**Annex A: Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

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 *Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu (VCAP)* (PIMS 4866)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | *Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu (VCAP)* | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5049 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00082472 | GEF financing: | 8,030,000 | | 8,030,000 |
| Country: | | Vanuatu | IA/EA own: | 2,731,344 | | 2,731,344 |
| Region: | | Asia and the Pacific | Government: | 21,170,341 | | 20,360,216 |
| Focal Area: | | CCA-1, CCA-2 | Other: | 6,995,568 | | 74,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 30,897,253 | | 23,165,560 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | $38, 927,253 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management(MCCMGEEDM) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 17th November 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  February 2019 | Actual:  December 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to explicitly address three of eleven priorities identified in the NAPA including: 1) community-based marine resource management, 2) integrated coastal zone management, and 3) mainstreaming climate change into policy and national planning processes.

The Vanuatu Coastal Adaptation (VCAP) project has provided valuable opportunities to the Vanuatu Government to increase the resilience of its communities to future climate change induced risks such as declining coastal and marine resources and intensifying climate related hazards. To address the priorities of NAPA, VCAP had focused on five of the adaptation options including: i) development of provincial / local adaptation and ICM plans, ii) climate proofing of infrastructure design and development planning, iii) development of an efficient early warning system, iv) awareness raising and capacity building, and v) coastal re-vegetation and rehabilitation.

The overall objective of VCAP is to improve the resilience of the coastal zone and its communities to the impacts of climate change to sustain livelihoods, food production and preserve and improve the quality of life in targeted vulnerable areas.

VCAP has been focusing on improving community level adaptation to climate change to address major environmental and associated socio-economic problems facing coastal communities impacts by climate change such as land degradation, biodiversity loss and reef destruction, all of which severely undermines prospects for sustainable development and threaten the food security of communities.

VCAP has supported information and early warning systems on coastal hazards to address the current lack of systematic analysis and predictions of climate-related events. This is to allow coastal communities to be less vulnerable to the effects of climate change with improved information management and data dissemination systems in place.

Below in summary is the objective and outcome; the progress towards these is measured through the following indicators:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project relative to the baseline (unless specified otherwise)** |
| Project Objective: To improve the resilience of the coastal zone to the impacts of climate change in order to sustain livelihoods, food production and preserve and improve the quality of life in targeted vulnerable areas | | |
|  | Number of fishery assets, small livestock breeds, and new resistant crops introduced to diversify community incomes and increase food security.  Percentage of the population in target sites covered by effective the 24/7 early warning system  Number of people benefited from having better access to markets, schools and health facilities which was provided through resiliency of public works assets (rural roads, bridges, water crossings, etc.)  Number of protected areas established in the coastal and upland areas that assist to preserve water, provide for food and protection against climate and coastal hazards. | At least 8 FADs, 8 solar freezers, 30 technical packages have been delivered consisting of small and improved livestock breeds and new resilient crops; including training on the use and maintenance of the assets  100% of Vanuatu population with access to mobile networks and radio signals receive high quality early warning in timely manner through multiple communication lines  A total of 25,000 community members with better access to markets, education and health facilities  At least 8 protected areas in coastal areas and other 2 in upland areas linked by biological corridors under the R2R approach, have been established with the clear endorsement of surrounding communities |
| **Outcome 1: Integrated community approaches to climate change adaptation** | | |
| 1.1 Integrated CC-Adaptation plans mainstreamed in the coastal zone | Community CC-Development Adaptation Strategies (C3ADS) at village level using common indicators across all project sites, reflecting management actions and norms for coastal, up-lands, waters, infrastructures and disaster preparedness related to EWS. | At least 30 C3ADS at village level using common indicators across all project sites, including gender and social inclusion.  The 30 C3ADS are framed into the Vanuatu Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Policy 2016-2030. |
| Community Disaster Committees established and operational with specific plans developed in targeted communities and at Area Council level | At least 15 CDC’s have been established or strengthened in VCAP intervention sites, equipped and trained.  8 Area Councils & 1 District equipped and trained. At least 30% trained people are women.  5 Area Councils trained on Disaster Management Response and have Disaster Management Plans developed |
| 1.2.1 Improved climate resilience of coastal areas through integrated approaches | Number of ecosystem-based fisheries management actions are clearly integrated with the Community CC-Development Adaptation Strategies (C3ADS) | 9 communities have defined "Taboo Area" in the coastal areas, where there were previously no protected areas and are implementing ecosystem-based fishery actions.  At least 9 Fisheries Association has the knowledge and suitable tools to monitoring and to evaluate successes, difficulties, benefits and challenges from ecosystem-based fishery and "taboo areas".  At least 40% of trained people are youth/men who are able to implement ecosystem-based fishery monitoring and evaluation. |
| Number of communities that have defined "taboo areas" in up-land and are implementing Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) practices in their croplands. | In project-selected sites, communities are managing sustainable community water systems, increasing water security for 2,000 people  Intervention in at least 7 erosion “hotspots”, related to hydric sustainability of community water systems.  30 communities have defined "Taboo Areas" in up-lands and **implementing actions/practices** to address Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) in crops lands. These communities will be monitored on the effectiveness of their actions plans through an institutional level monitoring mechanism.  At least 30 communities have been trained on mechanisms to |
|  | Number of public conveyances climate proofed to provide long-term use by vulnerable coastal communities | 10 pedestrian bridges established  4 water crossings rehabilitated  10 km of road rehabilitated  6 pedestrian walking paths “climate proofed”  Total of 10,000 community members with better access to markets, education and health |
| **Outcome 2**  Information and early warning systems on coastal hazards | | |
| **2.1.** Reduced exposure to flood-related risks and hazards in the target coastal communities | Better quality accuracy and timeliness in weather forecasting, particularly for extreme events such as extreme rainfall events, storm surges, tropical depressions and cyclones informing EWS | By the end of the project at least 100% of targeted V-CAP communities receiving timely and accurate early warnings of coastal hazards including floods, cyclones and other natural disasters and respond to early warnings and take the appropriate actions following the warning (disaggregated by gender and age)  Better quality meteorological forecasting available for all people of Vanuatu |
| VMGD has established an effective 24/7 service for monitoring, forecasting and public advisory for early warnings, able to cover all Vanuatu territory | VMGD has real time data flow received from 6 new Automatic Weather Stations.  At least 6 VMGD's staff member has received trainings to enhance data analysis, using up-grade computer systems to display satellites data and global/regional weather and climate models.  The 24/7 weather and coastal monitoring service has been established and works 100%, including procedures for Public Advisory Service under the WMO standards, linked with an Early Warning System at national level that provide direct support at least 30 CDCs. |
| **Outcome 3: Climate Change Governance** | | |
| 3.1 Climate change adaptation enabling policies and supportive institutions in place | Number of sectoral policies plans and strategies explicitly recognizing approaches to climate change adaption | Support the development of 3 policies/acts or strategies/frameworks to focus on CCA/DRR/Natural Resource Management/ Livelihood Improvement identified by the implementing agencies and are gender and socially inclusive |
| 3.2 Human resources in place at the national, provincial and community levels | Number of trained staffs with enough resources to implement CC resilience and adaptation at the national, provincial and community levels | 12 trainings addressing local level community resilience (disaster risk resilience, climate change adaptation, community planning) is delivered to 30 communities including leaders, men/women gender and youth representatives |
| **Outcome 4: Knowledge Management** | | |
| 4.1 Increased awareness and ownership of climate risk reduction processes at the national and local levels. | Practices demonstrated and shared by the project adopted by other parties (replication) and adopted by local communities  Development of 10 sets of training and awareness materials | Increased awareness and action incorporating the role of “natural solutions” natural resource plans and management (10 communities/villages)  Specific exchange programs for field staff, women’s and youth groups on identified climate change resilience topics  Secondary schools in V-CAP sites undertaking climate awareness and capacity building activities |

