##### Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Review

|  |
| --- |
| **Consultancy Title: Team Leader: Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) /Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist**. Mid Term Evaluation of Regional Ridge to Reef Project. |
| **Project Name:** Regional Ridge to Reef Project |
| **Duty Station:** Home-based and selected duty station. Team of consultants are expected visit the following islands: Fiji, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Palau. Consultants expected to have briefings with UNDP Pacific Office and Secretariat of the Pacific Community in Suva. |
| **Duration of the Contract:**  Duration of contract: 34 days within 16 weeks period Starting date: 30 January 2019  Completion date: 10 May 2019  Consultancy Proposal should be sent via email to [**etenderbox.pacific@undp.org**](mailto:etenderbox.pacific@undp.org) no later than **4th January, 2019 (Fiji Time)** clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to  [procurement.fj@undp.org.](mailto:procurement.fj@undp.org) UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. **Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.** |

**Objectives:**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries – Regional Ridge to Reef (R2R)* (PIMS#5221) (Atlas#92601) implemented through Pacific Community (SPC) which is to be undertaken in January 2019. The project started on the 31 August *2015* and is in its *third* year of implementation. This ToR follows the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects. (*<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20>

\_EN\_2014.pdf *).* Refer to Annex H for Project Logframe.

**NOTE :**

The review team will consist of 2 consultants: a **Team Leader/Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist** and a **Governance and Development Specialist**. The Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist will be the team leader and will be required to work with the Governance and Development Specialist in submitting one combined MTR report. Both consultants will be expected to travel to travel to 3 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) each as agreed between the team members, UNDP and SPC.

Both consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating ‘Ridge to Reef’ promoting programmatic approach to ecosystem governance, or similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report). 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.

**PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Given the close inter-connections between land, water and coastal systems in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the integration of freshwater watershed management with coastal area management is considered essential to foster effective cross-sectoral coordination in the planning and management of land, water and coastal uses. In Pacific SIDS, such integrated approaches to freshwater and coastal area management have been termed ‘Ridge to Reef’ to emphasize the inter-connections between the natural and social systems from the mountain ‘ridges’ of volcanic islands, through coastal watersheds and habitats, and across coastal lagoons to the fringing ‘reef’ environments associated with most Pacific SIDS. Inherent in the approach is the philosophy of cross-sectoral coordination in the planning and management of freshwater use, sanitation, wastewater treatment and pollution control, sustainable land use and forestry practices, balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, hazard risk reduction, and climate variability and change. Similarly, the integration of communities, stakeholders, and national governments within such a cross-sectoral planning framework is described by Pacific SIDS as a ‘Community to Cabinet’ approach.

To support the ongoing development of ‘Ridge to Reef’ and ‘Community to Cabinet’ approaches in Pacific SIDS through the abovementioned multi-focal area R2R Programme, the GEF Council approved the development of an International Waters project entitled “Ridge to Reef: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries”. This regional project will be implemented by the United Nations Development Program through the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community in partnership with the 14 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to improve the integration of water, land, forest and coastal management required to fashion sustainable futures for island communities. The project also aims to address the recent high-level recognition and calls for results-based approaches to the management of development assistance programmes and projects, and will provide support in areas of coordination, capacity building, technical assistance, and monitoring and evaluation for the operation of the broader Pacific R2R Programme.

Importantly, the project will build on nascent national processes built in the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each participating island nation through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; and improved consolidation of information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. These processes are being sustained. It is envisaged that this project will also focus much attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures to improve the relevance of investment in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management. This project will also provide coordination functions and linkages with the national GEF STAR multifocal projects and LDCF project and will facilitate dialogue and action planning through national Inter-Ministry Committees on responses to emerging issues and threats in environment and natural resource management. Similarly, it will facilitate coordinated exchanges of experience and results of the GEF portfolio of investments in a broader regional R2R Programme for PICs. Linkages with co-financed activities on water resource and wastewater management, coastal systems and climate adaptation and disaster risk management will ensure more targeted capital investment in coastal infrastructure within an integrated management framework. Similarly, the project will foster solidarity among the PICs, particularly with respect to the political will required to support more integrated approaches to R2R in natural resource management.

The purpose of the project is to test the mainstreaming of ‘ridge-to-reef’ (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services. This regional project provides the primary coordination vehicle for the national R2R STAR Projects that are part of the Pacific R2R Programme, by building on nascent national processes from the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each island through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management through on-site demonstrations; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; improved consolidation of results monitoring, and information and data required to inform cross sector R2R planning approaches. This project will also focus attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures to improve the relevance of investment in ICM, including MPAs, from ‘community to cabinet’.

Scope of work/Expected Output

**OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The modified MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term.

The MTR should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR reviewer will review relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, the project website and any other materials that the reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR reviewer will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach1 ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.2 Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Annex 1 list provided; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders and project managers, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR review is expected to conduct field missions to different government agencies in the 3 selected Pacific Island countries currently implementing the project (2 Polynesian countries and 1 Melanesian country). While visiting these countries, the following implementing partners will also be visited national and regional R2R partners on the ground and stakeholders including SPC. Moreover, at least 8 other PICs will be covered by teleconferences. The PICs will be determined jointly by UNDP and SPC.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. Refer to Annex B for guidelines on content of Midterm Review Report.

Between themselves, the team of consultants are expected visit the following islands: Fiji, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Palau.

DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR review will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions following the Theory of Change process. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* 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? Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept

1 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

2 For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?   * 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? * Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were captured in the project design. Make suggestions for how relevant gender issues can be better incorporated and monitored in the project. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines. * If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.   Results Framework/Logframe:   * Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe 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. * Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? * Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse 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. * Ensure 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.   **ii. Progress Towards Results**  Progress Towards Outcomes and Output Analysis:   * Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP- Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).   **Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project Strategy** | **Indicator3** | **Baseline Level4** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported**  **)** | **Midter m Target5** | **End-of- project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessmen t6** | **Achieveme nt Rating7** | **Justificati on for Rating** | | **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  | | **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  | | Etc. |  |  |  |  |  | | **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  * Indicator Assessment Key | | | |
|  | Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|  | | | |

3 Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

4 Populate with data from the Project Document

5 If available

6 Colour code this column only

7 Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

1. By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

* Review 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.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the Implementing Agency/GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support of the national agencies in PICs in the implementation of agreed national priorities, outputs and activities.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* 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 timely flow of funds?
* 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?

