

2018

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT



UNDP PIMS ID: 4928
GEF ID: 5045
Country: The Solomon Islands

“Integrating Global
Environment
Commitments in
Investment and
Development Decision-
Making (IGECIDDM)”
Project

Dr. Amal Aldababseh



International Terminal Evaluation Expert and Team Leader

Dr. Amal Aldababseh, adababseh@estidama-jo.com

Acknowledgments

The evaluator would like to thank all individuals; members of the Project Board, project stakeholders, members of the local community in Kia village and entities that spent time to participate in interviews with the evaluation consultant and generously provided honest views and suggestions on the project activities and results during the Terminal Evaluation mission in the Solomon Islands, during the period of 4-12 August 2018.

The evaluator would also like to express her gratitude and special appreciation for the excellent support provided by the personnel of the Project Management Unit, and the UNDP Country Office in the Solomon Islands.

3.3.6 Sustainability (*).....	35
3.3.7 Impact.....	38
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons	40
4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project.....	40
4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.....	41
4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives	41
4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success	42
5. Annexes	43
Annex 1. ToR.....	44
Annex 2. List of documents reviewed.....	53
Annex 3: Itinerary	54
Annex 4. List of persons interviewed.....	56
Annex 5. Evaluative Question Matrix.....	57
Annex 6. The questionnaire used for the interviews	63
Annex 7: Progress evaluation for the complete Logframe.....	65
Annex 8: Capacity Scorecards for Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making (IGECIDDM)/CCCD Project	80
Annex 9: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	84
Annex 10: Evaluation Report Clearance Form	85

List of Tables:

Table 1: Rating Project Performance	6
Table 2: Overview on the Terminal Evaluation of the Project's Logframe	16
Table 3: The list of national and international experts who were involved in the CCCD Project in the Solomon Islands.....	21
Table 4: Project Budget and Expenditures (US\$).....	26
Table 5: Co-financing of Project Partner (US\$).....	26
Table 6: Matrix for rating the Achievement of Outcomes	30

i. Executive Summary

1.1 Project Summary Table

Project Title: Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making (IGECIDDM)		
UNDP Project ID:	00083083	
UNDP ID (PIMS #):	4928	
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5045	
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Project	00091738	
Country(ies):	Solomon Islands	
Region:	Pacific	
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal Area	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	CD-3; CD-2.	
Trust Fund (GEF)	850,000 USD	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner	UNDP in cooperation with MECDM, MoFR, and MAL	
Project Financing	at CEO endorsement	at TE – Aug 2018 (US\$)
[1] GEF financing:	850,000	850,000
[2] UNDP contribution:	150,000	158,478.86
[3] Government:	250,000	545,428.06
[4] Other partners:	-	-
[5] Total co-financing [2+3+4]:	400,000	703,906.92
PROJECT TOTAL COST [1+5]	1,250,000	1,507,972.26
Project Document Signature Date	29.09.2014	
closing date	Proposed 30.07.2017	Actual 30.07.2018

1.2 Project Description

The goal of the IGECIDDM project is to realize the global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation by strengthening policy coordination and planning mechanisms in the Solomon Islands. Thus, the project objective is to enhance the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

To achieve the project’s goal and objective, the project includes three components, two main outcomes, and nine outputs. The Project Document lists three key components to achieve the project’s objective:

- **Component 1:** *strengthening institutional capacities for improved implementation of Rio Convention obligations;*
- **Component 2:** *strengthening the Development Consent Process to more effectively mainstream Rio Convention obligations; and*
- **Component 3:** *strengthening awareness and understanding of REDD+ as a strategy to meet Rio Convention obligations.*

The project’s outcomes are:

- **Outcome 1:** Strengthened policy coordination and planning mechanisms, and
- **Outcome 2:** Improved communications and dissemination of information related to Rio Conventions.

The project’s main goal is to deliver global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation by strengthening policy coordination and planning mechanisms. To this end, the immediate objective of the project is to strengthen and institute a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions in deforestation and forest degradation in a way that meets objectives under the three Rio Conventions.

According to the Project Document, the Project does not envisage the creation of any new institutional structure but rather seeks to strengthen existing institutional structures as the more cost-effective approach. The Project Document specified the expected project results – project outputs - for each project component that relates to the immediate objectives.

1.3 Evaluation Rating Table

The project has been able to achieve most of the planned activities and targets. Most significant achievements included the development of the REDD+ Roadmap, a number of critically needed guidelines, tools and a textbook and teacher’s guidebook on Rio Conventions, Table I.

Table I: Rating Project Performance

Criteria	Rating
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall quality of M&E	S
M&E design at project startup	HS
M&E Plan Implementation	S
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	S
Implementing Agency Execution	S
Executing Agency Execution	HS
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	S
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R
Effectiveness	S
Efficiency	MS
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).	
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	L
Financial resources	ML
Socio-economic	L
Institutional framework and governance	L
Environmental	L
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)	
Environmental Status Improvement	S
Environmental Stress Reduction (rate 3 pt. scale)	3
Progress towards stress/status change (rate 3 pt. scale)	2
Overall Project Results	S

1.4 Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons learned

Summary of Conclusions

The project has had a sustainable and considerable effect on mainstreaming Rio-conventions in decision making processes in the Solomon Islands. It achieved its objectives in terms of key targets, developing tools and guidelines for mainstreaming Rio Conventions in decision-making processes, and enhanced the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the Rio Conventions. It was also very successful in leveraging co-financing from the government.

The project was able to complete many of the planned activities within four years (one-year extension with no cost requested to finalize the remaining project’s activities). The project was unable to achieve the following expected results (results that were stated in the ProDoc):

- Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation convened by month 12
- Working groups established by month 3
- Lessons learned report drafted by month 27, finalized by month 33, and presented in stakeholder workshops by month 33
- A draft proposal for improved EMIS by month 13 and finalized by month 16: partially achieved.
- The unified format for the EMIS by month 22
- Training programme and materials on the new EMIS by month 24
- Training programme implemented by month 15 and month 27
- Broad-based surveys completed by month 3 and month 34, and independent analysis of the survey by month 35.
- At least 10 high schools and SINU have implemented education module by month 20
- At least 20 high schools have implemented education module by month 32
- Three-panel discussion, with at least 50 private sector representatives, one held each year. The first by month 8.
- A number of visits to the website show sustained and increasing interest in the project life cycle.

Taking into consideration the complexity of the project, the difficulties the project’s team had faced during project launching phase, the project overall rating is **Satisfactory**.

The Project is extremely acknowledged by the Government and is considered as the only national initiative that has contributed enormously to institutionalize the work on REDD+ since its start in the country. As a direct result of the project positive initial results, the Government requested a second phase or a follow-up project that would help the Government in piloting the tools and guidelines developed under the project, with focus on building capacities at local communities and provinces level.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Produce more hard copies of the guidelines, EIA checklists, the framework, and other project’s deliverables and make them available for national stakeholders. Developing hard copies is crucial due to the unreliable, costly, and intermittent internet access in the country. However, these deliverables can be made available online by developing the project’s website to ensure the dissemination of the results to a wider audience as well as linking the project’s website to UNDP CO website to ensure the dissemination of knowledge to other countries aiming at developing the same kind of tools/guidelines. (UNDP, MECDM).

Recommendation 2: The valuable public awareness products, mainly the secondary schools textbook and teachers’ guide, produced by the project on the Rio Conventions should be distributed to all stakeholders mainly to the Ministry of Education and a large number of high schools. It is also useful if a clear follow- plan on these public awareness and outreach tools linked to future development activities, like the IFM project and TNC activities to ensure that future initiatives would build on the CCCD project activities and results and will incorporate the project’s products in its work. (UNDP and MECDM).

Recommendation 3: While this TE was not able to analyze the training-manuals developed and implemented by the projects, it is recommended that the remaining project training and piloting activities be completed as soon as possible, including texting the training manuals that incorporating standardized local friendly methods for community-based ecosystem assessments for REDD+ projects, the proposed amendments to the Environment Act and Environment Regulations, and piloting the testing of an innovative forest management approach framed by REDD+ that aimed to demonstrating measurable indicators of delivering global environment benefits. (UNDP, and MECDM).

Recommendation 4: Mainstreaming Rio Convention in decision-making process capacity presently has limitations to meet the actual needs at the Country level. The REDD+ Programme and other initiatives supported by UNDP and other development partners should continue working on the upgrading of the national capacity in order not to meet the needed demand created under the project. (MECDM, UNDP, IFM/FAO, GIZ Project).

Lessons Learned

Below are lessons considered by the TE consultant to be significant and had contributed to the successful implementation of the project. Those were drawn from the project experiences. Some of the best practices are:

Lesson learned 1: When there is a clearly challenging situation at the national level, like lack of technical capacities, defining a set of practical concrete steps during the project design to help the project’s team implementing the project and overcoming the challenging situation, is very crucial. For example, CCCD projects are complex in nature and require technical support in many countries. For the Solomon Islands CCCD project, the involvement of an external international specialist was crucial to ensure the successful implementation of the project’s activities. It has proven to be highly beneficial in terms of supporting the project team in managing the project, providing technical back-stopping, and identifying issues and risks in addition to mitigation measures to be implemented. Such an arrangement was very necessary for the Solomon Islands CCCD project; however, it was not proposed in the project design or during the inception phase, which caused a major delay in project implementation up until the hiring of the international specialist.

Lesson learned 2: Timely and well-developed adaptive management measures undertaken during project inception phase would help the project to avoid delay and support the project to utilize whatever opportunities arising that would lead to improved cost-efficiency, and/or offers solutions to a problem. For example, the CCCD project is very relevant and was based on the NCSA. However, different operational issues resulted in slowing down the project implementation and have caused uncertainty with respect to project’s sustainability. Hence, such operational issues/risks need to be clearly analyzed at the project design stage as well as regularly during project implementation with concrete mitigation measures to be identified as part of the adaptive management.

Lesson learned 3: The CCCD project in the Solomon Islands has faced many challenging circumstances since the start of its implementation. Many of these challenges were beyond the project’s control. However, with the project’s team, UNDP, and the Government’s team’s enthusiasm, commitment, flexibility, and perseverance, the Solomon Islands was able to achieve the project’s objective. Hence it has been clear that even in difficult project implementation contexts, with determination and commitments from all stakeholders intended outcomes and results can be achieved.

Lesson learned 4: Hosting the PMU within the government premises is a very effective mean of fully engaging with government and local stakeholders. The CCCD project was hosted at the MECDM premises. The project team was very close to decision makers and were able to communicate directly with the Permanent Secretary concerning any risks/issues hindering the project implementation. The project was also able to get the needed political and technical support. Furthermore, locating the PMU within the MECDM office may have been more

effective for strengthening communication with other projects in the fields of climate change, land degradation, and biodiversity conservation. It also enhanced the country’s ownership of the project and facilitated discussions to ensure sustainability of key project’s deliverables.

Lesson learned 5: Proper and effective stakeholders’ engagement –mainly the receipt government- is a key to achieving project’s deliverables and intended outcomes. GEF projects are intrinsically connected to governments agencies and are considered as financial mechanisms to support governments to comply with their international environmental obligations. The experience from the Solomon Islands CCCD project confirms this and provides evidence that fully and timely engagement of government stakeholders is a key to achieve projects’ results.

Lesson learned 6: CCCD projects are complex and need technical, political, and financial support to ensure its successful implementation. The successful implementation of the CCCD projects depends on the fund's availability, strong political support, and the mobilization of technical expertise needed. However, in many cases, once these projects are operationally closed, there is no clear exit strategy developed, only sustainability aspects and replicability issues are discussed in the terminal report. A stand-alone exit strategy is very crucial to ensure the integration of these projects in governments work plan and strategies to ensure projects’ results sustainability.

Lesson learned 7: Based on the review of the technical deliverables and the produced reports, the TE sees progress in the visible outputs of the project, whose are with more ‘technical orientation’ outputs like (preparing an analytical framework for mainstreaming Rio Conventions in development plan, developing an education module and teacher resource material, prepare REDD+ Roadmap, prepare resources mobilization strategy, etc.), while outputs related to capacity development, information management, public awareness, and coordination are less visible in terms of achievements. During design, CCCD projects need to take this issue into consideration as some outputs may need much more time than the planned, mainly when it comes to government endorsement of laws, legislation, and acts.

ii. Acronyms and abbreviations

APR	Annual Progress Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CCCD	Cross-Cutting Capacity Development
CDRs	Combined delivery reports
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMIS	Environmental Management Information System
IGECIDDM	Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making
IFM	Integrated Forest Management
IR	Inception Report
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoSI	The government of the Solomon Islands
LF	Logical Framework
LOA	Letter of Agreement
MAL	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MECDM	Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology
MoFR	Ministry of Forest and Research
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPG	Ministry of Provincial Government
MTR	Midterm Review
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NECDAP	National Environmental Capacity Development Action Plan
NDS	National Development Strategy 2011 to 2020
NFMS	National Forest Monitoring System
NRC	National REDD+ Committee
PER	Project Evaluation Report
PIR	Project Implementation Report
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
REDD+	Reducing emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.
SINU	Solomon Islands National University
SPC	The Secretariat to the Pacific Community
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP-GEF	United Nations Development Programme- Global Environment Facility

I. Introduction

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the UNDP-supported and GEF-financed project “*Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making (IGECIDDM)/CCCD*” was carried out in three phases: i) desk reviews including data collection, analysis, and preparation of terminal evaluation inception report; ii) evaluation mission in the Solomon Islands to meet with the project team, implementing and executing partners, and other stakeholders. The mission included a site visit to one of the piloting sites (Kia village in Santa Isabel Province); and iii) finalizing the preparation of the Terminal Evaluation Report, integrating comments and feedback, and submitting the final version of the TE report.

I.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

In line with the UNDP and the GEF evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported- GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This report concerns the TE of the project “Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making (IGECIDDM)/CCCD” to assess project results achieved since its commencement, June 2015.

The TE is intended to provide evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information. The evaluation used the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined, and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The TE synthesizes lessons to help guide future design and implementation of GEF-funded UNDP activities and contributes to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits.

I.2 Scope and Methodology

This TE has been conducted according to the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. It is founded on evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation has followed a participatory and consultative approach and wanted to ensure close engagement with key government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, the UNDP GEF team, and key project beneficiaries and stakeholders. The evaluation included a field mission to The Solomon Islands. The TE was carried out in strict adherence to the Terms of Reference received (**Annex I**), and included the following three stages:

- **Desk Review and Preparation Phase:**

This initial stage of the terminal evaluation involved desk reviews of project-related documentation such as the project document, annual reports, project files, national strategic and policy documents, mid-term review report, response to management response, project’s Facebook, project’s technical reports, and any other materials (**Annex 2**) that the evaluator considered useful for an evidence-based evaluation assessment. The documents were mainly provided by the Project Management Unit (PMU).

As part of the preparatory phase, an Inception Report was prepared and submitted to PMU for approval; it included a preliminary itinerary for the field mission (**Annex 3**), a tentative list of interviewees (**Annex 4**) selected to provide a broad sample of the achievements and influence of the project, and an evaluation matrix was developed during this phase and used during the field mission to the Solomon Islands to guide the interviews with the project’s stakeholders (**Annex 5**).

- **Evaluation Mission to the Solomon Islands (4-12 August 2018)**

As per the TORs, an evaluation mission in the Solomon Islands took place from 4-12 August 2018. Meetings were held with several key project stakeholders to brief on the purpose and

methodology of the TE, to obtain the latest update on the project, and to finalize the mission schedules and arrangements. Key participants included PMU, UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO), Implementing Agency (IA), Implementing Partner, Executing Agency (EA). Interviews were held with a wide range of stakeholders using a pre-prepared set of questions (**Annex 6**).