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. It will cover the entire programme under this project.

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.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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 Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*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 Vanuatu. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management(MCCMGEEDM), Department of Fisheries, Department of Forestry and Department of Agriculture, Department of Local Authority, Public Works Department and the Vanuatu Meteorology (a list of stakeholders can also be referenced from the project document).

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.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ( 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](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| 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** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| 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 (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants |  |  | 0 | 1,280,611 |  |  | 0 | 1,280,611 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support | 2.731.344 | 2,631,344 | 24.252.771 | 714,864 | 3,007,400 | 82,669 | 29,991,515 | 3,428,877 |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 2.731.344 | 2,631,344 | 24.252.771 | 1,995,475 | 3,007,400 | 82,669 | 29,991,515 | 4,709,488 |

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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendation should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted with suggested implementers of recommendations. Lessons should have a wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Suva, Fiji. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *27 days* according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days | *31st May 2019* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 14 days | *21 June 2019* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 6 days | *5 July 2019* |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | *31 July 2019* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team 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 evaluation mission | CB2 PMU, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on 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.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator who will be expected to travel to at least 3 project sites (similar to the MTR sites) and other possible sites that can be reached within the mission timeframe.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Education (5%)

* A Master’s degree in development, environmental science, natural resource management and/or related field

Experiences (65%)

* Minimum *5* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation process and has lead evaluation process for at least 2-3 of UNDP/GEF funded projects
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the environmental sector in the Pacific especially for Vanuatu would be an advantage;
* Experience working with communities, government sectors, NGOs and understands local protocols and customs and has excellent communication skills;
* Experience in the policy development processes associated with environment and sustainable development issues
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset

A 30% rating is given to the financial proposal. Financial proposal must include:

* Daily Consultancy Fee (No fee range to be stated)
* Living Expenses while living in duty station for the period of work (only for those applicants living outside of duty station. Do not state UN DSA rate)