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?
* 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?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential 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? Do stakeholders have appropriate capacity developed to properly manage the project?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
* Assess the visibility of the project through the project website content

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?
* 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?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards

results in terms of sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

Sustainability

* + Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, project quarterly progress report, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
  + In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

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)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* + Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? 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? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? 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?

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.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* + Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conclusions & Recommendations**  The MTR review will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.8  Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.  The MTR review should make no more than 15 recommendations total. Recommendations should outline corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project and should focus on actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.  **Ratings**  The MTR review will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.  **Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for**  **“Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods**  **in Pacific Island Countries”** | | |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1  Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2  Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3  Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

8 Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * TIMEFRAME   The total duration of the MTR will be approximately (34) *days* over a time of *approximately 16 weeks* starting *(January 30, 2019),* and shall not exceed five months from when the reviewer is contracted. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows: | | | | | | | |
|  | | **TIMEFRAME** | | **ACTIVITY** | |  | |
|  | | *4 January 2019* | | Application closure | |
|  | | *15 January 2019* | | Select MTR Team | |
|  | | *30 January 2019* | | Contract signing | |  | |
|  | | *1- 11 February 2019* | | Preparation of the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) | |
|  | | *12 – 14 February 2019* | | Inception Meeting with UNDP and SPC via Skype/Teleconference | |
|  | | *15 -20 February,2019* | | Document review and preparing a joint MTR Inception Report | |
|  | | *21 – 26 February* | | Preparation and Submission of joint Inception Report | |
|  | | *7 – 23 March 2019* | | MTR mission (17 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | |
|  | | *25-26 March 2019* | | Presentation of initial findings to UNDP and SPC in Suva, Fiji | |
|  | | *10 April 2019* | | Submission of joint Draft MTR Report | |
|  | | *11-21 April 2019* | | Review of the Draft MTR Report by UNDP and SPC | |
|  | | *22 April 2019* | | Finalization of joint MTR report incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report. | |
|  | | *1 May 2019* | | Submission of joint Final MTR Report | |
|  | | *10 May* | | End of Contract | |
| * MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | * Deliverable | * Description | * Timing | * Responsibilities | |  | * MTR Inception Report | * MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | * No later than 2 weeks before   the MTR  mission (26  February 2019) | * MTR team submits to the   Commissioning Unit and project management | |  | * Presentation | * Initial Findings | * End of MTR mission (23 March 2019) | * MTR reviewer presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit | |  | * Draft Final Report | * Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | * Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (*10 April 2019)* | * Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP | |  | * Final Report\* | * Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. Includes power presentation of MTR. | * Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (1 May 2019) | * Sent to the Commissioning Unit |   **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**  The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for  this project’s MTR is UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji  The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR reviewer. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR reviewer to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.  **TEAM COMPOSITION**  The review team will consist of 2 consultants: **Team Leader/Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or** | | | | | | | |

**Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist** and **Development Management and Governance Specialist**. The Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist will be the team leader and will be required to work with the Development Management and Governance Specialist in submitting one combined MTR report. Both consultants will be expected to travel to travel to 3 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) each agreed between the team members, UNDP and SPC.

Both consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating ‘Ridge to Reef’ promoting programmatic approach to ecosystem governance, or similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report). 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.

**Resources Provided**

* The consultants are expected to provide their own computers

**Supervision/Reporting**

* The Team Leader will report directly to UNDP Head of Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit and/or her/his representative and UNDP Regional Technical Specialist/Advisor based in Suva, Fiji / Bangkok, Thailand.
* The Team Leader will also provide regular reporting to UNDP and Government Permanent Secretary together with the Project Implementation Unit.
* The Team Leader is expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules.

Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.as

##### Annex 3: List of documents and databases consulted.

|  |
| --- |
| **Document name** |
| 1. Guidance For Conducting Mid-term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects 2014 |
| 1. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019 |
| 1. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations in the UN System 2008 |
| 1. UNEG Ethical Guidelines 2008 |
| 1. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports 2010 |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Project document |
| 1. GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme Framework Document |
| 1. Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between UNDP and SPC |
| 1. Pacific Community Strategic Plan |
| 1. STAR Project Documents (All PICs) |
| 1. Terminal Evaluation Tonga STAR Project |
| 1. Pacific Ridge to Reef RBM Manual (draft) |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Project – GEF Tracking Tool 2014 and Regional IW R2R Project – GEF Tracking Tool 2019 |
| 1. Quarterly Progress Reports for PICs (as available) |
| 1. Progress Implementation Report 2017 |
| 1. Progress Implementation Report 2018 |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Project – Annual Workplans 2016, 2017, 2018 |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Project – Audit Reports |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Accumulated project expenditure reports |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Project – Quarterly Financial Reports |
| 1. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RSC |
| 1. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RSTC |
| 1. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RPCG |
| 1. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RPCU |
| 1. MOA between SPC and 14 PICs |
| 1. PICs/Country original and revised LogFrames |
| 1. Mid-term reports of Cook Islands, Fiji, Palau, Niue, Tuvalu, Vanuatu (others N/A) |
| 1. Overall Directory of Project Contacts in the 14 PICs |
| 1. Multi Year Costed Workplan (MYCWP) of PICs |
| 1. National IW R2R Booklets |
| 1. Country visits Travel/ Mission Reports |
| 1. ToR Mid-Term Review |
| 1. ToR MTR Team Leader: IWRM/ICM Specialist |
| 1. ToR MTR Member: Governance & Development Specialist |
| 1. ToR RPCU Country Focal Points |
| 1. Baseline Monitoring Guidelines (abridged version) |
| 1. Baseline Assessment/Diagnostic/RapCA Report Template |
| 1. Technical briefs (Revegetation, DLT, PEME, Habitat) |
| 1. Environmental Monitoring Plan, Guide Notes, Workplan and Templates, Compost and Wastewater Monitoring |
| 1. Standard Operating Procedures for Coastal Monitoring, Compost and Wastewater Monitoring. |
| 1. Field proformas |
| 1. Environmental Monitoring Report Template |
| 1. Environmental Monitoring Plans (as available) |
| 1. Concept notes for RapCA and SoC and list of indicators |
| 1. Tuvalu Water Quality Assessment Report |
| 1. Gender Assessment and Action Plans |
| 1. Gender Mainstreaming Strategy |
| 1. Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit |
| 1. Stakeholder Engagement Strategy |
| 1. Stakeholder Assessment Toolkit |
| 1. National Project Stakeholder Analysis (Niue, Palau, PNG, SI, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) |
| 1. IDA Concept Notes |
| 1. Diagnostic Report ToC and Template |
| 1. Diagnostic Workshop Documents |
| 1. Draft IDAs - Cook Islands, PNG, Palau |
| 1. Science to Policy Schema |
| 1. Geospatial Systems Officer ToR |
| 1. Inception reports: Fiji, Palau, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu |
| 1. Post Graduate Certificate with James Cook University |
| 1. Post Graduate Certificate Dashboard |
| 1. James Cook University Reports |
| 1. Concept Note for SoC database and GIS |
| 1. SoC Indicators List |
| 1. SoC Table of Contents |
| 1. Generic IMC ToR |
| 1. Solomon Islands IMC meeting |
| 1. Pacific R2R Programme Dashboard |
| 1. Regional IW R2R Dashboard |
| 1. Communication Strategy |
| 1. Concept note for lessons learned |
| 1. Lessons Learned Journal |
| 1. Networking and Partnerships (guidance) |
| 1. Development of National Communications Plan |
| 1. Pacific R2R Branding; Photography; Checklist |
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##### Annex 4: Mid-Term Review Interview Guide