The mission included three main groups of activities:

- **Semi-structured interviews and consultations** with a wide range of stakeholders, using a set of questions in an informal format. The questions aimed to provide answers to the points described in the following section. Findings were crosschecked during different interviews and with available evidence.
 - **Direct observations based on the mission’s interviews and meetings:** the information collected, including documentary evidence, interviews, and observations, were compiled, summarized, and organized according to the questions asked in the evaluation.
 - **A field visit to local communities involved in the project implementation – Kia Village/ Santa Isabell Province:** the meeting with the local community provided a good source of information about stakeholders’ involvement, project’s piloting and the project’s public awareness component’s efficiency and effectiveness.
- **Terminal Evaluation Report Preparation**

Following the field mission to the Solomon Islands, the data collected, updates on project progress, and materials received during the mission were carefully reviewed and analyzed in accordance with the UNDP Project Evaluation Methodology. All data was then consolidated and based on accountable information and opinions of the stakeholders with all sources and assumptions given, a draft Terminal Evaluation Report was prepared and submitted to PMU and UNDP CO for review and feedback.

UNDP Solomon Islands Country Office shall subsequently circulate the report to key project partners for review. Consolidated questions and comments on the draft TE Report received from UNDP CO shall be reviewed, responded to and incorporated into the final Report. An “**audit trail**” will be included to indicate how the comments received were (or were not) addressed in the final TE Report.

1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report

The structure of this TE Report corresponds to the Evaluation Report outline as documented within the TOR for the assignment as well as the GEF and UNDP Terminal Evaluation Guidelines.

The UNDP-supported and GEF-sponsored projects’ TE is based on a performance assessment approach guided by the principles of results-based management. The evaluation tracks impact per the project’s Logical Framework. The contribution of this project outputs and project management is evaluated with reference to the achievement of the project outcomes and overall objective. This TE reviews the implementation experience and achievement of the project results against the Project Document endorsed by the GEF CEO, including any changes made during implementation.

2. Project Description and Development Context

2.1 Project start and duration

The IGECIDDM project started in July 2014 for a period of 3 years with a planned closure date of June 2017. The GEF CEO Endorsement received 7 July 2014. All parties signed the Project Document by 29 September 2014. The first budget revision was submitted in December 2014. The Annual Work Plan (AWP) runs from January to December. The project was officially extended, with no cost, till July 2018 to allow the completion of the remaining activities. At August 2018, the second half of AWP 5, the budget execution (actual expenditure plus the encumbrance) was US\$ 850,000 (100%). In-kind contributions from MECDM amounted to US\$ 545,428.06 by August 31st, 2018 or 218% of the initially planned co-financing (US\$ 250,000) following the actual project implementation status. The UNDP cash co-financing amounted to US\$158,478.86 or about (105.65%). The high co-financing from the Government shows the high interest in the project.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The Solomon Islands completed its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) in 2008 to identify the most critical crosscutting constraints affecting implementation of the Rio Conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). This project was developed to address the key constraints identified in the NCSA including ineffective legislation and policy framework; institutional, technical, and capacity weaknesses; lack of public awareness and information sharing for sound environmental management and decision-making; lack of mainstreaming environmental considerations, biodiversity conservation and sustainable development across government programs; and gaps in human capacity and development.

Since the completion of the NCSA, The Solomon Islands has taken many steps to strengthen environmental policy and programming. In 2010, the national legislature passed the Protected Areas Act that provides a mechanism for community-based natural resource management. The Protected Areas Regulations of 2012, granting communities legal measures to protect their areas and ensure sustainable land-use practices, further strengthened this law. The Solomon Islands made another key advancement in 2010 when it joined the UN-REDD Program to address the country’s problems with deforestation and forest degradation. The country is still in the initial stage of the REDD+ development process and is preparing the REDD+ Roadmap to guide program implementation; this presents an opportunity for synergies to meet other MEA obligations. Additionally, The Solomon Islands has also completed and revised numerous other programs, policies, and plans that seek to address the country’s various MEA commitments. Such plans include the National Environmental Capacity Development Action Plan (NECDAP), the Strategic and Corporate Plan 2010–2012, the National Development Strategy 2011 to 2020 (NDS), the National Biosafety Framework, and the National Climate Change Policy 2012-2017.

Each of the above-mentioned policies and plans highlights the importance of capacity development for achieving local and global environmental benefits. This project responds to these specific crosscutting capacity development needs, and it is strategic in that it responds to a targeted set of underlying barriers to environmental management towards the goal of meeting and sustaining global environmental outcomes.

Specifically, this project seeks to fortify the policy and institutional framework that will harmonize the Rio Convention objectives and strengthen organizational and individual capacities to implement them as part of the REDD+ Roadmap. The project will facilitate the

proactive and constructive engagement of decision-makers across environmental focal areas and socio-economic sectors.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

This project was intended “to realize the global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation by strengthening policy coordination and planning mechanisms. In order to realize these global environmental benefits, it is imperative that the country has the capacity to access and use data and information, as well as best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into planning, decision and reporting processes” according to Project Document, Sub-Section C.2.c, Page 19. More specifically, the project document outlined the main objective of the project as “to strengthen and institute a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions of deforestation and forest degradation to meet the objectives under the three Rio Conventions”. The achievement of the goal and objectives were organized around three organized components:

- **Component 1: Strengthening institutional capacities for improved implementation of Rio Convention obligations**

The first component focuses on strengthening the policy and institutional framework by integrating Rio Convention provisions into The Solomon Islands’ sectoral policies that serve to meet national socio-economic development priorities. This mainstreaming exercise will be conducted in coordination with the REDD+ Roadmap to reinforce the legitimacy of these improved sectoral policies, programmes, plans, and legislation.

- **Component 2: Strengthening the Development Consent Process to more effectively mainstream Rio Convention obligations**

Component 2 focuses on the establishment of an effective knowledge management system that addresses the Development Consent Process within the context of the Rio Conventions. This system will provide a strong tool for promoting multiple benefits within REDD+ and monitoring the implications of safeguards. This component will especially support the national institutions responsible for the Rio Conventions in establishing clear, strong linkages with the REDD+ safeguards to increase cost-effectiveness in the implementation and monitoring of results toward meeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions in a highly harmonized fashion.

- **Component 3: Strengthening awareness and understanding of REDD+ as a strategy to meet Rio Convention obligations**

Component 3 aims to strengthen the institutional sustainability of the project results by advancing awareness, understanding, and capacity of REDD+ as a means of developing nationally appropriate social and environmental safeguards respecting the guidance and safeguards of the FCCC Cancun Agreements. Sustainability of the project will require that a solid baseline of stakeholders’ value the project and that champions embrace the project. Activities are therefore directed to raising the public profile of the project, convening targeted awareness-raising workshops, and developing related materials, as well as developing a resource mobilization strategy to address the financial sustainability of project results.

2.4 Baseline Indicators Established

In the baseline scenario, there were the following indicators:

- Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing poverty alleviation and other socio-economic priorities
- Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral

development planning or Development Consent Processes

- Best practices and lessons learned from mainstreaming Rio Conventions into the REDD+ framework is not readily accessed or tested.
- Planners and decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions, the result of which is that the global environment is heavily discounted.

2.5 Main Stakeholders

Main project stakeholders (including ministries, private sectors, and development partners) identified in the project design (ProDoc, page 31- page32) to be actively involved in project implementation include:

- Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology - Coordination and Facilitation of REDD+ process
- Ministry of Forestry and Research- deals mostly on regulatory issues. It is their role to come up with relevant Policies, laws, and regulations pertaining to forests in the country and ensure that those are enforced accordingly. Under REDD+ they would be responsible to collate and analyze data
- Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock-Plays a key role in REDD+ activities
- Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination- Mainstreaming of the REDD+ process into government National Development Strategy
- Ministry of Lands and Housing-Provides advice on land issues
- Ministry of Provincial Government: linkage between national government and communities
- Community-Based Organizations play a key role in REDD+ awareness and represents communities’ interest
- National Council of Women-represent women’s voice in the REDD process
- Private sector including the Eagon Forest Company Ltd, the Value-Added Timber Association, and the Village Eco-Timber Enterprise
- A number of non-government organizations have participated in REDD+ Initiatives and have good networking with communities and awareness programmes. They can play an important role in awareness-raising and dissemination of REDD+ information at the community level
- Multi- and bilateral donor organizations and technical support and additional funding for pilot projects.

Project relations with the key stakeholders have not been as strong as would have been required to build national capacity for Rio Conventions implementation at national level. A detailed discussion is provided under section 3.1.4, Page 18.

2.6 Expected Results

This project was designed to enhance the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other MEAs. Specifically, the project intended to strengthen and institutionalize a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions of deforestation and forest degradation in a way that meets objectives under the three Rio Conventions. It also intended to deliver global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation by strengthening policy coordination and planning mechanisms.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design/ Formulation

The project design is considered very relevant to the GEF objectives and to the Solomon Islands’ global environmental obligations and development objectives. The project document was designed with defined objectives, outputs, activities, and targets. Many of the intended outputs were designed to be goal-oriented, however, a few targets are difficult to achieve within the three-year implementation timeframe.

The Project Document reasonably included the required level of details concerning the project log-frame (LFA), components and outputs, but it failed -in some cases- to make a proper link to the local context as some proposed activities are difficult to achieve based on the local context. It addresses adequately five main barriers and opportunities to deliver sustainable impact in the way that knowledge and capacity for integrated Rio conventions and REDD+ in the development processes will be achieved or at least improved, implementation plan for their integration is developed with technical assistance of national and international experts, while on-going public awareness on linkages of the global environment to national socio-economic development priorities designed and partially implemented in the Solomon Islands. These activities will allow the Government to utilize knowledge benefits as they build upon a longer-term sustainability strategy.

The project is in full compliance with the national priorities and legislation that govern environmental issues. More specifically, the project is consistent with the following national policies and strategic documents: The Forest Resource and Timber Utilization Act (1991); The Forestry Bill 2004; The Mines and Minerals Act (1996); The Environmental Act (1998); The Wildlife Protection and Management Act (1998); The Fisheries Act (1998); The Solomon Islands’ Code of Logging Practice came into force in 2005; The Protected Areas Act (2010); The Protected Areas Regulations (2012).

3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic/ Strategy, Indicators)

The project objective, the components, and most of the outputs as mentioned in the Project Document are clear and practical. However, the project’s outcomes are mentioned once, then, components were listed as outcomes in the log-frame. According to the project’s inception report, the LFA has been reviewed but no changes have been made and therefore, has not been updated. Outcomes are not well identified in the Project Document, with targets are specified at the output levels. No update/fine-tuning of the outputs, activities, targets, and sources of verification at the inception phase. The targets achievement per the end of the project as formulated during project development-are generally realistic, with a few exceptions.

Essentially the LM followed the GEF format but it did not include targets at the outcome level. This resulted in some weaknesses in the LF in defining targets and indicators at the components/outcomes level and at the mid-term level. Therefore, the LF has led to a greater confusion concerning the project’s strategy. Table 2 provides an overview of the TE assessment of the project’s LFA and how “SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound” the achievements are compared to the defined end-of-project targets.

Table 2: Overview of the Terminal Evaluation of the Project's Logframe

Criteria	TE comments
Specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicators are mostly specific and target oriented, with a few exceptions. - The LFA refers to specific future events and results with a focus on the REDD+ implementation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The LFA relates to the 3 project components and defines corresponding outputs for each of them.
Measurable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The indicators are to a great extent linked to measurable targets. However, no quantifiable targets are listed for outcome 1/output 1.2 and outcome 3/ outputs 3.2 and 3.3. - Indicators are not clearly written. The wording used should be clearer to facilitate how to measure it. For example, output 1.2 it says, “Pilot forest management project”. It is not clear how to measure this indicator.
Achievable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the indicators seem realistic to be achievable. However, some of the indicators are impossible to be achieved during the proposed timeframe. One example was given in the MTR report “the target: Rio Convention priorities will be mainstreamed within the Development Consent Processes and government staff will be trained on the revised environmental management information system”. This target is difficult to achieve taking into consideration the need to involve different institutions working on development at the national level. Furthermore, there is no indicator to measure this target.
Relevant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All indicators are relevant since they address national development priorities.
Time-bound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicators are linked to targets that are clearly linked to specific timeframes. However, the time proposed to achieve some of the targets are not realistic. They don’t take into considerations the local contexts and capacity barriers. - All indicators are linked to their achievements by specific date linked to the proposed month to achieve. Yet, the project faced a one-year delay during its inception, however, the proposed timetable was not updated accordingly.

3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

According to the project document, the project was designed to remove several capacity barriers hindering the implementation and mainstreaming of Rio Conventions in development sectors. Those include the following five barriers; lack of coordination in environmental mainstreaming; weak compliance and enforcement of environmental acts and regulation; inadequate capacities of relevant environmental agencies and departments such as departments within MECDDM and MoFR to tackle existing and emerging environmental problems; lack of proper scientific environmental data and information; and poor technology development and transfer (including loss of traditional knowledge).

The project has effectively managed to address each of these barriers towards the effective integration and implementation of the Rio Conventions by improving the decision-making process in the Solomon Islands.

The project identified **three risks** during the formulation stage (Document Section C.3.c. Page 30-31). These included institutional, operational, and financial risks. However, during the MTR, the MTR consultant has identified two institutional risks and considered them as a medium to high risks.

The risks’ log has been updated quarterly, with a clear set of mitigation measures identified per risk, however, the TE consultant considers the management of the project’s risks needs some improvement in line with the MTR consultant findings: “*The risk assessment and mitigation planning (Risk log as extracted from the UNDP ATLAS) in the IGECIDDM project management reporting is found in the need of improvement, as they need more substance, critical analysis, and concrete mitigation measures*”.

3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.

The CCCD project was designed to complement what other projects are intended to achieve in order to eliminate any overlap and enhance the coordination and collaboration with existed projects. It was noticed that lessons learned from the CCCD project were used and incorporated into other projects’ designs. The government officials indicated that they have learned so many lessons from the implementation of the CCCD, which they have already used and benefited from in the design of other GEF and UN projects. For example, the Government indicated that they have learned three main lessons from the CCCD project: (i) a chief technical advisor should be hired from the early beginning of the project and should stay in the country to provide the needed technical support, (ii) an MOU should be signed between the executing and implementing partners with the needed details concerning the project implementation, and (iii) projects should be nationally implemented even if the capacity is limited in order to enhance the capacity and ensure government ownership.

So far, no clear signs for lessons learned from other relevant projects incorporated into the CCCD project design.

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

The project has managed to develop some of the critical partnerships with stakeholders at the national and at the provincial level with communities in piloting sites (Kia village in Santa Isabel province, and Gizo and Kolombangara in the Western provinces) where relationships appear to be pleasant and there is considerable support. However, considering the strategic aim to develop some national coordination mechanisms between central and provincial governments, the TE would have expected to see more evidence of partnerships with organizations involved in different provinces.

The Project Document required the project to set up Technical Working Groups in order to “discuss and deliberate on the various technical analyses as well as recommendations to establish the EMIS and supporting institutional reforms (Project Document, Section E.3, Paragraph 147, Page 45)”. At least three main types of organizations were listed as members of the Technical Working Groups in the project document (independent experts, technical government agency representatives, representatives from stakeholders’ groups), however, only technical government agency representatives from the three main ministries were involved in the project implementation. Although, it should be noted that the strategic decision of having one technical working group made it very much effective and organized, the absence of other stakeholders’ representatives has limited the work of the technical group due to the high workload.

The project has managed to develop the needed partnership with the academic sector. It has signed a letter of agreement (LOA) with Solomon Islands National University to develop educational and awareness materials. The textbook was officially launched by the UNDP, MECDDM, and the University in an official event, mid-2018.

The project established good cooperation with on-going national projects implemented or at the level of development by FAO, and GIZ. The networking activities established by the PMU to integrate national stakeholders and beneficiaries are contributing to their awareness about the project outcomes and thus are an important element to achieve sustainability of project results.

One international (The Nature Conservancy - TNC) and one national (Kolombangara Indigenous Biodiversity Conservation Association - KIBCA) NGOs were involved in the piloting exercises. During the TE mission, the consultant had the chance to meet with a member of KIBCA who was involved in commissioning different components, however, the TE consultant could not meet with any experts/members of the international NGO during the visit to Kia village.