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants 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 [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing and submission of an approved workplan |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the final draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report with all attached annexes |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by 17th May 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex B: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This project will contribute to achieving the following Program Outcome as defined in Sub-Regional Program Document 2013-2017:  UNDAF Sub-Regional Program Outcome 4 (UNDAF Outcome 1.1)   * Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environment management, climate change adaptation/mitigation and disaster risk management * By 2017, inclusive economic growth is enhanced, poverty is reduced, sustainable employment is improved and increased, livelihood opportunities and food security are expanded for women, youth and vulnerable groups and social safety nets are enhanced for all citizens.   Sub-Regional Program Outcome 2 (UNDAF Outcome 5.1)   * Regional, national, local and traditional governance systems are strengthened, respecting and upholding human rights, especially women’s rights in line with international standards   Vanuatu UNDAF   * Outcome 3.1: Alleviation of poverty and increased inclusive growth, employment and livelihoods with a focus on women and youth. Specific reference to Output 3.1.3: Improved and equitable access to markets, financial and business services for women and youth. | | | | | | |
| Sub-Regional Program Outcome Indicators (UNDP Sub-Regional Program Document):  Outcome 4   * Share of budget resources earmarked for environmental sustainability, disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and mitigation; share of population with sustainable access to improved water sources and to renewable energy (disaggregated by gender and age); ratio of protected area to maintain biological diversity   Outcome 2   * Number of countries to develop service delivery mechanisms to ensure greater equity and inclusion of most vulnerable in the population (including women, children, disabled and elderly) in the services rendered. | | | | | | |
| Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Growth is inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded (Outcome 1). Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented (Output 1.4.) | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  CCA-1: “Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level”  CCA-2: “Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.” | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas  Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas  Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  Outcome Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (no. and type)  Outcome Indicator 1.3.1: Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets (Score) – Disaggregated by gender and age  Outcome Indicator 2.1.1: Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders (Yes/No) | | | | | | |
|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| Project Objective[[3]](#footnote-3)  To improve the resilience of the coastal zone to the impacts of climate change in order to sustain livelihoods, food production and preserve and improve the quality of life in targeted vulnerable areas | Number of fishery assets, small livestock breeds, and new resistant crops introduced to diversify community incomes and increase food security. | Malampa (11):11 fisheries total assets (7 ice-boxes in Malampa {private and govt / aid supported used for fisheries} 4 FADS). No resistant crops shared. Livestock, forestry unknown.  Pentecost (1): 1 FAD in Melsisi. Unknown if resilient Ag / Forestry / Livestock species were introduced, not reported during assessments.  Santo (5): 5 forestry species (distribution of resilient coconut species reported along with whitewood, mahogany, sandalwood, & tamarind species. Ag species likely- perhaps through PRRP but not reported. 0 FAD’s (Cyclone Pam had destroyed 2 previous FAD’s).  Epi (4): 0 FAD’s. 4 private ice-boxes used for fishing. Distribution of Ag / Forestry / Livestock species unknown. Ag officer located nearby but distribution of seedlings not reported.  Torba (5): Ag species distributed in previous FAO / UNDP joint project on Loh Island only. Estimating around 5 species introduced through this project. No fisheries assets. No forestry assets. No resilient livestock breeds.  Tafea (52)  Aneityum: 0 FAD’s. 0 functional ice boxes. Distribution of Ag / Forestry / Livestock species unknown, not reported  Aniwa (14): Agricultural resilient species shared through CARE Int - quantity of species unknown. FAO / UNDP Joint project at site that also introduced resileint species. Estimate of number of resilient species introduced prior to VCAP is 10 total. CARE introduced poultry projects so likely 1 improved breed was introduced. 2 private ice-boxes, 1 cooperative owned ice-box. 0 FAD’s.  Futuna (9): 1 ice-box; 0 FAD’s; CARE Introducted estimated 8 new resilient species prior to VCAP.  North Erromango (14): 2 private ice-boxes, 0 FAD’s. Introduced species unknown - there was a forestry officer with a nursery containing resilient species here. CARE Int also introduced resilient species here - estimated number total 12.  South Erromango (15): CARE introduced 1 poultry species, there is an agro-forestry nursery with around 12 resilient species. 2 ice-boxes and 0 FAD’s. | At least 8 FADs, 8 solar freezers, 30 technical packages have been delivered consisting of small and improved livestock breeds and new resilient crops; including training on the use and maintenance of the assets | Presence of interventions on site  Report identifying the benefits of the interventions – through newsletter, quarterly reports etc | **Assumptions:**   * Target communities are willing to participate in the process of developing and implementing CC adaption plans * Project activities are fully participatory * Sufficient political commitment from key stakeholder governments are ensured throughout the life cycle of the project * Communities are able to identify and make use of suitable traditional and resilient methods of CC adaption. * The government is able to attract high-quality project staff   **Risks:**   * Communication issues with outer islands interferes with effective planning and implementation * Project unable to identify suitable/acceptable support mechanisms for communities * High cost of working in outer islands makes interventions uneconomic * Unable to attract and retain suitable staff |
| Percentage of the population in target sites covered by effective the 24/7 early warning system | Many communities in V-CAP sites are remote and not able to receive warning | 100% of Vanuatu population with access to mobile networks and radio signals receive high quality early warning in timely manner through multiple communication lines | Simulations  Quality of warning data  Feedback from communities (disaggregated by gender and age) |
| Number of people benefited from having better access to markets, schools and health facilities which was provided through resiliency of public works assets (rural roads, bridges, water crossings, etc.) | 2,937 people benefitting from improved access to markets, school, health facilities at sites prior to VCAP provided through resilient public works assets | A total of 25,000 community members with better access to markets, education and health facilities | Progress Reports from PWD on resilient works completed  Report endorsed by DLA confirming improved access for Area Council populations to services referencing population details  \* Communication products showings completed resilient roadworks - video and newsletter formats |
|  | Number of protected areas established in the coastal and upland areas that assist to preserve water, provide for food and protection against climate and coastal hazards. |  | At least 8 protected areas in coastal areas and other 2 in upland areas linked by biological corridors under the R2R approach, have been established with the clear endorsement of surrounding communities |  |  |