1. ***PROGRESS V. RESULTS FRAMEWORK (cross-reference to national country results framework)***
   1. *Is your national results framework as per the original project design (in the project document) or has it been changed? How and Why?*
   2. *Based on your results framework, how are you doing? What progress have you made so far in relation to the end of project targets? What have been your constraints?*
   3. *Given your progress so far, and considering adjustments (if any), do you think you will achieve your end-of-project targets given the remaining time? What would be required to do this?*
   4. *Were you involved in formulating this results framework? To what extent were you involved in the project design formulation? How did you participate and what were your inputs?*
2. ***INCLUSIVITY OF THE PROJECT***
   1. *How inclusive is the Project? Who are the other stakeholders, including those from traditional governing structures, that were considered and/or involved in formulating the Project design? In the various other stages of the Project – implementation, monitoring, evaluation, learning exchange? How are these stakeholders now involved in the project?*
3. ***PROJECT IMPACT ON MAINSTREAMING THE R2R APPROACH*** 
   1. *What impact has this Project made beyond/outside the National Demonstration or STAR Projects?*
   2. *Can you cite concrete examples of how R2R or IWRM or ICZM is being mainstreamed by local governments, national government, private sector, local communities, other donor-funded Projects, finance agencies (e.g. development banks) (Note: Project targets PICs endorsing a Regional Strategic Framework for R2R and the mainstreaming of R2R into national planning processes)?*
   3. *What is the status of the inter-ministerial committees? What is it they do? Are they being successful in mainstreaming R2R, IWRM, ICZM outside the Project areas? Are there other mechanisms/institutions in your country that achieve the same (or better) purpose or outcomes as the IMCs?*
4. ***PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT***

*4.1. RELATIONSHIP WITH STAR PROJECTS*

* + 1. *What is the relationship between the National IW R2R project and its demonstration project and the STAR Projects?*
    2. *Why is there a need for National IW R2R to coordinate with STAR and vice versa? Do they do it?*
    3. *How do the STAR steering mechanism, including the decision-making structure and processes, compared with that of the National IW R2R? Do they have separate governance structures? How functional is each?*
    4. *What are the advantages of having a joint STAR and R2R National Project Steering Committee?*
    5. *If the whole point of our Project is learning by doing, how much of the lessons learned (technical, management, etc.) from STAR Projects is being documented and fed-back to Regional R2R and vice versa?*

***4.2. RELATIONSHIP WITH RPCU-SPC***

*4.2.1. What sorts of support are you getting from SPC?*

* + 1. *Have there been any problems regarding these? Any problems with financial arrangements? Reporting requirements?*
    2. *What do you need from RPCU that you are not currently getting?*
    3. *What about technical support from SPC, how has this helped you? What other technical support do you need?*
    4. *How involved is SPC in influencing national Project decision-making?*

1. ***STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY***
   1. *What is the national level doing to strategically communicate R2R to various stakeholders?*
   2. *How is RPCU-SPC helping you here? What support are you getting?*
2. ***THE*** ***FUTURE***
   1. *When this project ends - do you think what the project is trying to achieve will have been accomplished and support in this area can cease - OR do you think there will be a need to continue to have support to work on R2R related activities (of any sort) in the longer-term after this project finishes?*
   2. *Forget the previous history of the IWRM project and the current R2R project - in the area of integrated management of land, water and coasts/reefs - what do you think the next phase of activities should focus on?*
   3. *If the project were to be extended for a year - what would you do it that year (applies to R2R IW Project staff only)*