Overall conclusion, the project management has achieved some modest appropriate partnerships with relevant stakeholders. However, the project management has failed to engage other stakeholders listed in the project document such as (Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination, Ministry of Lands and Housing, Ministry of Provincial Government, National Council of Women, and Private Sector).

3.1.5 Replication approach

Institutional and individual capacity building, public awareness, and the development of needed guidelines, tools and frameworks would ensure the sustainability of global environmental benefits and outcomes replicability of the key principles.

The implemented approach for replicability included the following main elements:

- The project has been designed to develop the needed tools, frameworks, textbooks and guidelines needed to ensure the mainstreaming of the Rio Conventions in decision-making processes in the Solomon Islands.
- The capacity development components focused on the learn-by-doing approach in order to institutionalize the project’s work at national levels and the application of the developed tools and guidelines through a pilot project. Thus, the replication value is very high.
- Furthermore, the produced tools, framework and EIA guidelines can be used in other provinces. Updating the needed legislation concerning forestry, logging, and socio-economic safeguards, as well as the amendment to EIA guidelines, would provide the legal coverage and support to replicate the developed methodologies and guidelines in other places.
- The piloting of the developed tools in two different sites, in cooperation with national and international non-governmental organizations and funded projects, provided learn-by-doing opportunities and helped in building the capacity at national and provincial levels.
- Research and Development including the development of a textbook and piloting the teaching guides in many secondary schools.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP comparative advantage lies in its experience in integrated policy in different national processes, policies, and frameworks. CCCD projects are complex due to their multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholders nature, hence, UNDP’s assistance in designing and implementing activities is consistent with both the GEF mandate and national sustainable development plans.

UNDP at the global level has been involved in designing and implementing around 60 projects under this focal area. UNDP Solomon Islands office has the adequate capacity for implementation of the CCCD project with the needed support from the region as well as global UNDP/GEF offices.

3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector

This CCCD project successfully collaborated with several national and regional projects and activities funded by international donors and development partners. Those include UNDP/GEF, FAO, TNC, GIZ, and the Government of The Solomon Islands (GSI). In addition, the project was implemented under the UNDP Resilience and Sustainable Development (RSD) Unit which is also directly responsible for implementing other ongoing UNDP-supported projects.

The project cooperated well with the following projects:

REDD+ Programme: The IGECIDDM Project supports the initiation of the REDD+ Programme at the country level. The Project was able to help the Ministry in finalizing the REDD+

Programme roadmap and then endorsing it by the Cabinet end of 2015. The project was able to support the set-up of the REDD+ Unit and to raise awareness at the national and provincial levels concerning the REDD+ programme. Also, the project facilitated the creation of a full-time position for the REDD+ officer at the MoFR. The Government considered this support as a very important contribution of the CCCD project to the REDD+ implementation and the sustainability of the project’s outcomes after the project’s timeline.

FAO Integrated Forest Management project (IFM). The IGECIDDM project started the needed practical steps to cooperate with the IFM project in order to hand over the piloting projects to the IFM project team.

The Secretariat to the Pacific Community (SPC) and GIZ: the IGECIDDM project manages to seek the technical advice and collaborates with the SPC/GIZ project. Cooperation included; refining the TOR for the National REDD+ Committee, and in developing a work plan for the committee.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC): The project collaborated with TNC by raising awareness in piloting sites about key conservation concepts concerning the natural environment gave their focus is on protected areas.

3.1.8 Management arrangement

The project was implemented under the DIM (Direct Implementation Modality), and UNDP was the GEF Implementing Agency for the project, with the UNDP Country Office responsible for transparent practices and appropriate conduct. The MECDM acts as the main beneficiary and executing partner. All project’s activities are developed in close cooperation with the MAL and MoFR.

UNDP hired a National Project Manager (PM) and a project-assistant and provided technical support through its staff to support the project management unit. The direct implementation modality is based on the 2009 HACT Macro assessment and agreed with the Government of The Solomon Islands.

A Project Board (PB) was to provide strategic decisions and management guidance to implement the project. The PB was to be made up of representatives of relevant ministries and government departments, and UNDP, and to be chaired by the NPD. The project was monitored by the PB. The Project Document stated that the project board should meet at least (2) times per year (Pro.Doc. Page 33, Paragraph 110).

The project management consisted of the following members: a full-time project manager was assigned to oversight the overall management of the project implementation; a full-time time project assistant; a part-time project technical specialist (PTS); and a part-time REDD+ specialist.

The Project Manager and the Project Assistant cooperate very well with the team of experts. The UNDP RSD Team Leader is reasonably practicing the project assurance role. The PTS was hired for around a year and had provided technical backstopping and support to the PMU. UNDP provided training sessions on UNDP/GEF M&E guidelines.

The project management arrangement can be summarized as follows:

- The Project Implementation Agency is UNDP.
- The project is following the DIM modality; jointly implemented by the MECDM, in cooperation with MoRL, MAL who are supported by international consultants.
- The MECDM is appointed to serve as Executing Agency.
- A Project Manager is responsible for daily management and actual implementation and monitoring of the project and is accountable to the UNDP Portfolio Team Leader.
- The project team has its project office in the premises of the MECDM (hosted in the governmental building, i.e. outside of the UNDP country office).

- The overall responsibility for the project is with a Project Board where ministries are represented.

A team of 10 national and international experts was established to ensure proper implementation of the project activities and delivery of the expected outputs (Table 3). The expert team was mobilized to implement project activities in line with the Project LFA. However, it was noted by many government officials that some of the international consultants were very knowledgeable but not committed to the project. They knew how to do the work, but they usually were not interested to finalize the work due to their busy schedule. The government officials urge that more attention should be given to selecting the international experts, making sure that they are available for the whole assignments.

Table 3: The list of national and international experts who were involved in the CCCD Project in the Solomon Islands

No.	Tasks
1.	International expert: International Technical Specialist
2.	National expert: Social Safeguard and Gender Specialist
3.	National expert: Environment and Customary Law Specialist
4.	International consultant: REDD+ Specialist
5.	International Consultant: International Environmental Economist
6.	National Consultant: Communication Specialist
7.	National Expert Forest Inventory Specialist
8.	International Expert: Environmental Safeguard Specialist
9.	International Expert: Mid-term Review
10.	International Expert: Terminal Evaluation

3.2 Project Implementation

The TE Consultant has reviewed the project implementation and its adaptive management. The following aspects of project implementation have been assessed:

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project finance
- Monitoring and evaluation; design at entry and implementation*
- UNDP and Implementation Partner Implementation/ execution coordination, and operational issues*.

Achievements of project implementation and adaptive management have been rated in terms of the criteria above at a six-level scale as follows (TE’s TOR): Highly satisfactory (HS) - the project has no shortcomings; Satisfactory (S) - minor shortcomings; Moderately satisfactory (MS) - moderate shortcomings; Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) - significant shortcomings; Unsatisfactory (U)- major shortcomings; and Highly unsatisfactory (HU) - severe shortcomings.

The results of the review and justification for the rating provided is described in the following paragraphs. The selected rating and a description/explanation of that rating are included in the FE Ratings & Achievements Summary table 1, Page 5.

3.2.1 Adaptive Management

The project was CEO endorsed in July 2014, whereas the inception workshop took place in June 2015 (one year later). As stated in the MTR, the project faced two major difficulties in

the first period; (1) political unrest in the country, and (2) major delay in the inception phase due to the inability to assign a qualified project team. The PMU has prepared annual work plans (AWP), based on which the activities and outputs are related to proposed project components and outcomes. The progress on the work plan is not in line with the initial plan.

Adaptive management means that the PMU must constantly keep referring to the goal and objectives and critically assessing how the activities are contributing to the outputs and how those outputs are leading to the objective. Although the project started one year later than the planned date and had witnessed major delays due to the difficulties in hiring the project manager, the international consultants, and the national team, the TE did not witness any major adaptive management measures.

Only three adaptatively management measures were taken by CCCD Project, these measures were discussed and agreed upon during different Project Board meetings:

- Host the project management at the Government premises, although the project followed a direct implementation modality.
- Mobilize more than the planned expertise (national and international) to support the project implementation. A team of national and international experts has been established to ensure proper implementation of the project activities and delivery of the expected outputs. The expert team was mobilized to implement project activities in line with the Project LF.
- Establish one technical working group instead of 3 groups.

The MTR report recommended a set of recommendation concerning adaptive management, those are discussed in detail under section 3.2.3 of this report.

3.2.2 Partnership arrangements

The Project has been successful in arranging partnerships with the three main stakeholders (MECDM, MAL, MoFR) for the implementation of the project. The project was hosted at the MECDDM despite the fact that the project was DIM, this has helped the project to be very close to other projects and initiatives led by the MECDDM. Hence, the Project was able to coordinate the involvement of international donors (including the FAO, and GIZ and JICA), the government counterparts and some of the international non-governmental organizations working in the field. However, as stated in the MTR, “*the Project Document made it very clear that the project should cooperate with a wide range of stakeholders at the national and provinces levels to ensure achieving the project outcome*”. Yet, the project did not manage to build the needed partnership with one of the key partners, which was identified in the project document: The Ministry Provincial Government. The TE echoed the MTR’s conclusion in considering “*the relationship with this Ministry, the largest player at the local and provinces level, to be lost*”.

The public awareness efforts concerning the REDD+ and the Rio Conventions that were done by the project were very much appreciated by the Government officials interviewed during the FE mission. It was also noted that the Project has managed to create a good partnership with the Parliament through the MECDDM. The project manager had the chance to prepare the needed notes, letters and background materials to present the project’s findings. This has helped in securing the needed approval of the project’s legislative components.

The Project Document required the project to set up Technical Working Groups to “*discuss and deliberate on the various technical analyses as well as recommendations to establish the EMIS and supporting institutional reforms* (Project Document, Section E.3, Paragraph 147, Page 45)”. At least three main types of organizations were listed as members of the Technical Working Groups in the project document (independent experts, technical government agency representatives, representatives from stakeholders’ groups), however, it was decided that only one technical group from the three main ministries assigned to undertake the needed technical review and support. Taking into consideration the limited number of technical officers working

on the three Rio-conventions, the TE is convinced that this new arrangement is an efficient adaptive management measure, however, limiting the membership to the three-line ministries is considered as a flaw in the project management structure.

The project has managed to include some of the relevant partners and stakeholders. Among key organizations: the *Solomon Islands National University* (SINU), GIZ, FAO and TNC and KIBCA as explained in Section 3.1.4. Page 18.

The overall conclusion is that the project management has achieved the minimum required partnership level with the relevant national stakeholders. The participation of many stakeholders was limited throughout the whole project. Hence, the project management has failed to engage other key stakeholders listed in the project document.

3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

The TE has reviewed the M&E activities and noticed that the PMU did not have any sufficiently developed adaptive management framework and did not fully understand the project’s strategy. However, the PMU had a true and genuine desire to get on with the job and get some of the project’s activities in place. Monitoring of the project by the Implementing Agency has been satisfactory with assisting in the preparation of the APR/PIR Review and subsequent Board Review, coordination of the Combined Delivery Report and reviewing and following up the project’s quarterly progress reports, financial reports, and work plans. However, as indicated in the MTR report *“there have been a number of critical weaknesses in the monitoring of the project cycle. These have resulted in missed opportunities to either refit the project LF to the project or vice versa. While it has been demonstrated that there were a number of extenuating circumstances caused by events external to the project¹, it is not unreasonable for the UNDP, to have taken the initiative in addressing these issues at some point in the project. Instead, the Project has implemented some components of the project very well, but not all the necessary strategic components to achieve the Objective.”*

The project inception workshop (IW) helped on the 23rd June 2015, after the recruitment of the PM in April 2015. The inception report was submitted immediately after the IW however, it was not well written and did not capture the necessary adaptive management measurements including the formulation of the project’s technical working groups. No justification was included in the Inception Report and as indicated by the MTR *“the Inception Phase and corresponding Report represent a considerable weakness in the project cycle”*. Furthermore, this shortcoming in the inception phase, IW, and IR should have been detected by the UNDP CO and the UNDP/GEF Unit as these monitoring tools are part of all UNDP supported projects.

However, it was evident that the Project regularly used feedback from M&E to address appropriately and adequately any new challenges and thereby ensure the achievement of established targets. The M&E plan was regularly updated. Risks and issues are quarterly updated. However, the LF and the Inception Report were not used as bases for adaptive management.

Furthermore, annually, quarterly and day-to-day M&E instruments such as the Annual and Quarterly Progress Reports were carefully reviewed, discussed and acted upon at the Project Board meetings. According to the project document, the PB is to meet twice a year with a total 6 meetings during the project lifetime, however, 2 project board took place before the MTR, and two were organized after the MTR. The TE considers that the UNDP project assurance role has been reasonably applied to this project.

Adaptive management in response to the Recommendations of MTR:

- MTR Recommendation 1: *The project’s M&E system should be made more participatory through the involvement of the stakeholders as part of the project’s adaptive management*

¹ Events over which none of the partners had control.

framework. More stakeholders were involved in the M&E system. This is done through sharing of annual work plans with the Government and vice-versa and the collaborative efforts in implementing the plans.

- MTR Recommendation 2: *UNDP-GEF Project Assurance to provide better guidelines and technical backstopping. Support for Inception Phase of projects is critical as it reflects the importance of this phase in the project cycle.* In response, commitments from the UNDP CO to provide better guidelines to avoid any delays with the support from the UNDP/GEF RTA. This was done through regular contacts and skype calls, official communication; revision of budget, work plan; etc. However, the technical support from the UNDP/GEF is still limited and could be further enhanced.
- MTR Recommendation 3: *The project reporting function should include the documentation of lessons learned so that institutional memory is preserved, and a reference guide is created to support any future replication of similar project initiatives.* This was done as the project has documented all lessons learned in the project’s terminal report. However, the lessons learned captured in the report are a mix of recommendations and lessons learned.
- MTR Recommendation 4: *The quarterly progress reports should be expanded to include an indicative work plan of activities for the next quarter as well as updated risks and mitigation measures. Management.* In response, the QPRs were expanded and included more details concerning the status of implementation and next steps.
- MTR Recommendation 5: *The role of the Project Board needs to be strengthened, with more frequent meetings, adequate advance provision of documentation, and follow-up mechanisms established.* In response, CCCD Project held frequent PB meetings, developed the needed minutes and defined the follow-up mechanisms as per the UNDP/GEF guidelines.
- MTR Recommendation 6: *The implementing and executing agencies and stakeholders of the project can provide valuable technical support and the Project should draw on these relationships further in its management approach. The MTR consultant would recommend that a greater spirit of cooperation and inclusion of other stakeholders by the Project in all aspects of the project delivery needs to be emphasized.* The CCCD project involved other key stakeholders in the project during the last 9 months of the project implementation and have reached out to local communities in Lata/Temotu Province, Buala, and Kia/ Isabel Province, Gizo and Kolombangara/Western Province, Ulawa/Makira Province, and with the SINU in Honiara.

3.2.4 Project Finance

The TE has assessed the differences between the actual expenditure and the leveraged financing and co-financing during the TE mission presented in Table 4, which provides an overview of the budgeted expenditures of the GEF Project of US\$ 0.85 million. As of August 2018, US\$ 727,969.56 about (85.64%) of the project total budget, has been dispersed. However, around US\$ 122 thousands (14.36%) remain in the Project budget, as encumbrance, for producing publications under public awareness components.

The third project component has the largest share of the budget that has been spent. The least share is for component 2. Reallocations between the project components (reaches 19%) have been foreseen at the TE stage. Accordingly, the spending of the budget is not much in plan and is not in line with the period of implementation, as are also the results of the project delivered so far.