| ***Component 1: Integrated community approaches to climate change adaptation***  1.1. Integrated CC-Adaptation plans mainstreamed in the coastal zone  **`** | Community CC-Development Adaptation Strategies (C3ADS) at village level using common indicators across all project sites, reflecting management actions and norms for coastal, up-lands, waters, infrastructures and disaster preparedness related to EWS.  Community Disaster Committees established and operational with specific plans developed in targeted communities and at Area Council level | Communities with Community Climate Change Adaptation Strategies (C3ADS) developed at village level using common indicators  12 of 30 villages have Community Disaster Committees  6 disaster management plans have been finalized at community level prior to VCAP  0 Districts & 0 Area Councils have Disaster Plans prior to VCAP | At least 30 C3ADS at village level using common indicators across all project sites, including gender and social inclusion.  The 30 C3ADS are framed into the Vanuatu Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Policy 2016-2030.  At least 15 CDC’s have been established or strengthened in VCAP intervention sites, equipped and trained. Also 8 Area Councils & 1 District equipped and trained. At least 30% trained people are women.  5 Area Councils trained on Disaster Management Response and have Disaster Management Plans developed | Documentation of Plans developed for all selected communities, District and Area Council  Sign-in sheets showing community participation in disaster planning process (disaggregated by gender and age)  CDC’s registered with NDMO, VMGD  Formal written plans approved by relevant government agencies including PMU, NDMO, DLA in addition to Provinces.  C3ADS documented and endorsed by DLA, UNDP & VCAP PIU | **Assumptions:**   * All target communities are willing to participate in the process of developing and implementing CC adaption plans * Communities are able to identify and make use of suitable traditional and resilient methods of CC adaption.   **Risks:**   * Communication issues with outer islands interferes with effective planning and implementation * Project unable to identify suitable/acceptable support mechanisms for communities * High cost of working in outer islands makes interventions uneconomic * Unable to attract and retain suitable staff |
| 1.2 Improved climate resilience of coastal areas through integrated approaches | 1.2.1 Number of ecosystem-based fisheries management actions are clearly integrated with the Community CC-Development Adaptation Strategies (C3ADS) | 0 eco-system-based fisheries management plans integrated with C3ADS at community levels | 9 communities have defined "Taboo Area" in the coastal areas, where there were previously no protected areas and are implementing ecosystem-based fishery actions.  At least 9 Fisheries Association has the knowledge and suitable tools to monitoring and to evaluate successes, difficulties, benefits and challenges from ecosystem-based fishery and "taboo areas".  At least 40% of trained people are youth/men who are able to implement ecosystem-based fishery monitoring and evaluation. | Plans developed for tabu areas and LMMA's using appropriate laws and regulations approved by province and authorities under ICZM framework  Training reports detailing eco-system based fisheries and Taboo Area capacity building for community stakeholders  Sign-in sheets from Fisheries trainings for capacity building of community stakeholders, photos from Back to Office Reports, (dissagregated by age and gender)  Taboo sites clearly documented within fisheries management plans and endorsed my community stakeholders | **Assumptions:**   * Island communities able to link traditional practices in “tabu areas” with LMMA approaches to contribute to CC resilience * Suitable “soft infrastructure” investments have demonstrable impact on marine ecosystem resilience within project period * Communities able to clearly articulate links between upland coastal issues and coastal and marine water quality   **Risks:**   * Ridge to reef management approaches not able to demonstrate impact in five year time frame * Communities unwilling to expand the practice of “tabu areas” * Tabu areas not respected by all community members in surrounding areas * Uptake of knowledge is low and resilience not significantly improved * Communities unable or unwilling to address water supply issues due to land or ownership disputes. |
| 1.2.2 Number of communities that have defined "taboo areas" in up-land and are implementing Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) practices in their croplands. | 0 communities with taboo areas in upland area that are also implementing LDN practices in croplands.  Note: there were some upland conservation sites present before VCAP in a few locations such as Torres and Erromango, but these were not established while delivering and documenting LDN practices | In project-selected sites, communities are managing sustainable community water systems, increasing water security for 2,000 people  Intervention in at least 7 erosion “hotspots”, related to hydric sustainability of community water systems.  30 communities have defined "Taboo Areas" in up-lands and **implementing actions/practices** to address Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) in crops lands. These communities will be monitored on the effectiveness of their actions plans through an institutional level monitoring mechanism.  30 communities will be monitored on the effectiveness of their actions plans through an institutional level monitoring mechanism.  At least 30 communities have been trained on mechanisms to address LDN. | Report from Water Dept endorsed by DLA verifying that Area Council populations benefiting from improved water resources  Documentation of water quality monitoring at site level  \*Report from DARD / Forestry in relation to hotspots endorsed by Water Department regarding erosion hotspots protecting sustainability of water systems  Community Upland Management Plans clearly showing “taboo areas” and LDN practices endorsed by communities and representatives from MoAFFLB and DEPC  • Agenda and Sign-In Sheets for community trainings delivered in LDN practices, conservation, Taboo Areas, etc |
| * + 1. Number of public conveyances climate proofed to provide long-term use by vulnerable coastal communities | Current public conveyance infrastructure (including roads, bridges, pedestrian walkways, river crossings and walking tracks) in poor and deteriorating condition due to flooding and erosion severely limits access to basic services  Pedestrian river crossings do not exist resulting in injury and death, especially of children, people who are ill and those with physical disabilities during severe flooding.  Erosion, water and climate related factors making public conveyance infrastructure to vehicles  Limited access to health, education and markets in extreme weather conditions. | * 10 pedestrian bridges established * 4 water crossings rehabilitated * 10 km of road rehabilitated * 6 pedestrian walking paths “climate proofed” * Total of 10,000 community members with better access to markets, education and health | Plans for development of infrastructure agreed with authorities and communities with due consideration to public use requirements and patterns, including the specific needs of women, children and people with disabilities  Climate proofing of existing conveyance infrastructure (i.e. roads and bridges) and construction of new pedestrian infrastructure (i.e. river crossing and walkways) as per the specifications contained in Section 1.2.3.  Public use surveys show improved school attendance, greater use of health and other services and increased amount of market goods (disaggregated by gender and age)  Village products sold at local outlets resulting in improved family income (disaggregated by gender and age) | **Assumptions**   * Public Works will provide resource inputs as per the agreed schedule of works * Communities will contribute labour for infrastructure investments   **Risks**   * Land issues will arise in areas where access is required * Communities will not maintain infrastructure   New public infrastructure will not be equitably shared by all community members; social problems could development |
| ***Outputs supporting Outcome 1***   * 1.1.1 CC adaptation plans, including risk management, preparedness and response plans, formulated in the context of ICM and in relation to assessed site-specific vulnerabilities, subsequently adopted and mainstreamed in planning processes for at least 6 priority vulnerable coastal communities * 1.2.1 Threatened coastal ecosystems and resources such as mangroves, coral reefs, and fisheries rehabilitated to support livelihoods and food production and increase climate resilience * 1.2.2 Coastal areas stabilized through re-vegetation and other ‘soft’ approaches to complement ‘hard’ measures * 1.2.3 Improved resilience through climate proofing of selected public conveyance infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc. implemented by the Public Works Department) in the coastal zone in at least 6 priority vulnerable coastal communities | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2:**  **Information and early warning systems on coastal hazards**  2.1 Reduced exposure to flood-related risks and hazards in the target coastal communities | Better quality accuracy and timeliness in weather forecasting, particularly for extreme events such as extreme rainfall events, storm surges, tropical depressions and cyclones informing EWS  VMGD has established an effective 24/7 service for monitoring, forecasting and public advisory for early warnings, able to cover all Vanuatu territory | A warning system exists, however it is limited by access to up-to-date information and high quality information.  