##### Annex 5: The standardised Evaluation Matrix

| **Evaluation Criteria & Focus** | **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i. Project Strategy**  ***Relevance* of Project Strategy: To what extent is the Project Strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, internationally-agreed goals and the best route towards expected results?** | | | | |
| **Internationally-agreed goals – sustainable development, environment, climate change adaptation and mitigation (CCAM), disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM)** | 1. What related international and regional agreements/ conventions does the Project mainstream? With regards to each:  * How does the Project relate to these international goals? In what way/s does the Project contribute to the goal/s? * Does the Project adapt the governance and management frameworks (e.g., R2R, IEM, ICZM, IWRM) that are deemed by grounded theory and good practice to be appropriate for its objectives and design? Have the adapted principles, frameworks, and systems been effectively operationalised on the ground so far? In what ways? | * Coherence between the Project’s objectives, management framework/s and results with identified internationally-agreed goals/conventions/frameworks * Evidence of contributions to internationally-agreed goals | * Texts of Relevant International Agreements/ Conventions and Integrated Management Frameworks * Project Documents (Progress Reports, Technical Studies) | * Documents Review |
| **UN and GEF system** | 1. How is the Project supportive of the relevant country, sectoral and programme objectives of the UNDP? UNEP? FAO? 2. How is the Project supportive of GEF? 3. How has the Project been leveraging the gains from previous (e.g., GEF IWRM) and existing GEF projects in the region and in the PICs (e.g., Regional R2R Programme, STAR Projects)?  * For instance, how has the Project been intentionally building on the nascent national processes established in the previous GEF-IWRM project? * How has it improved the linkages and coordination of the multi-focal STAR and Regional R2R country sub-projects within an R2R context? | * Coherence between the Project’s objectives and design and * Country, Sectoral, Corporate and Programme Objectives of UNDP/UNEP/FAO * GEF Tracked Outcomes (in GEF Tracking Tools) * Regional R2R Programme Focal Area Outcomes * STAR Multi-Focal Project Outcomes * Contributions to the objectives of UNDP, UNEP, FAO, GEF, Regional R2R Programme, STARs? | * Interview Results * UNDP/UNEP/FAO/GEF Documents (Strategic, Programme and Project Documents, UNDAFs) * STAR Documents * Project Documents including sub-project LogFrames of 14 PICs | * Documents Review * Interviews with: * reps of UNDP, UNEP, FAO in Suva and PICs * Regional Technical Adviser (BKK) * R2R Focal Points and STAR reps * National Project Managers |
| **PICs’ national policies and priorities** | 1. Provide the historical context for each PIC’s involvement in the Project.   In the Project design stage:   * How did each PIC get involved and why? Which institutions and stakeholder groups were consulted? * What were the specific inputs/contributions of the various country stakeholders to the Project design? * How and to what extent are the Project design and objectives aligned with the country’s own development and environmental, CCAM and DRRM policies, priorities and needs? * Has the Project in its design taken cognizance of the specific risks and assumptions present within the country? * How was the national implementing partner chosen? Other partners? | * Congruence/Responsiveness of the Project’s theory of change (ToC)/design/interventions to the results of national, sectoral and local situation analyses (e.g., status of governance preparedness, levels of absorptive capacity, state of ecosystems, vulnerability and risks) * Coherence of Project objectives with the national, sectoral and local goals of the PICs * Expressed concrete inputs of national implementing partner and other stakeholders into the Project Design * Extent Piloted and/or Upscaled ICM, IWRM, CCAM and DRRM innovations and investments are based on national diagnostic analyses, SOCA, RapCA * Appropriateness of the scale of the Project’s interventions, (e.g., R2R, river basin, district, region or district, landscape) vis-à-vis the requirements of targeted outcomes (e.g., sustainable ecosystems provisioning, securing sustainable livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and climate resilience, disaster risk reduction) * Ways the coordination/cooperation infrastructure is designed around the specific political/cultural and other realities on the ground in each PIC * Expressions of acceptance and appreciation of Project value-added and contributions supported by concrete empirical examples * Extent of involvement of relevant institutions and personalities in Project management; Evidence of their involvement and resource contributions consistent with organizational mandates * Expressions of dissatisfaction over any aspect of the Project/Extent of (non) familiarity with or (non) support of the Project supported by empirical instantiation * Extent the Project objectives, processes and mechanisms are shared by national implementing partners and mainstreamed into their management systems * Degree of ownership of Project results as well as accountability over delivered and non-delivered results * Suggestions about how the Project could have been designed more appropriately in consideration of the specific context of each country * Relevant coverage of capacity development provided (based on national capacity needs assessment); * Extent capacity development targeted gender parity | * Interview Results * Project Documents * Texts of Country Policies, National Framework Strategies, Physical and Development Plans, Sectoral Plans, Land Use Plans | * Documents Review * Participant Observation * Interviews with: * RPCU-SPC and reps from UNDP * R2R Focal Points and STAR reps * Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners reps sitting in inter-ministerial committees * National Project Managers |
|  | In Project management:   * How and to what extent is the Project implementation country-owned and country-driven? * To what extent is there awareness and/or acceptance of R2R as an approach to the sustainable development and management of the country’s ecosystems and resources by key public decision-makers, planners and implementers? * Did the Project correctly assess the country’s governance preparedness related to adapting R2R as an approach? Has the Project been correctly targeting these areas of capacity development, involving the right people, and focusing on the needed policy, institutional and systems reforms? * What have the Project results so far contributed to the relevant national, local and sectoral goals of the PIC? How does the Project synergize with other related Projects in the PIC to contribute shared impact to the country’s national, sectoral and local goals? |
| **Partner Communities, Partner-Beneficiaries and other Local Partners** | 1. How inclusive is the Project?  * In terms of its decision-making processes and mechanisms? * Are the Project’s objectives, design and interventions responsive to the needs, demands, issues and problems of local communities and partner-beneficiaries? * How have the Project’s interventions considered the specific contexts and needs of those most-affected by the issues and problems (including women) they attempt to address? * Are its approaches, strategies, and tools substantively participatory, multi-stakeholder and inclusive, rather than tokenist or participatory mainly in rhetoric and form?  1. How has the Project harnessed local support in the various stages of management?  * How did the Project involve traditional community leadership, local communities and partner-beneficiaries, the academia, other relevant civil society organizations and the private sector in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation? * How and to what extent have local stakeholders contributed resources to the Project? What resources have local stakeholders invested in the project and why? | * Relative to subsidiarity, extent and how the Project’s management and decision-making mechanisms and processes accommodated and engaged relevant stakeholders (relevantly-mandated government institutions, other sustainable development organisations, academia, research institutions and scientists, local communities in all Project management stages and functions * Extent partner-beneficiaries and other involved stakeholders were enabled to articulate their demands and positions, provide feedback and inputs, partake in decisions, and productively participate in activities. * Empirical evidence, accounts and claims of how substantive participation added distinct value towards the efficient and effective generation of relevant Project results * In relation to coverage, proportion, and how, those vulnerable, at-risk and most affected including women, were targeted and accommodated in intervention design * Level of awareness of/Buy-in to and popular support of the Project by partner-beneficiaries and other local stakeholders | * Results of interviews, FGDs, group interviews * Project Documents including most- significant-change (MSC) stories, minutes of meetings of decision-making bodies | * Interviews, Group Interviews, FGDs of partner-beneficiary groups and other stakeholders * Documents Review |
| **ii. Progress towards results**  ***Effectiveness* or Progress Towards Results and Emerging Outcomes: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the Project been achieved thus far?** | | | | |