The project budget includes US\$ 250 thousand from the Government of the Solomon Islands as an in-kind contribution and US\$ 150 thousand from UNDP (in-cash), which makes the whole planned co-financing contribution – according to the project document- US\$ 400

thousand over the project period. As of August 2018, the confirmed Project co-financing from the Government has amounted to an estimated US\$ 545,428.06 or 218% following the actual project implementation status, with details provided in Table 5. This high co-financing from the Government helped the project to operate for an extra year to finalize the project’s activities with no additional cost from the GEF.

UNDP provided more than the planned financial support. As of August 2018, the confirmed UNDP co-financing amounted to an estimated US\$158,478.86 (105.65%). UNDP also provided financial oversight of the project. Annual work plans, Combined Delivery Reports and project budget balance appeared to have been prepared timely and systematically, and in a manner consistent with the UNDP/GEF financial guidelines.

No annual audits have been conducted. The GEF grant has been monitored through the UNDP’s Atlas system.

3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)

M&E Design at Entry

The project document included a description of the budgeted Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan with identified responsible parties for M&E activities, allocated indicative budget, and specified time frame for each M&E activity. According to the M&E plan, M&E should be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation was further substantiated in the ProDoc. The indicative M&E budget was USD 29,000 or 3.4% of the total GEF grant, that was enough to conduct the planned M&E activities except for the MTR which was not planned as it is not a requirement for a medium-size project.

The UNDP/GEF standard M&E tools were included in the project document, including the logframe with the needed indicators, the inception report, the terminal evaluation, and the quarterly and annual progress report and board meetings.

Based on the above, the Monitoring & Evaluation design at project startup is rated:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
HS					

Implementation of M&E

The FE considers that the UNDP project assurance role has been correctly applied to this project, due to the following evidence:

- There have been a good number of monitoring and review exercises conducted by the UNDP Country Office including participation in the project board meetings, preparation of the project annual reports, and production of the Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs).
- The UNDP CO has been active in reviewing and following up on the project’s quarterly progress reports, financial reports, and project work plans.
- The UNDP/GEF Regional Unit and UNDP SI’s provisions of financial resources have also been in accordance with project norms and in a timeframe, that is supportive of covering the costs of project activities.
- The Project’s staff and consultants were contracted according to the established Rules and Regulations of the United Nations and the financial transactions and procurement activities similarly followed due process and the same Rules and Regulations.
- The project’s M&E activities were conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures.

Table 4: Project Budget and Expenditures (US\$)

Project Component	Budget Approved (US\$)	Disbursed as of 31 st of August 2018							Committed budget (2018)	Total (US\$) (Spent and committed)	Difference between planned and actual (US\$)
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total spent	% of budget spent			
Component 1	282,000.00	-	10,794.58	82,356.42	108,451.96	26,228.26	225,800.7	80.1%	43,328.05	271,159.27	10,840.73
Component 2	179,000.00	-	111.50	70,009.18	114,296.53	5,574.00	189,991.2	106.1%	0	189,991.21	(10,991.21)
Component 3	314,000.00	-	26,083.73	50,228.93	78,668.81	80,316.14	213,418.8	67.9%	78,702.39	314,000.00	0
Project Management	75,000.00	-	20,769.73	25,122.07	25,226.18	3,843.04	102,990.6	137.3%	0	74,961.02	38.98
TOTAL GEF	850,000.00	-	57,648.04	227,716.6	326,643.48	115,961.44	732,089.8	86.1%	122,030.44	850,000.00	0

Table 5: Co-financing of Project Partner (US\$)

Source of co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at the CEO endorsement (US\$)	The actual amount contributed at the stage of TE (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
UNDP	UNDP	Cash	150,000	158,478.86	105.65%
The government of the Solomon Islands	MECDM	In-kind	250,000	545,428.06	218%
Total			400,000	703,906.92	201%

As detailed in the MTR, “there have been a number of critical weaknesses in the monitoring of the project cycle. These have resulted in missed opportunities to either refit the project LF to the project or vice versa. While it has been demonstrated that there were a number of extenuating circumstances caused by events external to the project², it is not unreasonable for the UNDP, to have taken initiative in addressing these issues at some point in the project. Instead, the Project has implemented some components of the project very well, but not all the necessary strategic components to achieve the Objective.” However, the MTR also highlighted the reasons behind that, which the TE would echo, including the absence of a clear adaptive management framework, the project’s slow start and the absence of strategic guidance from the UNDP/GEF during the project inception phase.

The following elements are identified in the project document as the principal components of monitoring and evaluation:

A project inception workshop to introduce an understanding and ownership of the project’s goals and objectives among the project stakeholder groups. The Project Manager was recruited in April 2015, and the Inception Workshop was organized on the 23rd June 2015 (two months later), the final draft of the Inception Report was submitted with the same date. During the inception workshop, the management structure was neither discussed nor modified, no changes were made to the project LF, the limited discussion was done on the project’s annual work plan. Hence, the TE considers that the Inception Phase and corresponding Report represent a considerable weakness in the project cycle.

While these matters should have been detected through the UNDP/GEF Unit, it is also expected that UNDP CO to update the log frame and the role of monitoring and evaluation, particularly as it relates to adaptive management. After all, log frame planning, is part of all UNDP supported projects.

Annual Progress Reports APR. So far, 3 annual progress reports (2015, 2016 and 2017), have been delivered. A Mid-term analytical progress report (MAPR) has also been prepared. The MAPR provides critical analysis of the project’s status.

Annual Project Board (PB) meeting. The project is subject to Project Board meetings at least twice per year as per the project document. Four Board Meeting was organized (10 February 2016, 6 February 2017, 13 October 2017, and June 2018) and a number of technical group meetings and meeting minutes including discussion points were developed. The TE notes that the PB roles have been strengthened after the MTR, in response to the MTR’s recommendation: “The role of the Project Board needs to be strengthened, with more frequent meetings, adequate advance provision of documentation, and follow-up mechanisms established.” Two PB meetings were convened during and after the MTR, and the minutes of the meetings were well documented in comparisons of the two PBs meetings that were convened before the MTR.

Quarterly Progress Monitoring (QPRs): progress made is monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results-Based Management Platform. It includes updated risk log in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. The project has managed to submit all needed QPRs with the updated risks logs, however, the focus was on describing the activities to a great extent.

Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress is the responsibility of the PM based on the project’s AWP and its indicators. The TE consultant reviewed a few reports prepared by the project teams about their site visits and meetings.

Final Evaluation: the TE was organized to take place during the last three months of the project’s operation in accordance with UNDP and GEF requirements.

² Events over which none of the partners had control.

Project Terminal Report. The PM has prepared a full report that summarized all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project, lessons learned, the extent to which objectives have been met, structures and mechanisms implemented, capacities developed, among others. However, the TE notes that the quality of the report could be much further enhanced.

Terminal review meeting. The terminal reviewing meeting was organized by the project board, with the participation of its members, in June 2018 (one month prior to the project closure). The terminal review meeting referred to the terminal report that was prepared by the project manager.

TE consultant feels that the project had contributed to the GEF objectives and contributed positively to the process of building the needed capacity at the national level in the Solomon Islands. Hence, the monitoring of the project by the UNDP has been **satisfactory** with assisting in the preparation of the APRs and subsequent Board Review, coordination of the CDRs and reviewing and following up the project’s QPRs, financial reports, and work plans.

Based on the above, the implementation of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan is rated:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution coordination, and operational issues (*)

UNDP (Implementing Agency) implementation

The key aspects of the UNDP implementation are as follows:

- UNDP followed up on the CCCD Project and continuously examined if it is being implemented based on the Results-Based Management with an appropriate focus on established targets.
- The UNDP support to the PMU is regarded as satisfactory and, in many cases, timely:
 - ✓ Facilitate the recruitment and engagement of several international consultants in the implementation including a chief technical specialist for around a year.
 - ✓ UNDP Country Office Solomon Islands is offering full support to project implementation, including administrative support as well as high-level support by the participation of the UNDP Country Director in the Project Board.
 - ✓ Providing necessary guidance for and approval of AWP’s and their revisions.

However, as stated in the MTR report, and was repeated and brought to the attention of the TE consultant the government has a continuing concern over the UNDP lengthy procurement processes that have – according to the Government of the Solomon Islands - contributed to the major delay in project implementation. As highlighted in the MTR, “the HACT assessment in 2009 has recommended the use of the DIM modality to avoid the weak and limited government capacities to financially manage the project.” Yet, the government does not see that the UNDP procurement procedure is better than the governments in terms of the time needed to conclude the procurement process. The Government considered the UNDP procurement procedure is also “bureaucratic and unnecessarily lengthy”.

The Project was originally planned to last for three years and is to be closed in June 2017. Nevertheless, a no-cost time extension (max. 1 year) was granted on May 11th, 2017.

UNDP successfully updated the risk mitigation measures mainly that the risks log has been updated quarterly. The Project is considered as well managed according to the UNDP and the GEF guidelines. UNDP team including the PMU used to apply necessary procedures to ensure that the project implementation is operationally effective.

Rating for UNDP implementation:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

MECDM (Executing Agency) execution

The project followed the DIM modality; jointly implemented by the MECDM, in cooperation with MoRL, MAR who are supported by international consultants. The MECDM is appointed to serve as Executing Agency. The Project Manager and the project assistant are responsible for daily management and actual implementation and monitoring of the project and are accountable to the UNDP Portfolio Team Leader.

The MECDM is effectively implementing the project's activities, providing management oversight, and mobilizing the needed high-level support. The MECDM has also provided the project with the needed co-financing and has contributed significantly to support the project's activities in the Parliament. This demonstrated significant commitment by MECDM and the MAL and the Government to integrate the Rio Conventions in national decision-making processes.

The MECDM co-chairs the project board and actively cooperated with UNDP and the project's partners to resolve any issues hindering the project's implementation. The overall responsibility for the project is with a Project Board where ministries are represented.

The project team has its project office in the premises of the MECDM (hosted in the governmental building, i.e. outside of the UNDP country office in the Solomon Islands).

Rating for MECDM execution:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
HS					

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall Results (attainment of objectives) (*)

According to the UNDP/GEF evaluation guidelines, the achievements of expected results were evaluated in terms of attainment of the overall objective as well as identified outcomes and outputs. For this the performance by components is analyzed by looking at (i) general progress towards the established baseline level of the indicators; (ii) actual values of indicators by the end of the CCCD Project vs. designed ones; (iii) evidences of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the results as well as how these evidences were documented.

Overall results of the Project are rated as

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

The summary of an evaluation of attainment of objective and components of the Project are presented in Table 6. The assessment of progress is based on data provided in the annual reports, technical reports reviewed, the findings and observations of the TE mission, and interviews with the project stakeholders. The progress at the outputs level is provided in **Annex 7**.

Table 6: Matrix for rating the Achievement of Outcomes

The below key is used for indicator assessment (Color Coding):

Green = completed, the indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project
Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure

Goal/Objective/Outcomes	Performance Indicator	2014 Baseline	Target value by the END of the Project	Midterm Level Assessment	2018 End of Project Status	TE Comments	Rating
Project objectives: To enhance the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other MEAs	Institutional capacity and interagency coordination are strengthened for improved implementation of the Rio Conventions within national planning frameworks	Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing poverty alleviation and other socio-economic priorities	Government staff have learned, applied, and tested best practice tools to integrate Rio Conventions into forest and agriculture sector development plans	Progress in strengthening institutional capacity will result in improving implementation of the Rio Conventions target at the end of the project.	Four tools were developed (2 training manuals, one checklist, one framework for mainstreaming Rio Conventions). 4 training sessions for around 50 officials in total.	Target achieved.	S
	Global environmental priorities are mainstreamed into REDD+ management framework	Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning or Development Consent Processes	Rio Convention priorities will be mainstreamed within the Development Consent Processes and government staff will be trained on the revised environmental management information system.	Further work is required to mainstream Rio Convention priorities within the Development Consent Processes. Further training should also be provided	The analytical framework was developed and endorsed by the government. It is already tested and used by the government. A specific training was provided to concerned Government staff.	Target achieved.	S

	Awareness of the linkages between the Rio Conventions and REDD+ forest management	Best practices and lessons learned from mainstreaming Rio Conventions into REDD+ framework are not readily accessed or tested.	There is a minimum of 20% increase in the understanding of the Rio Convention mainstreaming among government staff	Further training activities are required to reach the target of increasing the understanding of the Rio Conventions by the end of the project (The project has a communication plan that is supposed to be implemented before the end of the project. If implemented correctly, this target will be achieved.)	The implemented training programmes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizing three awareness campaigns during the World Environment Day concerning the linkages between the Rio Conventions and the REDD+. - Creation of a new classroom training module on the linkages between the Rio Conventions and REDD+ and how they affect peoples' day to day life, which included (a textbook, a teacher's resources guide) and has been officially endorsed by the Solomon National University to be used in the University as part of the curriculum and in high schools by the Ministry of Education. - Training on the analytical framework in the EIA checklist (for around 25 government officials), to prepare the government staff on how to use it and make them aware of the tool itself. - 5 provincial awareness sessions for selected professionals from key government agencies in Temotu, Isabell, Makira/Ulawa, Western, and Guadalcanal (Honiara) provinces. 	Targets achieved	S
	Planners and		There is a minimum of 15%	A few public awareness	- 3 public events were organized	Target is partially	

	<p>decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions, the result of which is that the global environment is heavily discounted</p>	<p>increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public</p>	<p>events were organized. The project needs to focus more on awareness related to the Rio Conventions</p>	<p>during the World Environment Day (schools, private sectors representatives, NGOs representatives and Government officials).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribute brief information about Rio-conventions in these events. - Education materials for high school were developed and rolled out including a textbook and a teacher manual. - 2 Community meetings were organized, in Gizo, Buala, and Kia, in collaboration with TNC to raise awareness about the project. - A Facebook page was created to disseminate project's deliverables, lessons learned, results (IGECIDDM), in addition, some information about the Rio-conventions were added to the REDD+ website: - www.reddplussolomonislands.gov.sb 	<p>achieved</p>	<p>MS</p>
		<p>There is a minimum of 25% increase in the acceptance by government representatives and other stakeholder representatives of the legitimacy of REDD+ and its accompanying Roadmap</p>	<p>While a 25% increase in the acceptance by government representatives could be achieved, the involvement of other stakeholder representatives did not start yet.</p>	<p>Cooperation established with some partners like TNC (International NGO), KIBCA (CBO), GIZ (Bilateral Donor), FAO (International Organization), SINU (University), and NRDF (National NGO) among others, may help the project in achieving this target.</p>	<p>Target is partially achieved</p>	<p>MS</p>

3.3.2 Relevance (*)

During the TE mission, all evidence showed that the project is very relevant to the government and addressed highly regarded topic. The stakeholders interviewed during the mission expressed the added value of the project and emphasized that a new phase to pilot the developed EIA guidelines, tools, and frameworks in other provinces is crucial. To the TE's opinion, one of the major achievements attributed to the Project was the introduction of the REDD+ roadmap and the development of a set of guidelines, tools, textbooks, and frameworks that suits the local context in the Solomon Islands. The project managed to provide, not only specific technical advice and support in preparing main tools but also it improved national capacity and awareness pertaining to biodiversity, land degradation and climate change and the relevant international conventions.

The project has also been highly relevant to UNDP activities in the Solomon Islands. It represents a contribution to the fulfilment of the Solomon Islands' 2010-2015 UN Development Assistance Framework, mainly Outcome I.1 which calls for "*Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management*" (UNDAF, 2013-17). The UNDP strategic plan on the environment and sustainable development priority outcome I, which focuses on "*Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded*". It also corresponds to UNDAF outputs I.1.1 and I.1.3 on "*Strengthened capacity to integrate and implement policies/strategies for environmental sustainability, disaster risk reduction/management and climate change adaptation and mitigation at national level*", and "*Strengthened national capacity for effective management of natural and water resources, renewable energy, waste, land and land rehabilitation that promote good agricultural practices for conservation of the environment and biodiversity*", respectively.

Based on the abovementioned the Relevance is rated as Relevant (R).

