



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 08/15/2001	
PROJ ID: P036007		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Environmental Management Project	Project Costs (US\$M)	10.5	10.75
Country: Trinidad & Tobago	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	6.25	5.47
Sector(s): Board: ENV - Central government administration (100%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	0.95	0.98
L/C Number: L3863			
	Board Approval (FY)		95
Partners involved : UNDP	Closing Date	12/31/1999	12/31/2000
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
John C. English	John R. Heath	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The major objective of the project was to build effective institutional capacity to plan and implement sound environmental management in Trinidad and Tobago .			
Subsidiary objectives were to:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete a national environmental action plan (NEAP); • support a priority work program that would strengthen the legal and regulatory framework; and • implement measures for improved environmental management consistent with the findings of the NEAP . 			
b. Components			
Project activities were grouped under three organizational components :			
Ministry of Planning and Development : (11.8% of base costs) . This provided for the establishment and startup of the project, including the establishment of the Environmental Management Authority .			
Environmental Management Authority : (EMA) (54.8% of base costs) . Under this component the EMA was to be made operational with responsibility for implementation of activities in training and technical assistance, and for executing studies and planning exercises .			
Participating Agencies : (33.4% of base costs) . This component involved the strengthening of other agencies with responsibilities for environmental management .			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
Total project costs were estimated at \$ 10.5 million, to be covered by a Bank loan (\$6.25 million), a UNDP grant (0.95 million), and GOTT financing (\$3.3 million).			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
Institutional capacity. The principal element of the project was establishing the EMA and bringing it to full operating capacity. By the end of the project the EMA was operating with 38 trained staff, with approval and funds for a full complement of 72. The EMA is exercising its core functions and is considered a credible organization by other government agencies, the private sector, NGOs and the public .			
Strengthening other public agencies has only been partly achieved . For example, an Environmental Commission (environmental court) was only established in July 2000 after legislative delays .			
The NEAP. An initial draft of a NEAP was prepared but was then superseded by a National Environment Policy, which was then approved by Parliament in 1998. This provided a comprehensive framework for environmental management, specifying the objectives, key elements and principles for environmental management in the country . This, together with the Environment Management Act (EM Act), was used to guide the work program in place of the NEAP.			
Preparation of a priority work program. The Bank accepted that the above framework (i.e., the NEP and the EM Act) constituted an adequate statement of priorities .			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			

The EMA has been able to fulfill its statutory requirements and is seen as the key environmental management agency. During the project a comprehensive set of laws, standards and regulations was prepared. Approval was delayed by the dissolution of Parliament but is now proceeding, and will fully underpin the role of the EMA.

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

A major element of the third component was to have been the strengthening of the capacity of other agencies to carry out their functions under environmental legislation. Little was achieved on this front and the contacts that were established between the EMA and other agencies were proforma rather than effectively operational. Resources were directed away from this component to meet the core needs of the EMA, partly because of legislative and other delays.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev.:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability:	Highly Likely	Highly Likely	
Bank Performance:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf.:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR:		Satisfactory	

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

The importance of credibility with the public.

This leads to two main lessons:

- the need for regulatory agencies to demonstrate quickly their ability to enforce environmental laws that will address some of the expectations and engender public confidence;
- the value of strengthening the legal framework in advance, including bringing forward preparation of enabling legislation and related requirements as an integral part of the preparation process.

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR provides a good and clear account of the project experience and status.