| **Realisation of Phased Targets and Milestones** | 1. Have the Project’s key outputs been established in the targeted quantities, quality and timing such that uptake and use by relevant stakeholders are ongoing and up to standard, and thus facilitating progress towards the achievement of end-of-project outcomes? (e.g., Landscape/ Ecosystem/National Diagnostics Analysis, SOCA, RapCA, WQM protocols, CC and DR vulnerability and risk assessment processes and tools, integrated R2R or spatial and development planning processes and tools at landscape, local and national levels, Regional Strategic R2R Framework, Policy Regime and Institutional Framework, Capacity Development Assessment and Plan, Training Modules, stress reduction and sustainable livelihoods pilots, software and hardware for GIS use, WQM, rainfall monitoring, etc.) 2. Given temporal standards/requirements for the generation of these Project outputs/outcomes, based on considerations of science, technology, absorptive capacities as well as other local realities - social, cultural, political dynamics (monitored risks and assumptions), what are the chances the targeted outputs and outcomes will still be realized in the remaining Project life? 3. In general, what are the factors that facilitated effective implementation of the Project components in your country? Hindering factors? How can the hindering factors be overcome to improve the chances that Project outputs and outcomes may still be achieved at Project-end? | * Reported and Observed Variance in Progress vis-à-vis targets and milestones, and explanations of variance pointing out attribution links to Project management and how risks and assumptions were managed to strengthen achievability * Completeness and truthfulness of risk and assumption analysis * Quality and Timeliness of National/Ecosystem Diagnosis, State of Resources Assessments, Risk and Vulnerability Assessments vis-à-vis standards in grounded theory and good practice, including how assessments mainstream an R2R perspective; Also, extent and how attendant processes, systems and tools operationalized standards in good practice and grounded theory * Evidence of use of extensive knowledge sources (science, local knowledge, existing knowledge about fast cycle measurables, results of risks and assumptions monitoring) to inform logical phasing and sequencing of activities, as well as the doability of work packages * Stated and field-verified claims about existence and strength of implementation facilitating and hindering factors (including perceptions re effect of vacancy in the Project Management position to level of Project accomplishment) * Clarity and Feasibility of Project’s ToC within its time frame; Continuing plausibility of the Project’s ToC, or validity of the Project design, given current level of accomplishment and remaining Project life | * Results of Interviews, FGDs, group interviews * Project and PIC sub-project Documents (Framework Documents, LogFrames , Quarterly, Annual and Mid-Term reports, Technical studies, KPs, Assessment Tools and their results, Prepared Plans, Policy Instruments, Partnership MOAs, Financial Reports, minutes and decisions) | * Documents Review with Content Analysis of Generated Document Outputs * Participant Observation * Field Inspection * Interviews with: * RPCU-SPC and reps from UNDP * R2R Focal Points and STAR reps * Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners * reps sitting in inter-ministerial committees * National Project Managers * FGDs/Group Interviews of Beneficiaries and other Project stakeholders (traditional community leaders, private business, academia, involved NGOs) |
| **Emerging Outcomes** | 1. In what concrete ways has the Project improved your capacity for environmental governance (including ENR management, CCAM and DRRM) within an R2R approach? Why or why not? 2. Has the Project facilitated links, mutual access, cooperation and learning exchanges between the relevant national, sectoral and local public agencies and:  * Credible (Regional/National/Local) sources of knowledge and expertise (technical assistance, advisory services, research, continuous training) to assist in diagnostics exercises, preparation of SOC reports, RapCAs, field research, vulnerability and risk assessments, sustainable livelihoods development, planning, monitoring and evaluating stress reduction and improved catchment measures within an R2R approach? * Sources of financial and other resources including potential private sector investors, for ENR, CCAM and DRRM within an integrated R2R approach?  1. Is the Project realising gains from synergies/ complementarities with other UNDP/UNEP/FAO and GEF programmes and projects in the PICs and vice versa? Can these gains be attributed to the Project’s coordination? Why or why not and how? | * Evidence of changes in the targeted capacity areas (knowledge, attitudes skills of relevant individuals; policy, institutional structural, management systems and procedural reforms) in terms of decisions and actions taken and documentary outputs that the PIC: * Has bought into R2R as a local, landscape-wide, national and regional approach to managing the environment/ ecosystems and natural resources for sustainable development * can and has participated in the formulation of a Regional Strategic Framework for R2R * can and has undertaken analysis of the relevant policy regime, identified areas of complementarity and conflict and recommended policy actions; can and has enacted (or amended) legislation to support an integrated R2R approach to national, sectoral and local physical (land use) and development planning? * can and has (re)organized governance structures that allow cross-sectoral and cross-level environment/ ecosystem/natural resources management without substantial political and administrative jurisdictional barriers * has mobilised the relevant public agencies with the personnel complement (with secure tenure) able to use the management tools the Project trained them on (e.g., GIS-based mapping and planning, diagnostics tool, RapCAs, SOCA, project management); * has put in place an incentive structure and credentialing system to retain those assisted by the Project in their advanced studies related to R2R approach * has invested in the attendant software and hardware requirements for ENR under an R2R approach * can and has initiated, catalyzed and encouraged convergent and collaborative work of various sector agencies and the GEF R2R STAR projects, between governments, communities, and civil society and the private sector * can and has replicated, upscaled and led full-cycle ENR management, including diagnostics and assessments, planning management strategies within an R2R framework involving relevant stakeholders (local communities including traditional governance structures, the poorest, women and other minorities, NGOs, business), coordinating implementation, monitoring, evaluating and linking for learning * better target and involve the most-affected, most at-risk, and most vulnerable groups in ENR programming and management * can prepare and implement targeted communication strategies and use these to mobilise multi-stakeholder support for the various concerns of ENR management, CCAM and DRRM within an R2R framework? * Evidence that the stress reduction measures and sustainable livelihoods components are working and generating the expected results * Expressed claims of attribution of specific value-added results to complementarities/synergies from coordinating with other projects in the PICs * Expressed claims of attribution of specific value-added results to the adoption of an R2R approach compared to previous more spatially/sectorally-delimited projects |
| **ii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**  ***Efficiency* of Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the Project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting and project communications supporting the Project’s implementation?** | | | | |
| **Project Management and Cooperation Infrastructure for Adaptive Management** | 1. Are the regional and national Project management and advisory support structures in place?  * Are Project management bodies at regional and national levels adequately and correctly staffed, and functional? * Are the national PSCs now set up to jointly steer the Project and STAR? How do the PSCs deal with Project issues in general? How accurate and effective are the feedback links between PSC and RPCU? How timely are the response cycles? What are the effects on implementation? For instance, how was the vacancy in Project Management taken by PSC, the delays in implementation, the under-utilisation of funds? * To what level of detail and how often are the National Environment Councils informed about Project progress (or lack of)? To what extent do they participate in Project decision-making? * Do Project information and decisions ever reach the country’s Cabinet-level Ministers? What has been the value/advantages of involving high-level officials in Project decision-making? * Are the inter-ministerial committees functional? How are the networks of national R2R inter-ministerial committees involved in the Project? How have they improved management of components of the Project, coordination of GEF Projects nationally and regionally? * Has the UNDP and RPCU provided adequate timely technical, coordinative, financial and other assistance as needed? * To what extent are traditional and local governance structures involved in the Project? How has their participation enhanced the design, management and progress/performance of the Project? | * Consistency between Project objectives, design and management requirements (approaches, strategies, tools) and the organizational mandates, resources and capacity of the national implementing and other partners * The extent the organisational-structural attributes (authority, decision, communication, coordination and work systems and processes) of the various implementing partners are compatible with each other; clarity of terms of partnership and collaborative/coordination mechanisms * Quality, adequacy, sequencing and timeliness of the provision of inputs (technical, financial, etc.) by the responsible Project actors (e.g., UNDP, RPCU, PIC management structures, traditional governance structures in PICs, consultants, etc.) and how (in)efficient delivery affected effectiveness * Quality, feasibility and timeliness of Project decisions and choices given the Project’s changing context | * Interview Results * Project Documents (Partnership MOAs, PIRs, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions) | * Documents Review with Content Analysis * Participant Observation * Interviews with: * RPCU-SPC * UNDP * R2R Focal Points and STAR reps * Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners * reps sitting in inter-ministerial committees * National Project Managers * other Project stakeholders (traditional community leaders, private business, academia, involved NGOs) |