Relevant (R)	Not Relevant (NR)
R	

3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency (*)

Effectiveness

The Project has achieved its overall objective to "*enhance the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other MEAs*. It specifically aimed at strengthening and instituting a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions of deforestation and forest degradation in a way that meets objectives under the three Rio Conventions. The Project objective and main outputs have been achieved; the most of established targets have been met.

The effectiveness of the project strategy is evidenced by:

- The government approved strategic documents, frameworks, tools, and guidelines. Those include: *The Analytical framework for Rio Convention obligations into sector planning report, the EIA checklists, safeguards gap analysis report, the Logging and Palm Oil EIA Checklists, etc.*
- Endorsement and launching of a textbook and teacher resource guide entitled: '*Global Environment Awareness in Solomon Islands-Making the Connections*'
- The REDD+ Roadmap and Unit have been established and nationally endorsed.

- National ownership and high policy level engagement: Parliament’s review and approval of the amendment proposed to the EIA guidelines, the REDD+ roadmap, and the proposed tools and frameworks.
- All proposed co-financing resources were mobilized, and the project management unit was hosted at the Government’s premises.

Considering the above-mentioned facts, Effectiveness was rated **Satisfactory**.

Efficiency

The rating for project **Efficiency** is **Moderately Satisfactory** for the following reasons:

- Good quality project results achieved in 4 years since project commencement, even though some of the project’s activities are beyond the project’s control when it comes to Government’s approval of the proposed changes to the guidelines, frameworks, and codes.
- The hosting of the project within the MECDM premises with other UNDP and internally funded projects enhanced the projects’ efficiency and facilitated its work and cooperation with different projects and their stakeholders like FAO, GIZ, and TNC.
- The international consultants and the project technical specialist were able to provide the needed technical backstopping and develop some critical outputs during the project implementation.

However, the Project managed to leverage around 83% of in-kind financial resources (from the Government), and more than the planned UNDP cash contribution (105%).

Based on the above mentioned the Effectiveness & Efficiency is rated:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
		MS			

3.3.4 Country Ownership

As per the project document, “the Solomon Islands are eligible to receive technical assistance from UNDP and is thus eligible for support under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Solomon Islands ratified the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) on 28 December 1994, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 3 October 1995 and acceded to the Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought on 16 April 1999.”³ The Solomon Islands has committed itself to a number of multilateral environmental agreement such as Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its accompanying Montreal Protocol; Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas; Waigani Convention⁴, Marine Pollution Convention; Convention on Illegal Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES); and SPREP Convention on Natural Resources and Environment of South Pacific. As well as to: “The Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology (Acceded on 26 October 2004), and “The Kyoto Protocol committing to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions for the period 2008-2012 at the 1990 level (Ratified on 13 March 2003).”

The country ownership is evident in the strong interest and participation of government stakeholders. The project was considered strategic as it strategically built upon the REDD+

³ ProDoc. Page 7. Section B. Subsection B.1: Country Eligibility.

⁴ Banning the importation of hazardous and radioactive wastes into forum island countries and controlling the transboundary movement and management of hazardous wastes within the south pacific region

Programme and contributed tremendously to strengthening targeted capacity development activities at the national and provinces level to ensure the integration of global environmental commitments within national planning and policies. Furthermore, the project has a strategic value as it is directly aligned with two of the objectives of the National Development Strategy (NDS); (i) the effectively responded to climate change and manage the environment and risks of natural disasters, and (ii) improve governance and order at national, provincial and community levels and strengthen links at all level.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming

The project addresses the UNDP priorities of developing the Government's capacity to mainstream Rio Conventions implementation and obligations in national plans. The Project was able to successfully mainstream several UNDP priorities. In particular:

- Some policy frameworks, guidelines, tools, and frameworks have been improved or developed and endorsed. A few of them were also tested in the two pilot sites.
- The Project catalyzed integration of Rio Conventions into national strategies and planning.
- The Project developed the capacity of local teams and consultants, as well as decision makers, about the Rio Conventions.
- The Project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDAF and NDS.
- The Project targeted both women and men in its capacity building and public awareness components. International and national consultants included both women and men. Community members involved in the project piloting sites were mainly women.
- Around 25% of the project leadership position such as the National REDD+ committee were women.
- However, the project was unable to develop a nationally appropriate social and environmental safeguards as proposed in the project document.

3.3.6 Sustainability (*)

The project's main approach to sustainability is to create legal, institutional and human national capacities for continued mainstreaming of Rio Conventions in decision-making processes. The project's exit strategy should be dependent on the continuation of commitments and activities without the need for long-term international financing. These include, as stated in the MTR report: *"high-level political commitment to sustainable development; on-going commitment and accountability for inter-ministerial and inter-agency collaboration in decision-making and planning processes; cost-effective and well-functioning coordination structure for implementing the REDD+ Roadmap; regular trainings for civil servants at the national and local level using curricula on public administration for global environmental management and sustainable development; full engagement of all key stakeholders, in particular non-state actors; long-term implementation of REDD+ Roadmap; on-going raising of public awareness on linkages of the global environment to national socio-economic development priorities; and increasing the ownership of project benefits."*

The sustainability of the project can be measured against the following criteria⁵:

- **High-level political commitment to sustainable development;**
 - The project has effectively lobbied to raise high-level political commitment to implement the project. The TE was pleased by the high-level interest and commitment of the MECDM and MFR and it is evident that the Government is thinking very positively about the project and its outcomes. It is also evident that the MECDM is interested to utilize the developed tools and guidelines in other locations, with

⁵ As identified in the Project Document, Section C.3.a, Page 28 and discussed in the MTR report.

- different partners, and in other communities/provinces. This will contribute to the sustainability of the project's outcomes after the project comes to an end.
- CCCD Project and the REDD+ programme are already receiving high governmental priority and are backed by technical, institutional, and legislative frameworks in place including specific targets to achieve. Development of the REDD+ roadmap, the endorsement of many tools and frameworks as well as conducting many capacity developments and piloting exercises provided to the team are addressed by the CCCD project.
- **On-going commitment and accountability for inter-ministerial and inter-agency collaboration in decision-making and planning processes;**
- There is a consensus amongst all stakeholders that the Project should continue as it contributed positively towards the advancement of the work on Rio conventions mainstreaming at the country level. Stakeholders stated that the project was able to contribute enormously to the development of the needed legal, institutional, and human capacities to effectively integrate and incorporate Rio conventions and REDD+ programme in SI's national plans. In more than one occasion, high-level decision makers highlighted the need to have another project to test the newly developed tools and guidelines and the necessity to expand the public awareness of secondary schools to include other provinces and communities.
 - Although there is no developed inter-ministerial and inter-agency collaboration, however, as discussed and stated by the members of the technical group, the creation of only one group from the three concerned ministries has contributed significantly to create this kind of inter-ministerial and inter-agency collaboration. Technical staff from the three-line ministries are meeting on regular basis and have the chance to discuss several issues pertaining to Rio Conventions and REDD+ programme. As stated in the MRT, *"members of the TWG stated that without the project, it would have been impossible for them to get the chance to know other colleagues from another ministry and to work with them closely."*
- **Long-term implementation of REDD+ Roadmap,**
- The project has managed to contribute to building the needed technical capacities by providing some training programs that are considered - by the technical working group- as critical to the success and sustainability of both the REDD+ National Taskforce and other actors responsible for the implementation of the REDD+ Roadmap.
- **Regular training for civil servants at the national and local level using curricula on public administration for global environmental management and sustainable development;**
- As stated in the Project Document (Page 28-29), one of the main key challenges facing the country is *"is the dearth of expertise and information to inform decision makers. This issue is further compounded by the fact that the level of political will and accountability of decision-makers to implement Rio Conventions' obligations must be strengthened"*, and there is *"an insufficiency of understanding the importance and value of global environmental benefits to national socio-economic development priorities. Additionally, there is a need for an integrated approach for planning national socio-economic development within the framework of the Rio Conventions"*. To the TE's opinion, after 4 years of project implementation, there is currently good capacity among the stakeholders on the use of these guidelines and tools.

At the TE time, the contribution of the project to national capacity development is reflected in the updated capacity scorecard, Annex 8.

As stated in the UNDP-GEF guideline for TE, sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes.

Below is the detailed assessment of the four main risks categories:

Financial risks

There is only one financial risk related to mobilizing needed resources to ensure the implementation and use of the developed guidelines, textbooks, frameworks and tools. However, the project established two cooperation with the IFM project and the GIZ project in order to continue the work in the piloting sites and make sure that the tools developed are going to be utilized and tested in other piloting sites.

Based on the above discussion, the financial risks are limited, and the sustainability is rated as Likely (ML):

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
	ML		

Socio-economic risks

Social risks were not identified by the project, or in the project document. However, introducing different tools, guidelines, and frameworks to integrate Rio Conventions into the decisions making processes might have some direct socioeconomic impacts on the local community if their livelihoods and socio-economic situations are not taken into consideration.

Certainly, stakeholders are interested in integrating Rio Conventions into the decision making and planning processes as this will facilitate the integration of economic assessments into the conservation and protection efforts, yet, a detailed assessment of the socio-economic impacts should be taken into consideration.

Based on the above-mentioned Socio-economic Risk, risks are negligible and thus the sustainability is rated as Likely (L)

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Institutional framework and governance risks

The project has taken the necessary mitigation measures to avoid institutional and governance risks as outlined in the project's risks log. The project's outcomes have already established the needed institution and legal frameworks that would ensure the project's outcomes on sustainability. The MECDM is interested to continue the work of the project and has established the needed mechanisms to ensure its sustainability.

The Institutional framework and governance risks are low, and the sustainability is Likely (L):

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Environmental risks to sustainability

There are no activities that may pose any environmental threats to the sustainability of the project's outcomes

The Environmental risks are negligible, and the sustainability is Likely (L):

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Overall rating: All the associated risks are negligible and thus, the overall rating for Sustainability is Likely (L):

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

3.3.7 Impact

The Project has made major and unprecedented advances in integrating Rio Conventions into decision-making processes as well as advance the work on REDD+ at the national level. Many outputs of the Project were first time achieved in the Solomon Islands. The successful impact of the project is evident through;

- **Component 1: strengthening institutional capacities for improved implementation of Rio Convention obligations.**
 - ✓ Cabinet Endorsed the REDD+ Readiness Roadmap which provides the REDD+ Implementation Unit (RIU) mandate
 - ✓ National REDD+ Committee already established. Its first meeting was held in 2nd May 2018
 - ✓ National Land Use (NLU) Working Group established under previous UNDP Project-SWoCK was re-convened to finalize the National Rural Land Use Policy (NRLUP). The NRLUP is already submitted to Cabinet for Endorsement
 - ✓ REDD+ Training Manual: Geospatial Data Management for REDD+ developed
 - ✓ Training on the Training Manual for Geospatial Data Management for REDD+ conducted for MoFR RIU officers
 - ✓ REDD+ Policy developed
 - ✓ Training Manual for Community Based Ecosystem Assessment for REDD+ Projects in the Solomon Islands
 - ✓ Training on the Manual for Community Based Ecosystem Assessment for REDD+ Projects conducted for Kia Community rangers and Government officials.
 - ✓ Analytical Framework for mainstreaming Rio Conventions developed and endorsed by the Conventions national focal points
 - ✓ TORs of the Forest and Agriculture sector developed.
 - ✓ Training on Good mainstreaming practices to mainstream Rio Conventions for Government officers.
 - ✓ Draft Pilot proposal on approaches to Sustainable Forest Management developed.
 - ✓ Resource Mobilization Strategy (RMS) and Plan highlighting possible funding sources for the Roadmap and how to access them developed.
 - ✓ Report on Best Practice Financial and Economic instruments to implement the Roadmap developed.
- **Component 2: strengthening the Development Consent Process to more effectively mainstream Rio Convention obligations.**
 - ✓ Social and Environmental Safeguards Gap Analysis Reports developed.

- ✓ Gap Analysis on the Code of Logging Practice (COLP) under the Ministry of Forestry & Research (MoFR) and the National Rural Land Use Policy (NRLUP) under the Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock (MAL) developed.
 - ✓ Environment Impact Statement (EIS) Checklist for forestry sector (logging) and agriculture sector (mainly for palm oil development) developed.
 - ✓ Training on the EIS Checklists conducted for Government officers.
 - ✓ Study Report on the Valuation of Environmental Services from Forest Eco-systems assessing the values of forest ecosystem and conservation based on the concept of TEV to determine the economic viability of developing 'Standards' for valuation of Environmental Services' from Forest Eco-systems developed.
 - ✓ In the effort to establish a central system to collect and disseminate information on carbon, forest inventory, land use change, safeguards, ecosystems and so forth, a report has been developed. The report identifies existing data (SOLGEO) within Government ICT unit which can be utilized to fulfill the EMIS. It also outlines ways to set an EMIS. This includes conducting an inventory of existing data from key Government ministries and conducting a workshop to agree on rights of ownership of data shared. A sample MOU is also provided on how to share data.
 - ✓ Action/Workplan for establishing Solomon Islands Forest Reference Level (FRL) developed.
 - ✓ Draft Sections of Action Plan for Solomon Islands National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS).
 - ✓ Proposed recommendations to strengthen the institutional linkages between the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) and Environment Monitoring Information System (EMIS).
 - ✓ Proposed Amendments for Integration of Redd+ in key environmental laws of Solomon Islands.
- **Component 3: strengthening awareness and understanding of REDD+ as a strategy to meet Rio Convention obligations.**
 - ✓ The project launch workshop conducted to introduce the project.
 - ✓ Project Results workshop completed.
 - ✓ Public Awareness Strategy and plan focusing on REDD+ and the Rio Conventions developed.
 - ✓ Awareness materials (brochures, news articles, on the Rio conventions, REDD+ and ecosystem services and the project developed and published in various media outlets.
 - ✓ A Text Book and Teacher Resource Guide on the Rio Conventions and REDD+ developed and endorsed by MEHRD to be distributed to all high schools throughout the country.
 - ✓ Provincial Awareness conducted in Lata Temotu Province, Buala, and Kia, Isabel Province, Gizo and Kolombangara, Western Province, Ulawa, Makira Province, SINU, Honiara Province.
 - ✓ National REDD+ Website developed and launched. www.reddplusolomonislands.gov.sb

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

The project has had a sustainable and considerable effect on mainstreaming Rio-conventions in decision making processes in the Solomon Islands. It achieved its objectives in terms of key targets, developing tools and guidelines for mainstreaming Rio Conventions in decision-making processes, and enhanced the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the Rio Conventions. It was also successful in leveraging co-financing from the government.

The project was able to complete many of the planned activities within four years (one-year extension with no cost was requested to finalize the remaining project's activities). The project was unable to achieve the following results:

- Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation convened by month 12
- Working groups established by month 3
- Lessons learned report drafted by month 27, finalized by month 33, and presented in stakeholder workshops by month 33
- A draft proposal for improved EMIS by month 13 and finalized by month 16: partially achieved.
- The unified format for the EMIS by month 22
- Training programme and materials on the new EMIS by month 24
- Training programme implemented by month 15 and month 27
- Broad-based surveys completed by month 3 and month 34, and independent analysis of the survey by month 35.
- At least 10 high schools and SINU have implemented education module by month 20
- At least 20 high schools have implemented education module by month 32
- Three-panel discussion, with at least 50 private sector representatives, one held each year. The first by month 8.
- A number of visits to the website show sustained and increasing interest in the project life cycle.

Taking into consideration the complexity of the project, the difficulties the project's team had faced during project launching phase, the project overall rating is **Satisfactory**.

4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project

The project design was relevant to the national development priorities and the REDD+ Programme at the national level and continues to be of relevance to the current national development strategy. However, the design did not take in to consideration the following key facts: (i) long time is needed to undertake some activities mainly the mobilization of international experts, the piloting, and the endorsement of any codes or guidelines by the Parliament/Government, and (ii) the complexity of mobility and transportation in the country and the high associated cost and time needed.