Collection of weather-related data is manual, relies of 24/7 staffing and limited during weather related events  A warning system exists; however, it is limited by access to up-to-date information, distribution networks and capacity of government to delivery timely warnings and information  There are no special provisions or considerations regarding the needs of vulnerable groups of people including children, older people and those with a disability | By the end of the project at least 100% of targeted V-CAP communities receiving timely and accurate early warnings of coastal hazards including floods, cyclones and other natural disasters and respond to early warnings and take the appropriate actions following the warning (disaggregated by gender and age)  Better quality meteorological forecasting available for all people of Vanuatu  VMGD has real time data flow received from 6 new Automatic Weather Stations.  At least 6 VMGD's staff member has received trainings to enhance data analysis, using up-grade computer systems to display satellites data and global/regional weather and climate models.  The 24/7 weather and coastal monitoring service has been established and works 100%, including procedures for Public Advisory Service under the WMO standards, linked with an Early Warning System at national level that provide direct support at least 30 CDCs. | Observations and reports from the annual mock drills  Delivery of high quality training and full participation by relevant officials  Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of plans which actively includes representatives of all community social groups including women.  Data from weather stations reported in a timely manner  External evaluation of weather data collation  Disaster response plans prepared for villages and implemented inclusive of the needs of vulnerable groups in emergency situations | **Assumptions**:   * Appropriate Radio and other related infrastructure, which is the primary baseline project for covering 100% of population continues to operate under extreme conditions * NDMO has sufficient capacity and skills to implement the EWS * Phone companies are willing to participate and provide services * There is sufficient technical capacity and human resources for installation of communication equipment   **Risks:**   * High turn-over among key stakeholders in the government and NGO sector during the project implementation results in loss of knowledge and experience * Access and communication is difficult with selected sites |
| Outputs supporting Outcome 2   * 2.1.1 Automated system for real time monitoring of climate-related hazards such as coastal flooding, storm surges, sea-level rise designed, installed and maintained; trends in these climate impacts analyzed over time * 2.1.2 Timely release of early warnings against coastal flooding and storm surges through various public media, e.g., radio, internet, TV through applicable public-private partnerships with e.g., with Digicel; TVL – Telecom Vanuatu Ltd; commercial radio and TV stations * 2.1.3 Capacity of 18 VMGD staff in the operation and maintenance of AWS and in the analysis of data strengthened | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3. Climate Change Governance**  3.1 Climate change adaptation enabling policies and supportive institutions in place | Number of sectoral policies plans and strategies explicitly recognizing approaches to climate change adaption | Currently there are limited number of national sectoral policies, plans and strategies that incorporate climate change adaptation  Currently there is no strategic framework for developing reform agenda for key sectors  NICZM Framework is draft form (2010)  Currently there are no written guidelines concerning incorporation of gender and social inclusion in national or sector strategic or business plans regarding climate change | Support the development of 3 policies/acts or strategies/frameworks to focus on CCA/DRR/Natural Resource Management/ Livelihood Improvement identified by the implementing agencies and are gender and socially inclusive | Sectoral policies / plans incorporating climate change  Minutes of meetings and discussions  Policy reviews to support integration of CC into sectoral policies / plans | **Assumptions**:   * Line agencies are willing to incorporate cc adaptation into sectoral policies and plans * Sufficient information exists on possible climate scenarios to identify appropriate sectoral responses * Suitable experts can be identified to deliver capacity building programs * Suitable trainees can be identified for capacity building activities at the community level   **Risks:**   * Insufficient capacity exists within line agencies to undertake the review * Insufficient and/or suitable policy responses are able to be identified for Vanuatu by key agencies due to lack of institutional capacity |
| 3.2 Human resources in place at the national, provincial and community levels | Number of trained staffs with enough resources to implement CC resilience and adaptation at the national, provincial and community levels | Currently few staff with capacity for integration of CC Adaptation approaches at provincial and community levels | 12 trainings addressing local level community resilience (disaster risk resilience, climate change adaptation, community planning) is delivered to 30 communities including leaders, men/women gender and youth representatives | Number of communities where training is adopted as part of the cc resilience adaptation practices  Reports of training courses |
| Outputs supporting Outcome 3   * 3.1.1 Legislation and national/sector policies with impacts on climate change adaptation reviewed and a policy reform agenda developed and implemented (e.g., finalization of draft National CC Policy; incorporation of CC into the EIA Policy, and sector policies in forestry, coastal fisheries, agriculture, water and sanitation; localization of existing policies) * 3.2.1 Capacity building of key national and provincial government agencies (DEPC, PWD, Department of Internal Affairs, Departments of Fisheries, Forestry, Water) in areas of compliance and enforcement, monitoring and evaluation and mainstreaming of climate-related policies and regulations * 3.2.2 Communities empowered to deal with climate change impacts in the coastal zone though a supportive Integrated Coastal Zone Management Framework | | | | | |
| Outcome 4:  4.1. Increased awareness and ownership of climate risk reduction processes at the national and local levels. | Practices demonstrated and shared by the project adopted by other parties (replication) and adopted by local communities  Development of 10 sets of training and awareness materials | Few (if any) villages adopting and using climate change and risk reduction approaches and incorporated into local and provincial level policies, plans and practices  Currently few opportunities for communities and local authorities who are practicing or are interested in practicing innovative CC solutions to exchange information and learn from one another | Increased awareness and action incorporating the role of “natural solutions” natural resource plans and management (10 communities or villagers)  Specific exchange programs for field staff, women’s and youth groups on identified climate change resilience topics  Secondary schools in V-CAP sites undertaking climate awareness and capacity building activities | Development and implementation of V-CAP communication strategy to increase awareness of key issues in relation to climate change adaption and building resilience Documentation of best practices at the community, provincial and national levels (reports, reviews)  Website for the project linked to NAB related databases  Project newsletters printed and shared with key stakeholders  Community radio show / packages to share – 12 /  Documentary films produced for each site (6 sites)  Documentary / awareness films produced for key themes ( 4 themes e.g. Reef to Ridge, erosion, MPA, climate change)  Development of sets of training and awareness materials on approaches to climate change adaption and EWS | **Assumptions:**   * Suitable mechanism are able to be identified to reach all stakeholders at the community level * Teachers are willing to attend CC in-service courses and use learning materials developed by the project   **Risks**:   * Local communities are not willing to incorporate to incorporated local adaptation responses into plans * Communication materials are not able to reach target communities |
| Outputs supporting Outcome 4   * 4.1.1 Best practices are captured, documented, and distributed to all local and national stakeholders and shared globally in appropriate mechanisms (development, populating and maintenance of national website for CC) through the NAB (National Advisory Board) * 4.1.2 Awareness, training and education programs developed and implemented for e.g. schools, households and the private sector; translated into Bislama and French as applicable and working with ongoing initiatives | | | | | |