| **Knowledge-Managing Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for Adaptive Management** | 1. Are framework documents (Project and sub-project documents and LogFrames, MEL Plan, PIRs, key decisions) shared among the relevant Project stakeholders intended to directly contribute to the realization of outputs and outcomes? Do these documents provide a good basis for alignment of activities of all involved towards shared impact? 2. Is there a good balance between MEL and on-the-ground implementation activities? Does the MEL support adaptive management for effective implementation?  * How much time, at the regional, national and local levels, are spent for – * Annual planning and budgeting * Quarterly and annual progress reporting, including on the ground monitoring * Semestral Project Steering Committee Meetings? * Do you think this amount of time is reasonable to enable learning and adaptive management? Do administrative tasks take anything away from direct productive activities on-the-ground, or vice-versa, relative to targeted milestones?  1. Is the Project’s M&E system coherently linked with the M&E systems of partner-institutions? Is it transparent and accessible to all concerned stakeholders? 2. Are progress reports instructive for decision-making? Have qualitative and temporal standards been set for work packages based on science, institutional framework, political, social and cultural contextual dynamics (risks and assumptions) unique to the country/locality? Do targets and milestones reflect these standards such that they are useful guides for phasing/pacing implementation? Are decisions and adjustments routinely and timely made based on the content of monitoring reports? Are decisions systematically documented and shared? 3. Are risks and assumptions being systematically monitored and managed? How and what have been the effect on implementation? 4. Are knowledge products generated to facilitate learning at various levels - locally, nationally, regionally, inter-sectorally, among relevant publics? Do learnings immediately feedback to Project implementation, to related programming, to policy? | * Transparent sharing of LogFrames and their use as a management tool (implementation guide, basis for M&E); * Existence and use of a shared M&E Plan for adaptive management, learning and defining accountability, linked to the M&E systems of involved institutional partners; SMART-ness of M&E indicators; allocation of funding for M&E and learning activities * Quality, timeliness and truthfulness of Progress Implementation Reports, usefulness for decision-making with focus on results; Responsiveness of management to implementation problems; Extent follow-up actions and implementation adjustments were timely made as instigated by monitoring results * Completeness and realism of risk and assumption analysis and their regular/systematic monitoring * Proportion of time spent for implementing productive activities and administrative support tasks * Relevance of knowledge products to the needs of implementation; Quality and Appropriateness of knowledge products to targeted users; Evidence of practical use of knowledge products in managing the interventions | * Interview Results * Project Documents (LogFrames, M&E Plan, PIRs, KPs, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions) | * Documents Review with Content Analysis * Participant Observation * Interviews with: * RPCU-SPC * Key (M&E) staff from National Implementing Partners * National Project Managers * Reps from other implementing partners |
| **Financial Management and other Administrative Systems in support of Adaptive Management** | 1. In general, does the Project budget support the LogFrame? How does the Project define efficiency and cost-effectiveness as applied to both administrative and direct implementation costs? 2. Have partners provided counterparts as committed in a timely fashion? Why or why not? What were the effects on implementation? 3. Has the Project instituted a financial management system that is not in conflict with the financial management systems of other stakeholders contributing resources? Are the necessary sub-systems in place and functioning? Is the system transparent? Has the system ever been a reason for implementation delays? How, why and to what effect? | * Timely deployment of resources for intended purposes; spending levels and variance between forecasts and expenditures * Costs and benefits of the actions; Value (for money) of investments * Spending cognisant of cost standards, value-for money considerations, cost-effectiveness standards * Soundness of financial management policies, systems and practices (decision-making, treasury, bookkeeping and audit, including bidding, canvassing and procurement); extent financial management systems of implementing partners are compatible with each other * Financial feasibility (financial, material, human, technological resource requirements) of the interventions given scale, approach, and funding environment * Transparency of financial transactions * Compliance of reporting with quality and timeliness requirements * Soundness of management response to Audit and other finance-related findings | * Interview Results * Project Documents (LogFrames, Budget, Financial (Financial Books, Statements, Audit Reports and Progress Reports, Financial Management Policies and Manual, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions) | * Documents Review Documents Review * Interviews with financial officers of: * RPCU * PICs * Other institutional partners with financial counterparts |
| **iv. Sustainability**  **Indications of *Sustainability*: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term Project results?** | | | | |
| **Political, Technical, Social, Environmental and Financial Sustainability** | 1. Are the Project investments in stress reduction and catchment improvement measures, and reforms in governance institutions, mechanisms, processes and management systems, now backed by policy promulgations/legislation? 2. Are the Project-prepared plans mainstreamed into public physical and development public plans at various levels and sectors? Is R2R adopted as a planning approach by the national and local governments? 3. Have the management tools and systems developed by the Project been mainstreamed into the systems of involved government agencies at various levels? Are the Project investments, products, resources, tools and systems lodged with the appropriate institutions for their use and maintenance? 4. Is there intentional effort to build and use in-situ/local expertise, on related technical areas of policy and programming post-project? Are there indications of commitment from those taking higher studies in R2R to serve their countries? Have incentive structures and credentialing systems for the R2R positions been put in place, especially in public agencies? 5. Has the Project created widespread support and buy-in for R2R and other Project advocacies among the relevant stakeholders? Has the Project produced champions for the Project’s advocacies across levels and sectors of governance, and among civil society and private sector actors? 6. Are there indications the Project components and gains will be built upon by national and local stakeholders beyond the Project life? Replicated? Upscaled? Will financing by public agencies, private sector and local communities for the investments started through the Project be sustained? 7. What are the key constraints and challenges to Project components and gains being sustained beyond the Project life? | * Presence of Supportive Policy Context for R2R and the Project’s various components; Policy promulgations by national implementing partners mainstreaming Project interventions into their regular mandate * Endorsement of Regional Strategic Framework for R2R by the relevant high-level officials in PICs * Adoption of R2R in the PICs’ mandated physical and development planning processes * Concrete demonstration of Project components and activities being taken over by national implementing partners and other implementing partner-institutions * Replicated and upscaled activities * Expressions and Evidence of commitments (financial, human, equipment, knowledge, etc.) from national implementing partners and other stakeholders (international donors, local communities, private sector) to support the various components after Project end * Presence of Pro-activeness of Champions in lobby and advocacy activities related to the Project * Extent Project fostered solidarity among the PICs particularly with respect to the political will required to support more integrated approaches to R2R in NRM. | * Interview Results * Visited sites and offices * Project Documents * Pronouncements by PICs | * Documents Review * Participant Observation * Interviews with: * RPCU-SPC * Officials and Key staff from National Implementing Partners * National Project Managers * Reps from other implementing partners * Reps from (potential) donors * FGDs/Group Interviews of beneficiary groups |