For the Design

Corrective Action 1: Review and revise the project Logframe to address the two above-mentioned issues that were missed during the project design. However, the project managed to overcome the associated problems by involving part-time specialist, and by establishing the needed cooperation with national and international NGOs active in pilot sites.

For the Implementation

Corrective Action 2: Revise the project management and define clear adaptive management measures to effectively implement to avoid the delay. The project management proposed in the ProDoc was a bit generic and did not take the Solomon Islands national context into

consideration. Yet, with PMU was hosted at the MECDM premises, this provided benefits for a more direct and effective monitoring and management of the project activities, in addition to building capacity of the three-line ministries in the fields of climate change, biodiversity, and land degradation.

For the Monitoring and Evaluation

Correction Action 3: Develop a well-written lesson learned report that will be useful for other projects and technical people working on any of the three Rio Conventions technical fields; climate change, biodiversity consideration, and land degradation.

Some recommendations below have been put forward for the timely implementation of the remaining activities presently underway.

4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

The FE recognizes the valuable achievements of the Project and would like to make the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Produce more hard copies of the guidelines, EIA checklists, the framework, and other project's deliverables and make them available for national stakeholders. Developing hard copies is crucial due to the unreliable, costly, and intermittent internet access in the country. However, these deliverables can be made available online by developing the project's website to ensure the dissemination of the results to a wider audience as well as linking the project's website to UNDP CO website to ensure the dissemination of knowledge to other countries aiming at developing the same kind of tools/guidelines. (UNDP, MECDM).

Recommendation 2: The valuable public awareness products, mainly the secondary schools textbook and teachers' guide, produced by the project on the Rio Conventions should be distributed to all stakeholders mainly to the Ministry of Education and a large number of high schools. It is also useful if a clear follow-up plan on these public awareness and outreach tools linked to future development activities, like the IFM project and TNC activities to ensure that future initiatives would build on the CCCD project activities and results and will incorporate the project's products in its work. (UNDP and MECDM).

Recommendation 3: While this TE was not able to analyze the training-manuals developed and implemented by the projects, it is recommended that the remaining project training and piloting activities be completed as soon as possible, including texting the training manuals that incorporating standardized local friendly methods for community-based ecosystem assessments for REDD+ projects, the proposed amendments to the Environment Act and Environment Regulations, and piloting the testing of an innovative forest management approach framed by REDD+ that aimed to demonstrating measurable indicators of delivering global environment benefits. (UNDP, and MECDM).

Recommendation 4: Mainstreaming Rio Convention in decision-making process capacity presently has limitations to meet the actual needs at the Country level. The REDD+ Programme and other initiatives supported by UNDP and other development partners should continue working on the upgrading of the national capacity in order not to meet the needed demand created under the project. (MECDM, UNDP, IFM/FAO, GIZ Project).

4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

The implementation of different tools, frameworks, and guidelines developed by the project is very important and will further help the Government of the Solomon Islands to mainstream the Rio Conventions and global environmental agreements in the decision-making process in the Solomon Islands.

4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success

The project demonstrated several good and worst practices which resulted in the successful implementation of the project that may be adopted for the formulation of other projects. Some of the best practices are:

- i. The project document expected that the piloting will start during the first year of the project. It took much longer and started during the last year of the project. The delays were related to several factors some of them were beyond the capacity of the project team. The worst practice is directly related to the level of discussion during the project design to define the obstacles that would face the piloting, how to overcome them, and how long that would take. It has been learned that an effective communication with the stakeholders and government during the design phase is the most critical factor to ensure the successful implementation of any initiatives. Not only that but, the continuous communication and discussion with the partners and stakeholders would help in developing the needed adaptive management mechanisms that could help in implementing the project's activities according to the work plan.
- ii. Inception phase is very critical to ensure successful implementation of the project. The absence of timely and well-developed adaptive management measures during project inception phase had not helped the PMU to avoid project delay and wasted some of the existing opportunities that would have helped to offer solutions to some problems.
- iii. Capacity development at the institutional, legislative, and individual levels are critical for achieving the project outcomes and to ensure its sustainability. This project shows a best practice in the involvement of national government to ensure the successful implementation of a project.
- iv. The role of the CCCD project on mainstreaming global environmental conventions in decision-making processes is very critical and unique.

5. Annexes

Annex I. ToR

GEF funded Project on “Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision Making in the Solomon Islands”

Job Title: International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)
 Reports to: RSD Team Leader and US/T MECDM
 Application Deadline: 4th May 2016
 Type of Contract: Individual Contract
 Duty Station: (10 days in Duty Station and 10 days home Based)
 Language required: English
 Expected Duration: 20 working days over one month starting June 18, 2018.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

A. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision Making in the Solomon Islands” (PIMS # 4928.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

GEF Project ID:	5045		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00091738	GEF financing:	850,000	\$651,096.06 (NB as off 20/04/18 and should increase by end of the project)
Country:	Solomon Islands	IA/EA own:	150,000	161,809.7
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly increase by the end of the project)
Focal Area:	Multiple focal areas	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly increase by the end of the project)
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	350,000	

Other Partners involved:	Solomon Islands Government	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29-Sep-14
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 29-Sep-2017	Actual: June 2018

BACKGROUND

Solomon Islands completed its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) in 2008. The NCSA identified some key cross-cutting constraints impeding the country from meeting the obligations under the three Rio Conventions or even its own environmental laws. These include; ineffective legislation and policy framework; institutional, technical and capacity weaknesses; lack of public awareness and information sharing for sound environmental management and decision making; lack of mainstreaming environmental considerations, biodiversity conservation and sustainable development across government programmes; and gaps in human capacity and development. A National Environmental Capacity Development Action Plan (NECDAP) was developed as a result of the NCSA.

In 2011, a UN-REDD Program was implemented. A key outcome of the UN-REDD program is the Solomon Islands REDD+ Roadmap. The REDD+ Roadmap was endorsed by the cabinet in 2015 through this project-the IGEICDDM Project collaboration with the Ministry of Forest and Research (MoFR) and the Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM). The IGEICDDM Project is a response to the key capacity constraints identified in the country's NCSA.

The Project goal is to deliver global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) by strengthening policy coordination and existing planning mechanisms. This requires the country to have, among others, the capacity to access and use data and information, as well as best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into planning, decision and reporting processes. To this end, the project's objective is to strengthen and institute a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions of deforestation and forest degradation in a way that meets objectives under the three Rio Conventions.

To that end, the project mainly uses REDD+ Roadmap as the overarching framework to guide the strengthening of existing institutional arrangements to be more effective in meeting the Rio Conventions. The project is divided into three key components.

Component 1 focuses on strengthening the policy and institutional framework by integrating Rio Convention provisions into The Solomon Islands' sectoral policies that serve to meet national socio-economic development priorities. This mainstreaming exercise will be conducted in coordination with the REDD+ Roadmap to reinforce the legitimacy of these improved sectoral policies, programmes, plans, and legislation.

Component 2 focuses on the establishment of an effective knowledge management system that addresses the Development Consent Process within the context of the Rio Conventions. The system will provide a strong tool for promoting multiple benefits within the REDD+ and monitoring the implications of safeguards. This component will especially support the national institutions responsible for the Rio Conventions in establishing clear, strong linkages with the REDD+ safeguards in order to increase cost-effectiveness in the implementation and monitoring of results toward meeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions in a highly harmonized fashion.

Component 3 aims to strengthen the institutional sustainability of the project results by advancing awareness, understanding, and capacity of REDD+ as a means of developing nationally appropriate social and environmental safeguards respecting the guidance and safeguards of the UNFCCC Cancun Agreements.

The two key outcomes of the project are:

- i. Strengthened policy coordination and planning mechanism, and
- ii. Improved communication and dissemination of information related to Rio Conventions.

These outcomes will be measured through a set of output, process, and performance indicators. Output indicators include the preparation of an in-depth institutional analysis of information needs to enable an environmental management information system which improves overall monitoring and evaluation of the country's performance in implementing both the REDD+ Roadmap as well as the Rio Conventions. Process indicators include the convening of a national working group on land degradation that will facilitate better inter-agency communication, coordination, and collaboration with regard to the formulation of the National Land-Use Policy. Performance indicators include the set of learn-by-

doing review of best practices for mainstreaming global environmental priorities into national planning from a REDD+ framework.

The UNDP Office in the Solomon Islands was the implementing agency for this project and partners for implementation is the MECDM. The key beneficiaries include MECDM itself, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) and MoFR.

The Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology (MECDM) is the executing entity for this project, and the project was developed in accordance with agreed policies and procedures between the Government of The Solomon Islands and UNDP. With the support of UNDP, MECDM will establish the necessary planning and management mechanisms and facilitate government decision-making to catalyze implementation of project activities and timely delivery of project outputs. The project was designed to be complementary to other related projects under implementation in The Solomon Islands, including those supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Given these, careful attention will be given to coordinating project activities in such a way that activities are mutually supportive and opportunities capitalized to realize synergies and cost-effectiveness.

This project conforms to Programme Framework CD-3 of the GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Strategy, which calls for countries to strengthen capacities for developing policy and legislative frameworks. More precisely, this Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) framework provides the vision for CCCD projects to integrate and mainstream Rio Convention obligations into The Solomon Islands' national environmental management framework by institutionalizing capacities to manage the global environment through the pursuit of sustainable development.

The project is also consistent with the programmatic objectives of the three GEF thematic focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation, the achievement, and sustainability of which is dependent on the critical development of capacities (individual, organizational and systemic). Through the successful implementation of this project, The Solomon Islands' institutional and human resources will be strengthened to help implement MEAs and national policy instruments in a manner that fully reflects Rio Convention principles and obligations. Furthermore, this project is consistent with other GEF-funded activities such as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The project will take an adaptive collaborative management approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

B. SCOPE, RESPONSIBILITIES, Ethics, EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

Objective and Scope

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluator Ethics

The Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex E](#)) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEP 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method⁶ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-](#)

⁶ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (fill in [Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Honiara, Solomon Islands. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), Ministry of Forest and Research (MoFR), and Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The consultant is expected to use personal and phone interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. The consultant can also make use of written questionnaires, which could be distributed to the project partners and stakeholders with the assistance of the project team. In addition, the consultant can use other data collection methods and evaluation methods in order to assess the project.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

Project Finance / Cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will

receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mil. US\$)		Government (mil. US\$)		Partner Agency (mil. US\$)		Total (mil. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	\$ 150,000	\$161,809.7						
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			\$ 250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly increase by the end of the project)				
• Other								
Totals	\$150,000	\$161,809.7	\$250,000					

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.⁷

Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

The evaluation report must include chapters providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations, and lessons**. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. Special attention will be paid to the Lessons Learned section. This should provide recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- Exit strategy;
- post-project sustainability of the efforts both in terms of governance and in terms of environmental benefits;
- capacity building;
- project achievements and challenges;
- mobilization of stakeholders and participation of the civil society;
- key institutional, technical and legal barriers found during the implementation of the project, and recommendations to address them in the future.

Implementation Arrangements

⁷ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Solomon Islands. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for him/her. The Evaluator will be responsible for liaising with the UNDP CO in the Solomon Islands and the project team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

C. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The key product expected from the terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report written in English that should follow the requirements indicated in Annex F. The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The report, together with its annexes, will be submitted in electronic format in both, MS Word and pdf format.

Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of the evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	The full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFFs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNDP regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Lynelle Popot

Team leader, Resilience & Sustainable Development (RSD)

UN Joint Presence Officer

Ground Floor, ANZ Haus, Ranadi, Honiara, Solomon Islands

e-mail: Lynell.popot@undp.org

D. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20days according to the following plan starting 18 June 2018:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days (recommended: 2-4)	4 th week of June 2018
Evaluation Mission	10 days (recommended: 7-15)	1 st June 2018 & 1 st week July 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days (recommended: 5-10)	2 nd & 3 rd week July 2018
Final Report	2 days (recommended: 1-2)	4 th week of July 2018

E. The CONSULTANT PROFILE

The evaluation team will be composed of (1 international / and 1 national evaluators). The International and National consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Prior Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have a conflict of interest with project related activities.

International Consultant (Team Leader)

The International Consultant shall be responsible for completing and delegating tasks as appropriate for the Terminal Evaluation to the National Counterpart. He/she will ensure the timely submission of the first draft and the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report with incorporated comments from UNDP and others.

National Consultant (Team member)

The National Consultant will, jointly with, and under the supervision of the International Consultant, support the evaluation. He/she will be responsible to review documents, translate necessary documents and interpret interviews, meetings and other relevant events for the International Consultant. He/she will work as a liaison for stakeholders of the project and ensures all stakeholders of the project are aware of the purposes and methods of the evaluation and ensures all meetings and interviews take place in a timely and effective manner.

Provide logistical support for the evaluation mission as per travel schedule.

The consultants must satisfy the following qualifications:

COMPETENCIES

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

International Consultant

Education (20%):

- A minimum Master degree in fields related to environmental science

Experience (65%):

- The evaluators should be an expert with at least 7 years of experience fields related to Multi-focal areas cross-cutting capacity development projects development projects and the three Rio conventions.
- The evaluators should have 7 years of experience in implementing or evaluating projects in the Pacific region;
- The evaluator should have some experience in implementing or evaluating climate change, biodiversity, and desertification related projects;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Previous experience with results- based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Experience with evaluating similar UNDP/GEF financed projects is an advantage.

Competencies (15%):

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
- Excellent English communication skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Technical knowledge in Multi-focus areas of GEF
- Excellent report writing skills
- Good knowledge of Solomon Pidgin is an asset.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Education:	A minimum Master degree in fields related to environmental science	20
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should be an expert with at least 7 years of experience fields related to Multi-focal areas cross-cutting capacity development projects 	

	<p>development projects and the three Rio conventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluators should have 7 years of experience in implementing or evaluating projects in the Pacific region; • The evaluator should have some experience in implementing or evaluating climate change, biodiversity, and desertification related projects; • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; • Previous experience with results- based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; • Experience with evaluating similar AF/GEF financed projects is an advantage. • Sound brief methodology on the proposed approach and conduct of the required work. 	65
Functional Competency:	<p>Demonstrable analytical skills;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management; • Excellent English communication skills; • Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system will be considered an asset; • Knowledge of UNDP and GEF; • Technical knowledge in Multi-focus areas of GEF • Excellent report writing skills • Good knowledge of Solomon Pidgin is an asset. 	15

F. HOW TO APPLY

The application should contain:

The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position, a concise description of the bidders understanding of the consultancy assignment, a summary of the comments on the TOR, and a **brief methodology** on the proposed approach and conduct of the required work.
- **Confirmation of Interest document, template attached along with the ToR.**
- **Updated and signed P-I I along with your CV** to include qualifications/competencies and relevant past experience in similar projects and contact details of 2 professional referees who can certify your competencies, professionalism, quality of writing, presentation and overall suitability to this TOR
- Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a combination of factors including cover letter, the credentials on offer and brief interview (optional) and the offer which gives the **best value for money for the UNDP.**
- **Please duly fill the below financial proposal and attach to the last page of the CV along with all other required documentation above.**
- To apply please access UNDP Jobs site <http://jobs.undp.org>.

G. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee: USD (_____) Or

All Inclusive Daily Fee: USD (_____)

Amount in words:

(. _____)

Note: Payments will be based on invoices on the achievement of agreed milestones i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR and certification of acceptance by the UNDP. The applicant must factor in all possible costs in his/her “**All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee/Daily Fee**” financial proposal including his/her consultancy and professional fee, honorarium, communication

cost such as telephone/internet usage, printing cost, return travel from home to office, ad-hoc costs, stationery costs, and any other foreseeable costs in this exercise. No costs other than what has been indicated in the financial proposal will be paid or reimbursed to the consultant. The UNDP will only pay for any unplanned travel outside of this TOR and Duty Station on an actual basis and on submission of original bills/invoices and on prior agreement with UNDP officials. Daily per-diums and costs for accommodation/meals/incidental expenses for such travel shall not exceed established local UNDP DSA rates.