Annex C: List of Documents reviewed

**General documentation**

• UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);

• UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;

• UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects;

• GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;

• GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

**Project documentation**

* Signed Project Document: Mainstreaming global environmental priorities in to national policies and programmes
* Quarterly Progress Report: 2015-2019
* Inception Workshop Report
* Signed AWP 2016-2019
* Financial Audit Report 2018
* Project board meeting minutes: what years are in records to put here
* Co-financing letters
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
* Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
* Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
* Management response to MTE;
* Project budget and financial data
* Project Tracking Tool (CCA), at the baseline and at the mid-term
* Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) 2016 -2017
* Knowledge and legislation related products
* Community Profile Reports
* Epi VCAP Community Planning and Sector-Based Priority Setting
* Oversight mission reports
* UNDP Initiation Plans
* VCAP Tracking Tool

Annex D: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent is the project is in line with GEF operational programs? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent are the objectives and design of the project supporting regional environment and development priorities? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the project increased institutional capacity (at national and island level) to increase the resilience of coastal areas and community settlements in Tuvalu? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How was the project been able to influence monitoring and evaluation for coastal resilience? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What were the risks involved and to what extent were they managed? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How cost-effective were project interventions? To what extent was project support provided in an efficient way? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How efficient were partnership arrangements for the project and why? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Was project support provided in an efficient way? |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * What risk have affected/influenced the project and in what ways? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How were these risks managed? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability of project results? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the sustainability of the project results? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed to, or enabled a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding contributions towards reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological stress? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the reduction of environmental stress and/or improve ecological status? |  |  |  | |

Annex E: Rating Scales

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution** | |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings |  |
| 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings |  |
| 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) |  |
| 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings |  |
| 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems |  |
| 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems |  |
| **Sustainability rating** | |
| 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability |  |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks |  |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks |  |
| 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| **Relevance ratings** | |
| 1. Relevant (R) |  |
| 2. Not relevant (NR) |  |
| **Impact Ratings** | |
| 1. Significant (S) |  |
| 2. Minimal (M) |  |
| 3. Negligible (N) |  |

Annex F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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 if 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[4]](#footnote-4)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_Patrick Sakiusa Fong\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *Suva, Fiji* on *Friday 20/12/2019*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex G: Evaluation Report Outline[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex H: Summary of Field Visits

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Stakeholder/Community** | **Island/Group of Islands** | **Province** |
| 11-16 July, 2019 | National government | Port Vila, Efate Island | Shefa province |
| 17 July, 2019 | Lungharegi | Loh Island in Torres group | Torba province |
| 17 July, 2019 | Rinuhe | Loh Island in Torres group | Torba province |
| 17 July, 2019 | Sola | Vanua Lava Island in Banks group | Torba province |
| 18 July, 2019 | Luganville | Santo Island | ‎Sanma province |
| 18 July, 2019 | Burumba | Epi Island | Shefa province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Itamotou | Aniwa Island | Tafea province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Imalé | Aniwa Island | Tafea province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Isavaï | Aniwa Island | Tafea province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Ikaokao | Aniwa Island | Tafea province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Namsafoura | Aniwa Island | Tafea province |
| 19 July, 2019 | Anelgauhat | Aneityum | Tafea province |

Annex I: List of Persons interviewed



Annex J: Audit trail

Audit Trail of comments received on draft TE Report [Draft Report October 2019].

The log below tracks comments on the draft TE report (version dated 23 September 2019. Comments are identified by the comment author and number in a ‘track change’ version provided to the Review Team on 13 November 2019. Comment location is identified by both the report heading/sub-heading, and by page numbers this version when printed in full (expanding the comments changes the layout and pagination).

