTE will take place between August to November 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (*i.e, the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)