For an Individual Contractor who is of 62 years of age or older, and on an assignment requiring travel, be it for the purpose of arriving at the duty station or as an integral duty required under the TOR, a full medical examination and statement of fitness to work must be provided. Such medical examination costs must be factored into the financial proposal above. A medical examination is not a requirement for individuals on RLA contracts. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org.

H. PAYMENT FOR SERVICES

The Terminal Evaluation Specialist shall receive payment from UNDP as follows:

%	Milestone
10%	Upon submission of the inception report
40%	Following the submission and approval of the first draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following the submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

Approved by: _____
Name/designation/Signature

Annex 2. List of documents reviewed

The PMU has shared a list of documents to the TE Consultant in advance of the review mission as well as during the mission to Honiara:

Document Title	
1.	Project's Mid-term Evaluation Report
2.	Management Response to the MTR recommendations
3.	Reported progress against project logical model document
4.	The Project's Identification Form
5.	UNDP/GEF Project Document
6.	GEF CEO Endorsement letter
7.	UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
8	Project Inception Report
9	Annual Project Progress/Implementation Reports 2015, 2016, a mid-term analytical progress report on activities performed till October 2017, 2017, and Terminal Project Report
10	Quarterly progress reports: 3 for 2015, 4 for 2016, 3 for 2017, and 2 for 2018
11	Project Work Plans
12	Capacity Building Score Card - at CEO endorsement
13	Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
14	Project Lograme
15	Project's budget revisions
16	Project Budget Balance
17	UNDP CDR 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018
18	International Project Specialist Missions Reports
19	Snapshots of UNDP Risks and issues log
20	In-kind assistance table
21	Technical reports produced by the international and national consultants (since the start of the project until its completion)
22	Training sessions progress reports
23	Project's activities media coverage – Samples
24	Request Letter from Implementing Partner requesting no cost extension
25	Approval from the UNDP GEF on the project no-cost extension
26	The project's Facebook and website

Annex 3: Itinerary

The MISSION ITINERARY
International Expert Dr. Amal Aldababseh
Terminal evaluation of the project “Integrating Global Environment
Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making
(IGECIDDM)/CCCD”

Mission period: 4-12 August 2018 (8 days, including days of arrival and departure)

Meetings with project partners: Honiara

Date	Item	Time	Who to meet / Titles	Venue
4/8/18	Arrive at Honiara	2:45 pm		hotel
6/08/18	Project Management Team	10 am	Hayley Kouto Eric Houma Deltina Solomon	UNDP Conference Room
	Skype with the UNDP/GEF Regional Office	4 pm	Eva Huttova	UNDP Conference Room
7/08/18	Ministry of Forest and Research (MoFR)	1 pm	PS MoFR	Permanent Secretary’s office-MoFR
	Meetings with Deputy Director – FRMTSD MoFR Director – FRMTSD, MoFR Chief Policy Planning Officer, FRMTSD, MoFR	2 pm 3 pm	Terrence Titiulu Gideon Solo Kedson Ago	MoFR headquarter
	Meeting with REDD+/Forestry Technical Adviser, SPC/GIZ REDD+ II Regional Programme	4 pm	Manuel Haas	MoFR headquarter
	Kolombangara Indigenous Biodiversity Conservation Association	5 15 pm	Ferguson Vaghi	KSH
8/08/18	Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM)	8 am	PS	Permanent Secretary Office / MoECCM
	Integrated Forest Management Project/ FAO	9 am	Digolus Yee	MoECCM
	Meeting with Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL)	10 am	Simon Iro sefa	Permanent Secretaries Office-MAL

	Meeting with Director Climate Change Division	11 am	Hudson Kauhiona	MoECCM
	Director of Environment Division	12 noon	Mr. Joe Horokou	MoECCM
	Meeting with the SWISAP	1 pm	Habib Ur Rahman	UNDP Offices
	The Solomon Islands National University	230 pm	Professor Prem Rai, Ms. Mary Tahu	SNRAS, SINU
9/08/18	Community based organizations – Santa Isabel Province – Kia Village	8 am	Fly to Santa Isabel	
		9:15	Boat trip to Kia community	
		3 -5 pm	Community discussion	
10/08/18	Community meeting	8 am -1 pm	Kia village community meeting– a CCCD project piloting site	
11/08/18	Leave Santa Isabel	410 pm		
12/08/18	Leave Honiara	130 pm		
13/08/18	Arrive home	935 am		
27/08/18	UNDP RSD Team Leader	4:30 pm	Ms. Lynelle Popot	Skype call
28/08/18	UNDP Country Director	5:00 pm	Ms. Azus aKubota	Skype call

Annex 4. List of persons interviewed

	Name	Title	Organization
1.	Dr. Melchior Matakai	Permanent Secretary Board member	Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM)
2.	Ms. Azusa Kubota	Country Director	UNDP
3.	Mr. Kedson Ago		Deputy Director – FRMTSD MoFR
4.	Ms. Eva Hutton	Programme Associate	UNDP/GEF
5.	Ms. Lynelle Popot	Team Leader	UNDP
6.	Ms. Deltina Solomon	Project Assistant	UNDP
7.	Mr. Hayley Kouto	Project Manager	UNDP/ PMU
7.	Mr. Eric Houma	Project Assistant	UNDP/ PMU
8.	Mr. Habib Ur Rehman	Civil Engineer Specialist	LDCF UNDP/GEF -SIWSAP Project
9.	Professor Prem Rai	Research director	SINU
10.	Ms. Mary Tahu	Lecturer and Course Coordinator Dept. of Environment Studies	SINU
11.	Mr. Terrence Titiulu	Director – FRMTSD	MoFR
12.	Mr. Gideon Solo	MoFR Chief Forest Officer	Technical Group
13.	Mr. Simon Iro sefa	MAL Chief Agriculture Officer	Technical Group
14.	Mr. Manuel Haas	REDD+/Forestry Technical Adviser,	SPC/GIZ REDD+ II Regional Programme
20.	Mr. Joe Horokou	Director of Environment Division	MECDM
21.	Mr. Hudson Kauhiona	Director Climate Change Division	MECDM
22.	Mr. Ferguson Vaghi	Officer - Kolombangara Indigenous Biodiversity Conservation Association	KIBCA
23.	Mr. Digolus Yee	IFM Project Manager	IFM/FAO

Annex 5. Evaluative Question Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Means of Verification
i. Project Strategy		
1. Project design		
Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context of achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?	Reported progress toward achieving the results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?	<p>Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies.</p> <p>Provision of counterpart funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents endorsements and co-financing. ▪ Interviews with UNDP, project staff and governmental agencies.
Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with stakeholders. ▪ Project progress reports.
Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.	Level of gender issues raised outlined in project documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents
2. Results Framework/ Logframe:		
Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "smart" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.	Indicators and targets of outcome and outputs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project framework

Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and within its time frame?	The stated contribution of stakeholders in project implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with stakeholders.
Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.	Indicators of the project's outcome (from the project results framework)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Field visits and interviews with local stakeholders involved with these projects and the direct beneficiaries.
Ensure the broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend smart 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.	Measures were taken to ensure proper project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project's reports. ▪ Interviews with PSC/Project board members ▪ Minutes of interviews with key stakeholders
ii. Progress Towards Results		
3. Progress towards outcomes analysis		
Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix.	Output level indicators of the Results Framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Tangible products (publications, studies, etc.) ▪ Interviews with the project's staff, partners, and stakeholders.
iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management		
4. Management arrangement		
Review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.	Level of implementation of mechanisms outlined in the project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with project staff and partners. ▪ Project progress reports.
Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by Implementing partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations

Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations
5. Work planning		
Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.	Level of compliance with project planning / annual plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.
Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?	List of results proposed in the work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project work plan.
Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.	Level of compliance with project results framework and logframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.
6. Finance and co-finance		
Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning / annual plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project financial reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.
Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project financial reports.
Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for the timely flow of funds?	<p>Quality of standards for financial and operative management.</p> <p>Perception of management efficiency by project partners and project staff/consultants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with the project and UNDP finance staff. ▪ Financial reports.
Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?	Level of co-financing in relation to original planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial reports of the project. ▪ Interviews with project management staff and UNDP RTA.

7. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems		
Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?	Measures were taken to improve project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation. Level of implementation of M&E system. Changes in project implementation as result of supervision visits/missions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress and implementation reports. ▪ Interview with project staff, UNDP team, and key stakeholders.
Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?	The number of cases where resources are insufficient. The number of cases where budgets were transferred between different budget lines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports/ financial reports/ consultant contracts and report
8. Stakeholder Engagement		
Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with key stakeholders
Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?	Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies. Provision of counterpart funding Perception of ownership by national and local agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with national partners, UNDP and project staff. ▪ Project progress reports/PIR. ▪ Documented endorsements and co-financing.
Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?	Perceived level of collaboration and coordination. The stated contribution of stakeholders in the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with the Project Management team. ▪ Interviews with stakeholders. ▪ Citation of stakeholders' roles

	achievement of outputs.	in specific products like publications
9. Reporting		
Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfill GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?)	Level of alignment with the GEF mandate and policies at the time of design and implementation; and the GEF CCCD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparison of project document and annual reports and policy and strategy papers of local-regional agencies, GEF and UNDP. ▪ Interviews with UNDP, project and governmental agencies.
Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.	Reported adaptive management measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
10. Communications		
Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?	<p>The degree to which plans were followed up by project management.</p> <p>Perception of effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)	<p>Stated the existed means of communication.</p> <p>The degree to which plans were followed up by project management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
iv. Sustainability		
Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management	Identified risks and mitigation measures during project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project document ▪ Progress report

Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.	and the updated risk-log sheet in ATLAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk log
11. Financial risks to sustainability.		
What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income-generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?	<p>Estimations on financial requirements.</p> <p>Estimations of the future budget of key stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Studies on financial sustainability. ▪ Documented estimations of the future budget. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
12. Socio-economic risks to sustainability.		
<p>Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</p> <p>What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</p> <p>Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?</p> <p>Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?</p> <p>Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?</p>	<p>Key factors positively or negatively impacted project results (in relation to the stated assumptions).</p> <p>Main national stakeholders participate actively in implementation and replication of project activities and results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with project staff, key stakeholders. ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Revision of literature on context ▪ Documentation on activities of key stakeholders
13. Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability		
Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures, and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.	Key institutional frameworks that may positively or negatively influence project results (in relation to stated assumptions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of existing frameworks. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
14. Environmental risks to sustainability		
Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?	Number of identified risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk log and management response.

Annex 6. The questionnaire used for the interviews

The below questions were used in the interviews. Not all questions will be asked of each interviewee. The questions were used to make sure that all aspects are covered, and the needed information is requested to complete the review exercise and a guide to prepare the semi-structured interviews.

I. Relevance - How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the GEF and to the environment and development priorities of the Solomon Islands?

1. Is the Project relevant to the GEF objectives?
2. Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?
3. Is the Project relevant to the Solomon Islands development objectives?
4. Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?
5. Is the Project internally coherent in its design?
6. How is the Project relevant considering other donors?
7. What lessons have been learned and what changes could have been made to the Project to strengthen the alignment between the Project and the Partners' priorities and areas of focus?
8. How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?

II. Effectiveness – To what extent are the expected outcomes of the Project being achieved?

1. How is the Project effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
2. How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

III. Efficiency - How efficiently is the Project implemented?

1. Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
2. Did the Project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
3. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
4. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
5. Was Project implementation as cost-effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently?
6. Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
7. Were there an institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to Project design and implementation effectiveness were shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement? Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?
8. To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported?
9. Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?
10. What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? (between local actors, UNDP/GEF and relevant government entities)
11. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?

12. Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?

IV. IMPACTS - What are the potential and realized impacts of activities carried out in the context of the Project?

1. Will the project achieve its objective that is to improve fiscal measures for collecting, managing, and allocating revenues for global environmental management?
2. How is the Project impacting the local environment such as impacts or likely impacts on the local environment; on poverty; and, on other socio-economic issues?

V. Sustainability - Are the initiatives and results of the Project allowing for continued benefits?

1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated into Project design?
2. Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?
3. Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?
4. Are laws, policies, and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address the sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
5. Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?
6. Did the Project contribute to key building blocks for social and political sustainability?
7. Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?
8. What are the main challenges that may hinder the sustainability of efforts?

Annex 7: Progress evaluation for the complete Logframe

Goal/Objective/ Outcomes	Performance Indicator	2014 Baseline	Target value by the END of the Project	Midterm Level Assessment	TE level assessment	TE Comments	Rating
Project objectives: To enhance the capacity of relevant policy and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other MEAs	Institutional capacity and interagency coordination are strengthened for improved implementation of the Rio Conventions within national planning frameworks	Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing poverty alleviation and other socio-economic priorities	Government staff have learned, applied, and tested best practice tools to integrate Rio Conventions into forest and agriculture sector development plans	Progress in strengthening institutional capacity will result in improving implementation of the Rio Conventions target at the end of the project.	Four tools were developed (2 training manuals, one checklist, one framework for mainstreaming Rio Conventions). 4 training sessions for around 50 officials in total.	Target achieved.	S
	Global environmental priorities are mainstreamed into REDD+ management framework	Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning or	Rio Convention priorities will be mainstreamed within the Development Consent Processes and government staff	Further work is required to mainstream Rio Convention priorities within the Development Consent Processes. Further training should also be	The analytical framework was developed and endorsed by the government. It is already tested and used by the government. A specific training was provided to concerned Government staff.	Targets achieved	S

		Development Consent Processes	will be trained on the revised environmental management information system.	provided			
	Awareness of the linkages between the Rio Conventions and REDD+ forest management	Best practices and lessons learned from mainstreaming Rio Conventions into REDD+ framework are not readily accessed or tested.	There is a minimum of 20% increase in the understanding of the Rio Convention mainstreaming among government staff	Further training activities are required to reach the target of increasing the understanding of the Rio Conventions by the end of the project (The project has a communication plan that is supposed to be implemented before the end of the project. If implemented correctly, this target will be achieved.)	The implemented training programmes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizing three awareness campaigns during the World Environment Day concerning the linkages between the Rio Conventions and the REDD+. - Creation of a new classroom training module on the linkages between the Rio Conventions and REDD+ and how they affect peoples' day to day life, which included (a textbook, a teacher's resources guide) and has been officially endorsed by the Solomon National University to be used in the University as part of the curriculum and in high schools by the Ministry of Education. - Training on the analytical framework in the EIA checklist (for around 25 government officials), to prepare the government staff on how to use it and make them aware of the tool itself. - 5 provincial awareness sessions for selected professionals from key 	Targets achieved	S

					government agencies in Temotu, Isabell, Makira/Ulawa, Western, and Guadalcanal (Honiara) provinces.		
		Planners and decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions, the result of which is that the global environment is heavily discounted	There is a minimum of 15% increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public	A few public awareness events were organized. The project needs to focus more on awareness related to the Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 public events were organized during the World Environment Day (schools, private sectors representatives, NGOs representatives and Government officials). - Distribute brief information about Rio-conventions in these events. - Education materials for high school were developed and rolled out including a textbook and a teacher manual. - 2 Community meetings were organized, in Gizo, Buala, and Kia, in collaboration with TNC to raise awareness about the project. - A Facebook page was created to disseminate project's deliverables, lessons learned, results (IGECIDDM), in addition, some information about the Rio-conventions were added to the REDD+ website: - www.reddplussolomonislands.gov.sb 	Targets partially achieved	MS
			There is a minimum of 25% increase in the acceptance by government representatives	While a 25% increase in the acceptance by government representatives could be achieved, the involvement of other	Cooperation was established with some partners like TNC (International NGO), KIBCA (CBO), GIZ (Bilateral Donor), FAO (International Organization), SINU (University), and NRDF (National NGO) among others, may help the	Targets partially achieved	MS