##### Annex 6: Recommended adjustments to the targets and indicators in the Project LogFrame. Deletions are marked as ~~strikethrough~~ text, additions are marked as underlined and italicised text.

| **Original Indicator/Revised indicator** | **Original project target/Revised project target** | **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics | 1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed | No change |
| 1.1.2 Stress reduction and water,  environmental and socioeconomic status indicators \* Municipal waste  pollution reduction (N kg/yr)  \* Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr)  \* Area of restored habitat (ha)  \* Area of conserved/protected  wetland  \* Area of catchment under improved  management (ha)  \*Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods  \* Status of mechanisms for PM&E  \* Number and quality of  demonstration projects that have  incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans  *\* Number of people (or general societal) benefiting from defined, quantified and verified improvements in ecosystem condition* | 1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in:  \* Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites)  \* Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites)  \* 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) \* 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7 sites)  \* 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities  \* Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites)  \* 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results  \* Direct national pilot project beneficiaries equitably shared | For targets - as underlined - To be revised in accordance with revised and PSC/RSC-approved national project LogFrames  These targets/indicators are a mixture of process (e.g. "areas under improved management") and outcome (e.g. nitrogen pollution reduction).  It can take quite some time before some stress reduction measures deliver improvements in the environment. For example, catchment rehabilitation takes time, in some cases several years, before water quality improves. For some of these targets/indicators there are technical issues with measurements. For example in Tuvalu there are several sources of nitrogen pollution in addition to pig waste so it can be challenging to link any improvements in pig waste management to changes in Nitrogen loads. Despite these issues the targets/indicators should be maintained to keep focus on environmental outcomes.  For indicators: the purpose of reducing stressors is to improve the ability of ecosystems to deliver benefits (ecosystem services). Currently the indicators refer to processes that reduce stressors, or environmental parameters, without identifying improvements in benefits. Addition of the new indicator will encourage the project to monitor and interpret stress reduction as improvements in benefits. |
| 1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas | 1.2.1 *Up to* 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments  conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs | For target - see Section 4.2. Diagnostic analyses that are done should comply with the criteria for continuing or starting an analysis as per the recommendations of the MTR on the process/strategy for conducting diagnostic analyses. |
| 1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating  baseline environmental state  and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites | 1.2.2 *Up to* 14 ICMIWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project. | See Section 4.2. |
| 1.3.1 ~~Number of national, local leaders and local governments engagement/participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks~~  *Level of satisfaction of local communities in their influence on policies.* | 1.3.1 ~~Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks~~  *Effective participation of communities in national government policy making strengthened.* | See Annex 7. |
| 1.3.2 ~~Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development~~  *Number of investment planning forums held that explicitly discuss opportunities for R2R investments in PIC sustainable development* | 1.3.2 ~~Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions~~  *At least 14 National private-sector and 14 donor partnership forums (one in each PIC respectively) for investment planning reflect due consideration of priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions* | Forums need not be "new". Much better to mainstream R2R into existing discussion forums (where being held).  The purpose (indicator) is to promote R2R opportunities (previously missing).  See also Annex 7. |
| 2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management.  \*Data will be gender disaggregated | 2.1.1 At least 10 people with postgraduate training in R2R management.  \*At least 5 people will be women, At least ~~3~~ *1* innovative post-graduate training program~~s~~ for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized  educational institutes and technical support and mentoring programme with results documented | Project document refers to only one programme. But it is understood that a "programme" will include several topics/modules (three of which are already delivered and one recently commenced with JCU). |
| 2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders *groups* (i.e. catchment  management committees, CSOs,  etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities | 2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities.  \*Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through  direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented | No change (except editorial on indicator). |
| 2.2.1 ~~Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are~~  ~~benchmarked, tracked and analyzed~~  Number of studies completed identifying the national human  capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM)  implementation and benchmarking/  tracking competencies of national and local government units for  R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented | 2.2.1 ~~Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional~~  ~~competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed.~~  At least one study completed identifying national human  capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and  benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity  building support provided with results documented. | The target bears limited relationship to the outcome that refers to "incentive structures" whereas the target refers to personnel.  "up to" is ambiguous and not a defined quantified target. (See annex 7).  The MTR does not understand what is meant by an "R2R personnel" and proposes its deletion - also because it also maintains that R2R capacity needs mainstreaming into existing personnel. |
| ~~2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local~~  ~~government levels~~ | ~~2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive~~  ~~structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.~~ | See Annex 7.  Proposed deletion of the target and indicator because achieving this is beyond the ability of the project (see section 4.2). In addition - the MTR notes that the project's objective is to mainstream R2R and therefore build R2R capacity across all government levels and not to centralise such capacity in individual "R2R practitioners". |
| 3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance frameworks harmonised and strengthened *through incorporation of R2R* into national and regional development frameworks | 3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and  budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with  options for harmonization of governance frameworks | Indicator: needs to be explicit that the harmonisation and strengthening relates to incorporating R2R. |
| ~~3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action frameworks for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building~~  ~~in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans~~  3.1.2  *Integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building and national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans integrated into inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action frameworks for 14 PICs.* | ~~3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders~~  *3.1.2 At least one relevant agreement and/or strategic action framework that incorporates R2R endorsed by leaders in each of the 14 PICs* | See section 4.2. The priority should be to integrate R2R into existing inter-ministerial agreements and/or strategic action plans. |