Comment authors:

MA: Margarita Arguelles, UNDP HQ

ML: Merewalesi Laveti, UNDP Fiji MCO

LS: Loraini Sivo, UNDP Fiji MCO

Notes:

• The TE response column indicates briefly how the comments have been reflected in the TE Report

• [text insert] refers to instances where text has been added directly into the document (not all of these have a comment number in the track change version). Proposed text for insertion is written in italics.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Pg. No./ Para No. / Report Section/ comment location** | **Comment / Feedback on the draft MTE report** | **MTR Team response / actions taken** |
| ML | 1 | Pg. 8. 2nd Table on UNDP Comparative Advantage | It might be a typo ‘MDG’ as it is supposedly to be SDG? | Edited |
| LS | 2 | Pg. 9. Table on Adaptive Management | I don’t think that there were any changes to the output but rather from the changes to the targets and indicators. | Edited to reflect comment |
| ML | 3 | Pg. 9 Table on Partnership arrangements | Page 94 of the project document states Project board – National advisory board nd not project steering committee.  As per page 94, the project board is a decision making body of the project represented by the executive (Govt-IP), Senior Supplier (UNDP) and Senior beneficiary (Govt counterparts), Project assurance and PMU. Please explain ho the project steering committee comes into establishment in the project. Was there a project document revision during the implementation phase resulting in the establishment of the project steering committee and its roles? Was this documented?. | Edited to reflect comment. Interestingly, more project reports refer to Project Steering Committee, as compared to Project Advisory Board including:  1, RESUBMISSION Vanuatu LDCF Prodoc 28Aug 2014 Final1  2. Project Board Meeting minutes |
| ML | 4 | Pg. 9 Table on Partnership arrangements | Responsible parties in this case would be the private sectors, institutions, NGOs government ministries that are responsible for delivering certain activities of the project. Responsible parties does not have the same role as the project board-national advisory board in reviewing and endorsing workplans. They may assist the project management unit in the consolidation of the AWP but does not approve or endorse it. The AWP is endorsed by the board. Please confirm this para. | Edited to reflect comment |
| LS | 5 | Pg. 9 Table on Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation | Narration seems to contradict the rating | Edited to reflect comment |
| LS | 6 | Pg. 10 Table on Overall results (Attainment of Objective and Outcomes) | Narration seems to contradict the rating | Edited to reflect comment |
| LS | 7 | Pg. 10 Table on Impact | Narration seems to contradict the rating | Edited to reflect comment |
| LS | 8 | Pg. 10 on Section 1.3 | Can you put this is a table Issues and recommendations | Table formulated |
| LS | 9 | Pg. 11 last paragraph | Sorry not clear what this means.. | Edited to reflect comment |
| LS | 10 | Pg. 17 on Section 1.2 Scope & Methodology, Paragraph 5 | Enquiry on the total number of days for mission | Added |
| MA | 11 | Pg. 17 on 1.2 Scope & Methodology | The UNDP IEO quality reviewer will look at whether the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women were integrated in the evaluation’s scope and indicators, as relevant. Therefore, it would be useful to mention any gender responsive tools and methodologies that were used for this evaluation. | Have added narration to reflect the comments. Refer to last paragraph on Pg. 17 |
| LS | 12 | Pg. 19 on Table 3 | Can you put colour coding to the rating and in table? | Table just shows the ratings used in each evaluation criteria, however a table has been added to address this |
| LS | 13 | Pg. 20 last paragraph | Insert recommendations too | Added in the sub-heading |
| LS | 14 | Pg. 25 on 2.6 Main stakeholders | Please put this into a table format with two columns | Information presented in a Table form |
| LS | 15 | Pg. 28 on 3. Finding | Please reference to the annex on the list of documents reviewed | Reference added |
| MA | 16 | Pg. 28 on 3.1 Project Design & Formulation  3.1.1 Analysis for Results Framework | The first paragraph of this section mentioned the project’s Theory of Change. Include text on whether the Theory of Change was clearly defined and robust. Did it include a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, consideration of how to address barriers, a plan for a phased withdrawal of the project, and responses for the project to focus on? | Have added narration to reflect the comments. Refer to first paragraph on section 3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework in Pg. 18 |
| MA | 17 | Pg. 28 on 3.1 Project Design & Formulation | -Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?  -Evaluate the project’s results in advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment, including delivery of its gender action plan (if one was done) and the relevance of its gender analysis.  -Assess any environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP in line with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards and the management measures outlined in the Project Document, SESP and any management plans, if relevant | Further analysis has been done on these aspects and texts have been added in the write-up. |
| LS | 18 | Pg. 29 on 3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework, Paragraph 4. | Please explain how/why this had changed later in the implementation stage | Narration added to address comment |
| LS | 19 | Pg. 29 on 3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks, Paragraph 1 | On what grounds were this identified as major. Could we just classify them as risks ?? | Has changed to possible instead of major. |
| LS | 20 | Pg. 30 on 3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks, Table 6 | The operational should be implementation?? | The analysis is based on risks identified at project design how these were relevant during implementation. Since there is no section on implementation specifically allocated for risk analysis, I have included all aspects of project risks here. |
| LS | 21 | Pg. 33 on 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation | Please put into a table | Table formulated |
| LS | 22 | Pg. 34, Para.1 on 3.1.5 Replication approach | Do you think that the project achievements or interventions were replicated enough or what are the weaknessess | Analysis is on the quality and approach of replication strategies at project design. What has worked and need to be replicated is captured in the Conclusion/Lessons learned and recommendation section |
| LS | 23 | Pg, 34, Para.1 on 3.1.5 Replication approach | What then has worked that could be encouraged for replication | Analysis is on the quality and approach of replication strategies at project design. What has worked and need to be replicated is captured in the Conclusion/Lessons learned and recommendation section |
| LS | 24 | Pg. 35, Para 1 on 3.1.7 Management arrangements | Clarification needed on NIMI acronym | Edited to address comment |
| LS | 24 | Pg. 36, Para 3 on 3.1.7 Management arrangements | Not sure about this…the chair of the SC is the DG for the Ministry of Climate Change | Edited to address comment |
| LS | 25 | Pg. 37 on 3.2.1 Adaptive management | Were there any other activities across outcomes that had changed – please confirm this with PMU | There were some but these were the major adjustments to demonstrate project adaptive management of the project |
| LS | 26 | Pg. 37 on 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements | The project did face some difficulties working with Fisheries so can that be highlighted here please… | Added narration to address comment. |