			and other stakeholder representatives of the legitimacy of REDD+ and its accompanying Roadmap	stakeholder representatives did not start yet.	project in achieving this target.		
Output 1.1 Strengthen the organizational capacities of the REDD+ Implementation Unit	REDD+ Implementation unit has the mandate to coordinate CCCD activities National REDD+ Committee and Focal Points formally established Memoranda of Agreement between REDD+ Committee and national working groups Working group on land degradation Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation	REDD+ organizational structures are still inchoate and in need of clearly defined mandates Evidence of public sector staff's technical capacities related to the Rio Conventions is limited	Implementation unit receives a mandate by month 3	Target achieved but with a substantial delay	The Unit is officially mandated to follow up on REDD+ Roadmap	Target was achieved	S
			National REDD+ Committee and Focal Points formally recognized by month 3	Target achieved but with a substantial delay	The National REDD+ Committee and Focal Point formally recognized	Target as achieved	
			MOU signed by month 4	Although the National REDD+ Committee and the focal point are formally recognized, no MOU has been signed.	The MOU was prepared but was not signed because the Government believed that its early to sign such an MOU as the National REDD+ Committee is still in the learning process and would need more time to move with this MOU.	Target partially achieved	
			Working group on land degradation established by month 8	No working group on land degradation is established up until now	There was a working group on land degradation that was established by another project. Based on the MTR recommendation, the project helped the Government to reconvene the working group and get it operational.	Target achieved	
			Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation convened by	No training workshops for inter-agency cooperation convened until now	Since there is no clear mechanism for inter-agency cooperation, or MOU signed between the NRC and the Rio-conventions focal points, it was not possible to organize the needed training	The target was not achieved	

			month 12		workshops.		
Output 1.2: Global environmental priorities mainstreamed into selected development plans	Analytical framework for integrating Rio Conventions into forest and agriculture sector planning Working groups for Rio Convention mainstreaming in forest and agriculture sector and provincial development plan Technical training sessions on mainstreaming global environmental priorities into development plans Pilot forest management project Report on lessons learned from the pilot forest management	There is no systematic approach or institutional procedures to integrate environmental conservation priorities and Rio Convention provisions into socio-economic development planning processes Commitment to Rio Convention provisions are not evident Sector development plans do not adequately address Rio Convention obligations Implementation of sector development plans emphasize socio-economic priorities	Analytical framework finalized by month 6	Target is achieved with a substantial delay	The analytical framework is finalized.	Target achieved	MS
			The analytical framework is revised per COP decisions by month 20 and by month 32	Target is achieved with a substantial delay	The framework is revised and endorsed by COP, and the technical group	Target Achieved	
			High-quality rating of the analytical framework by peer review experts	Target is achieved.	The framework was highly rated by peer experts.	Target Achieved	
			Working groups established by month 3	The target is not possible to be achieved as it has not been initiated yet	A biodiversity working under the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI), and a climate change working group already exist and is headed by MECDM. There is also the Land use working Group headed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL). Following the discussion with the Government, it has been highlighted that there is no need to establish any new groups as these groups already cover issues related to Rio Conventions. Also, due to the small pool of human resource available to make up these	The target was not achieved	

	approach				<p>groups, most of these groups comprises of the same people from the Government, relevant NGOs and interested group.</p> <p>It is due to these facts no working groups have been established under this project. However, these facts should have been integrated into the project design during the formulation or during the inception workshop.</p> <p>The technical working group convened under this project to provide technical assistance in the reports produced and so forth mainly comprises of the key people under the groups mentioned above.</p>	
		Technical training sessions held by month 7 and updated annually by months 15 and 27	One technical training session is planned to take place before the end of 2017	4 technical training sessions were organized in Honiara and in Kia village.	Target achieved	
		Pilot project begins by month 13 and ends by month 24	A pilot proposal on sustainable forest management has been developed, yet to be reviewed, endorsed, and approved by MoFR.	<p>A wide stakeholder consultation has been jointly conducted by the project in collaboration with the Integrated Forest Management Project (IFMP) implemented by Food Agriculture Organization and the Government at the project site (Kolombangara island) as well as for the Western Provincial Government.</p> <p>The discussion is ongoing with IFMP and UNDP for IFMP to take on the proposal and assist the Government especially MoFR to implement it.</p>	Partially achieved	

					MoFR is expected to review and finalize the proposal hence implementing it within the framework of the IFMP. The lessons learned from this pilot will be crucial to REDD+ development and implementation in the country		
			Lessons learned report drafted by month 27, finalized by month 33, and presented in stakeholder workshops by month 33	Lessons learned report to be drafted based on the implementation of the pilot project	This target will not be achieved	The target was not achieved	
			All Rio Convention Focal Points endorse analytical framework by months 13, again by month 21 and finally by month 33	The Framework has been reviewed and endorsed by the CBD focal point.	The Framework has been reviewed and endorsed by all Rio-conventions focal point.	Target achieved	
Output 1.3: Resource mobilization strategy	Resource mobilization strategy and plan for National REDD+ Roadmap Feasibility study and consultations on REDD+ Roadmap implementation		Strategy and plan drafted, reviewed, and finalized by month 7	A Resource Mobilization Strategy and Action Plan was drafted and are under review.	The resource mobilization strategy and action plan were endorsed by the Government	Achieved	S
			Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments to implement REDD+ Roadmap completed by month 12	A draft of “ <i>Proposed best practices, financial and economic instruments to implement the REDD+ Readiness Roadmap</i> ” is prepared and shared with the Government	The feasibility study on “financial and economic instrument” is finalized and endorsed by the Government.	Target achieved	

				for review.			
			The expert working group is made of at least 20 rotating members, who will undertake a review of the drafts of the strategy, plan, and feasibility study, and meet at least once to discuss the findings of each within one month of their completion, i.e., by months 8 and 13	Only one working group is formulated from the three main Ministries. No other stakeholders are involved.	The only working group that was formulated from the three key ministries is mandated to follow up on all project's deliverables including the work related to the 3 Rio-conventions. Due to the limited number of experts in the three domains, it was agreed at the PMU to keep this expert working group for the entire project.		Partially achieved
			Feasibility study and plan are rated as high quality ⁸	Target achieved	The study was reviewed and endorsed by the TWG.		Target achieved

⁸ Ratings will be based on a set of 12 criteria on a scale of 1 to 5.

Output 2.1: Global environmental priorities and REDD+ Safeguards are integrated within the EIS and PER processes	Safeguards framework Strengthened EIA guidelines Training and workshops for revised guidelines Linked National Forest Monitoring System database Formal approval of National Safeguard Information System Study on ecosystem services valuation within EIS and PER processes	The current Development Consent Process lacks clarity and oversight and does not adequately reflect Rio Convention obligations Land-cover databases are not linked to Development Consent Process Impacts to environmental services are not accounted for within EIS and PER processes	Safeguards framework drafted by month 9, peer-reviewed and finalized by month 12	The PMU, in cooperation with the Project's international experts, decided to prepare two analytical reports that are considered very crucial to prepare the Safeguards Framework. However, due to time constraints, the intended Safeguards Framework will no longer be formulated as required in the project document. the project is not planning to prepare the Safeguards framework.	The safeguards Gap Analysis report should provide guidance to Government to set up the Country Safeguard System. The project was unable to develop the safeguards framework due to time constraints.	Partially completed	S
			Strengthened EIA guidelines drafted by month 6, peer-reviewed and finalized by month 8	Expected targets achieved	A social and environmental impact assessment guideline and checklist for forestry and agriculture sector have been developed.	Achieved	
			Letters of endorsement by month 4	Has not been initiated yet	The MECDM approved the EIA checklist and guideline. The Ministry also adopted.	Achieved	
			Training programmes by month 17 and 25	Has not been initiated yet	One training programme has been developed and conducted in Honiara. Around 10 government staff including the National University representative have attended the training.	Achieved	

			Study on ecosystem services valuation drafted by month 20, peer-reviewed by month 24, and finalized for distribution by month 32	Expected target achieved.	The study on ecosystem services valuation is drafted, reviewed, approved and distributed.	Target achieved	
Output 2.2: Improved environmental management information system and National Forest Monitoring System	Analysis of information needs Working group meetings to draft proposal of improved EMIS The unified data format for all government institutions Training programme and resource materials for EMIS and NFMS	Existing socio-economic and environmental data are managed in a highly disorganized and fragmented manner with little awareness of Rio Convention obligations	Analysis of information needs to be completed by month 5	Expected target achieved	The developed report identifies existing data within Government. The project TWG has reviewed and approved the report.	Target achieved.	MUS
			Working group meets by month 3 and 9	Expected target achieved.	Expected target achieved.	Target achieved.	
			A draft proposal for improved EMIS by month 13 and finalized by month 16	A report identifying existing data is finalized. It outlines ways to set an EMIS.	The outline to set up an EMIS was developed but no full proposal for improving the existed EMIS was put in place.	Partially achieved	
			Unified format by month 22	Has not started yet	The project was not able to propose a way to improve the EMIS or to define a unified format.	No achieved	
			Training programme and materials by month 24	Has not started yet	This target is linked to the two previously explained targets. Due to time constraint, it was not possible to prepare and conduct these training programmes	Not achieved	
			Training programme implemented by month 15 and month 27	Has not started yet	Programme implementation is pending the development of the training programme materials.	Not achieved	

Output 3.1: Project launch and results conferences	One-day Kick-Off conference raises the high profile of Rio Convention mainstreaming into sectoral policies and plans and REDD+ One-day project results conference to showcase lessons learned and opportunities for replication	Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, with stakeholders not fully appreciating the value of conserving the global environment.	One-day Kick-Off conference is held by month 3	Target achieved	The inception workshop was organized in June 2015.	Achieved	S
			One-day Project Results conference is held between months 32 and 34	To be organized by the end of the project	A project completion workshop was organized on June 21, 2018. Around 30 participants have attended.	Achieved	
			Over 200 participants attend both conferences	To be reported by the end of the project	Around 60 participants attended both conferences	Partially achieved	
Output 3.2: Public awareness implementation plan and survey	Analysis of The Solomon Islands' awareness and understanding of the link between environment and development (survey results) Comprehensive public awareness plan developed to organize and convene targeted activities to promote the Rio Conventions Articles on Rio Convention mainstreaming in popular literature	The Solomon Islands has been carrying out a number of activities to promote environmental consciousness, including with support from development partners. However, these have focused on specific thematic issues Articles on the Rio Conventions are being published, but in the	Broad-based surveys (N>250) completed by month 3 and month 34	Has not started	The survey was prepared by the end of the 34 months. The number did not reach 250.	Partially achieved	MS
			Independent analysis by month 35	Has not started	Pending the completion of the surveys.	Not achieved	
			Public awareness plan completed by month 5	Target achieved	A communication strategy and plan has been developed	Target achieved	
			9 articles by end of the project: 1 article by month 6, 4 by month 18, and 7 by month 30	Has not initiated	Nine articles have been published.	Target achieved	
			Convention mainstreaming are also published as brochures, at 100	Target achieved	A few brochures on the Rio-conventions, REDD+, and ecosystem services have been developed and shared with the public during the	Target achieved	

High school and university education modules and accompanying lecture material on the global environment Public service announcement on practices to safeguard global environmental benefits	specialized literature that is largely read by environmental supporters or in the popular literature during crisis events, with few exceptions	copies each, and distributed to at least two high-value special events, at least 9 by month 20 and at least 18 by month 32		provincial awareness events as well as during public events such as the world environment day and the world forest day	
		By month 34, statistical and sociological analysis of broad-based survey shows at least 20% increase in the understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming values and opportunities	Has not started	The needed training was not conducted.	The target was not achieved
		By month 31, reporting in the popular literature on Rio Convention mainstreaming shows a 10% increase over business as usual forecast	Has not started	No plans by the PMU concerning this target.	The target was not achieved
	High school and SINU education module on Rio Conventions and accompanying	Target achieved	The education module on Rio Conventions and the lecture materials have been prepared and reviewed by the project TWG.	Target achieved	

			lecture material are completed by month 8				
			At least 10 high schools and SINU have implemented education module by month 20	Has not started yet	The module and the lecture materials were distributed but not implemented in the high schools but were implemented in SINU.	The target was not achieved	
			At least 20 high schools have implemented education module by month 32	Has not started yet	No implementation took place.	The target was not achieved	
Output 3.3: Awareness-raising dialogues and workshops	Expert panel discussions on synergies between Rio Conventions and business Annual public constituent meetings on Rio Convention mainstreaming Awareness-raising workshop at the provincial level on implications of Rio Conventions to local socio-economic priorities	The private sector is primarily focused on traditional approaches to maximizing profits, seeing environmental issues as an added transaction cost that reduces profits Provincial-level government representatives are not familiar with approaches to mainstream Rio Convention into provincial	Three (3) panel discussions, with at least 50 private sector representatives, one held each year, the first by month 8 At least four provincial awareness workshops on Rio Convention mainstreaming and REDD+ implementation, one held by month 9 and the last by month 33, with at	This target is difficult to achieve Further awareness workshops are required to reach the target by the end of the project	The project has not initiated any contact with the private sector representatives up until the time of the MTR. 5 provincial awareness workshops on Rio Convention mainstreaming and REDD+ implementation was held with at least 100 participants	The target was not achieved Target was achieved	S

	Increased sensitization and understanding on Rio Convention mainstreaming values	development plans The general public in The Solomon Islands remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities.	least 50 district government representatives attending each				
Output 3.4: Internet visibility of Rio Convention mainstreaming via REDD+	The website for REDD+ and Rio Convention mainstreaming activities A new website that serves as a form of a clearinghouse on Rio Convention mainstreaming Facebook page on Rio Convention mainstreaming	There are websites that promote environmental issues in The Solomon Islands, but they are poorly linked, often outdated and tend to focus on topical issues, such as water, energy, sea level rise, and air pollution. Government websites, if they exist, tend to be outdated with sparse details on activities No websites could	A new website that provides clear guidance and best practices for Rio Convention mainstreaming by month 9	Further modifications are needed to finalize the website	A website was developed; however, the focus is mainly on REDD+ with limited focus on Rio Conventions.	Partially achieved	MUS
			The website is regularly updated, at least once a month with new information, articles, and relevant links on Rio Convention mainstreaming.	A further update is needed.	The website contains important information and is regularly updated	Partially achieved	
			Number of visits to the website shows sustained and increasing	No mechanism in place to show the number	No mechanism in place to show the number	Not achieved	

		be found that promoted an integrated Rio Convention and socio-economic development approach	interest in the project life cycle				
			Facebook page created by month 9	Has not started yet	The project team has created a Facebook page	Achieved	
			At least 500 Facebook likes by month 31	Has not started yet	The FB page has been created late April 2018, it is getting more likes as time passes.	Partially achieved	

Annex 8: Capacity Scorecards for Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-Making (IGECIDDM)/CCCD Project

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
CR 1: Capacities for engagement					
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0			
	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1			
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2			
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3	3	3	3
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0			
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1	1		
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2		2	2
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/ functional	3			
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0			
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1	1	1	1
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2			
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3			
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge					
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware of global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs)	0	0		
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)	1		1	
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2			2
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3			
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0			
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1	1	1	
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to	2			2

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
	manage and give information access to the public is limited				
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3			
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0			
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1	1		
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2		2	2
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3			
Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exists between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0			
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes	1	1	1	1
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2			
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3			
Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0			
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1	1	1	
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2			
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3			
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy, and legislation development					
Indicator 9 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0			
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used	1	1	1	1
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	2			
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3			
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1			
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2	2	2	2
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3			
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0			
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1	1	1	
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2			2
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use the updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3			
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation					
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0			
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1	1	1	1
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2			
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3			
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0			
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1	1	1	1
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2			
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3			
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate					
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0	0		
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1		1	1
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3			
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0	0	0	0
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1			
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities	3			

Annex 9: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about it and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings, and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Terminal Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: AMAL ALDABABSEH

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Jordan (Place) on 31 August 2018 (Date)

Signature:



Annex 10: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by
UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: Mr. Tom Twining-Ward _____



Signature: _____ Date: 8 October 2018 _____