| MA | 27 | Pg. 38 on 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements | -How did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the project document and Stakeholder Engagement Plan?  -Were women’s groups, NGOs, civil society orgs and women’s ministries adequately consulted and involved in project design? If not, should they have been?  -Were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive? Was gender on the workshop agenda? Did women make up at least 30% of participants? Were women-only sessions held, if appropriate, and/or were other considerations made to ensure women’s meaningful participation | Have added text in Section 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation on Page 38 and have added text to address comments |
| MA | 28 | Pg. 39 on 3.2.4 M&E | -Were PIR findings consistent with MTR and TE findings?  -Was the Theory of Change reviewed or revised during implementation?  -was the GEF OFP kept informed of M&E activities?  -Comment on the extent to which the Project Team used inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems | Narration added to address comments. Only the logframe was revised and not the ToC, as there was none |
| LS | 29 | Pg. 45, last Para on 3.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation: | You missed a section on project finance. An analysis on project spending to date and co-financing. Let us know what financial reports do you need to do this bit | Added and is part of Section 3.2.5 |
| LS | 30 | Pg. 49, last Para on Section 3.2.6 | Just feel that there is not enough provided to give it this rating. What are some success experiences/example in terms of partnership and coordination that could support this rating. UNDP is happy to share some experiences with you | Added narration to address comment. |
| ML | 31 | Pg. 50, second row on Table 10 | Can this data be disaggregated into sex (females: males) if better number of people leaving with disability that also benefitted? | Reporting is based on indicator for End of Project Target, which is “number of people..”) |
| ML | 32 | Pg. 51 , first row on table | Need disaggregated data | Reporting is based on indicator for End of Project Target, which is “% of Vanuatu population..”) |
| ML | 33 | Pg. 52, first row on table | Equivalent to what area? Ha? | Reporting is based on indicator for End of Project Target, which is “number of taboo area..”) |
| ML | 34 | Pg. 52, fourth row on table | Need disaggregated data on this. | Reporting is based on indicator for End of Project Target, which is “number of people..”) |
| MA | 35 | Pg. 55 on 3.3.2 Relevance | Include information on how the project is relevant to UNDP programming. Also include text on any linkages between the project and relevant SDG targets/indicators. | Have included two paragraphs that discuss VCAP relevancy to UNDP programming and SDG |
| LS | 36 | Pg. 58, first paragraph on 3.3.4 Country ownership | Please also include the setting up of DLA positions | This has been included in the text |
| LS | 37 | Pg. 58, 2nd paragraph on 3.3.4 Country ownership | Give some examples | Examples provided in the text |
| MA | 38 | Pg. 59 on 3.3.5 Mainstreaming | -Assess the achievement of the gender action plan and the gender-related indicators of the results framework by reporting on the level of progress for each indicator at the time of the TE. Assess any other planned or unplanned gender results.  -Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women’s empowerment? What can be done do to mitigate this?  -Indicate which of the results areas described below the project contributed to gender equality. These results areas align with those included in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request and annual project implementation report. Indicate as many results areas as applicable and describe the specific results that were attributed to the project:  o Contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources;  o Improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance;  o Targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women. | Have added narration to address the comment. It is worthy to note that indicators for VCAP do not have specific gender ones. |
| LS | 39 | Page 59, 2nd Paragraph on 3.3.6 Sustainability | Can you do a table like this for the other ranking. | Table formulated |
| LS | 40 | Page 60, 4th Paragraph on 3.3.6 Sustainability | Can you give an example of the PWD work as they had mentioned in the board meeting..on what evidence on the ground supports this statement | Example has been added in the text |
| LS | 41 | Page 60, 5th Paragraph on 3.3.6 Sustainability | Describe some of the activities implemented on the ground to support this | Examples have been included in the text |
| ML | 42 | Pg. 67 on 3.3.7 Impact | Need explicit elaborations on the below under this section as highlighted on page 9 of the TOR.  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. | There is an absence of project documentation to explicitly demonstrate a & b, therefore the TE process relied on anecdotal evidence provided by the project beneficiaries and on-field observation to cover for this. Have added a paragraph for Point C though. |
| LS | 43 | Pg. 61, 1st Paragraph on 3.3.7 Impact | Describe some of the hardship that they had previously faced that the project had resulted to positive impact | Narration added to address comment |
| LS | 44 | Pg. 61, 5th Paragraph on 3.3.7 Impact | Provide example of communal disagreement | Narration added to address comment |
| LS | 45 | Pg. 62, 6th Paragraph on 3.3.7 Impact | Check sub-title | Corrected |
| LS | 46 | Pg. 63 on 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons Learnt | Can you please put a narrative to the overall conclusion rather than jumping right into the issues? What has worked and no worked. Also, what are some of the lessons learnt from VCAP that could be adopted for future project planning. Recommendation should be actionable and who should it be directed to. It should be focused on addressing constrains and issues like you have done her. Please separate recommendation on what can be addressed now as the project closes and what are those that can be used for future project designing etc. | Have added narrative and lessons learned |
| LS | 47 | Pg. 67 on Annex 5.1: Term of Reference | Can you please put this as portrait | Adjusted to portrait |
| MA | 48 | Mission section | A section dedicated to “Project Finance and Co-finance” seems to be missing from the report. It was part of the TOR, so it should be included in the TE.  When considering the effectiveness of financial planning, the TE team should consider the following for assessing project finance:  • Variances between planned and actual expenditures, and the reasons for those variances  • Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing;  • Whether strong financial controls were established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;  • Whether the project demonstrated due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits  • Observations from financial audits, if any, and a presentation of major findings from audits  • Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions  Complete the following co-financing table, which could be inserted in the “Project Finance and Co-finance” section or added as an Annex. | Added accordingly |
| MA | 49 | Annexes | Add the following to the Annexes:  -Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form  -Signed TE report Clearance form  -Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail | Added accordingly |

Annex K: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)