| 3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national ‘State of the Coasts’ or ‘State of the Islands’ reports *or information* in  national and regional action planning for R2R investment | 3.1.3 *Up to 14* National ‘State of the Coasts’ or ‘State of the Islands’  reports completed*, or uptake of related information into parallel or related report mechanisms,* ~~and launched to Pacific Leaders during~~  ~~National Coastal Summits (Yr 3)~~ in coordination with  national R2R projects and demonstrated as *a* national development  planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal  areas | See section 4.2. |
| 3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project  inter-ministerial committees *strengthened or* formed  and linked to existing national IWRM committees | 3.2.~~114 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM~~  ~~committees and contributing to a common results framework at the~~  ~~project and programme levels~~  *14 inter-ministry committees (one in each PIC) strengthened or formed, building on existing structures, including IWRM committees where feasible, that contribute to a common results framework for R2R at the project, programme and national levels*. | See Annex 7.  Note comments in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees and its recommendations on how they should be implemented. Revision of this target/indicator should be pending further clarification and consideration of IMCs as recommended in section 4.3. The indicator should be re-assessed and re-aligned to the outcomes of this process. |
| 3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and  planning decisions  \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender | 3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with meeting results  documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums  \*50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups | See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs. |
| 3.2.3 Number of networks established between community  leaders and local government from pilot projects | 3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits | See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs. |
| 3.2.4 ~~Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the~~ *~~1~~*~~4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender~~  *Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 14 pilot PICs and those that have changed their perception on R2R as a result of the project \*Data to be disaggregated by gender*. | 3.2.4 At least 20 I~~CM~~ MC members *in* total from the *1*4 pilot PICs (sub- regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) *engage* ~~gauged~~ in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques.  \*50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups | Editorial corrections.  See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs.  See annex 7 for change to indicator. As noted in Annex 7. The target refers to change in perception. So should the indicator. |
| 4.1.1 Number and quality of national  and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme | 4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting  templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14  PICs | No change. |
| 4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries | 4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries | No change |
| 4.1.3 Number of National planning  exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to  embedding R2R results frameworks  into national systems for reporting,  monitoring and budgeting | 4.1.3 *On demand*, Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting | Activity/target should respond only where there is national level demand. |
| 4.2.1 Regional communications  strategy developed and number of  partnership with media and educational organizations | 4.2.1 Regional ‘ridge to reef’ communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project, including, ~~at least 10~~ *as relevant*, partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations | The media landscape has changed since project conception. Partnerships with national and regional media and educational organisations should be promoted but a numerical target on this depends on the practicalities and feasibility of the communications strategy on a case-by-case basis. |
| 4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published  A second indicator should be added:  *Percentage allocation of GEF grant expended on participation in IW:LEARN and partnerships* | 4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant | No change to target (However, the MTR regards this target as unambitious and the project should aim for a lot more)  Additional indicator added (from Annex 7). |
| 4.2.3 Number of users, volume of  content accessed, and online visibility of the ‘Pacific R2R  Network’ | 4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users ~~registered~~,  online regional and national portals containing among others, databases,  rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc. | "Registered" removed because number can be tracked electronically from downloads etc.  The RPCU has suggested changing this to 38 (from 100) users based on a calculation of the number of programme staff currently actively involved (UNDP/FAO/UNEP/GEF, STAR and IW). But the MTR concludes this facility should go well beyond this limited scope of users and notes that the "100" is unambitious in this regard. |
| 5.1.1 Programme coordination unit  recruited and staff retained | 5.1.1 overall R2R programme coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R  projects (Year 1) | No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination" |
| 5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit | 5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall programme  goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively. | No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination" |
| 5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing | 5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting  and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity  building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing. | No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination" |
| 5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories | 5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and  for sharing best practices | No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination" |
| 5.1.5 Number of planning and  coordination workshops conducted  for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and  STAR project coordination, delivery  and reporting | 5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network | No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination" |

##### Annex 7: Analysis of original project targets as S.M.A.R.T. and the appropriateness of original indicators

(S = Specific: must use clear language, describing a specific future condition; M = Measureable: must have measureable aspects making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not; A = Achievable: must be within the capacity of partners to achieve; R = Relevant: must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework; T = Time-bound: never open-ended; there should be an expected date of accomplishment).

Note: these adjustments arise from the analysis of targets/indicators as per original project design. Further adjustments to targets and indicators arise as a result of the review of progress towards results. Recommended adjustments to targets and indicators from both sources are reflected in Annex 6.

| **Target** | **Indicator** | **Targets SMART ?** | | | | | **Notes** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S** | **M** | **A** | **R** | **T** |
| **Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability** | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]** | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed | 1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | Since baseline environmental data are required before interventions start the "T" for this target should be early in the project (year 1). | |
| 1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in:  \* Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites)  \* Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites)  \* 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) \* 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7 sites)  \* 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities  \* Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites)  \* 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results  \* Direct national pilot project beneficiary | 1.1.2 Stress reduction and water,  environmental and socioeconomic status indicators \* Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) \* Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) \* Area of restored habitat (ha) \* Area of conserved/protected wetland \* Area of catchment under improved management (ha) Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods \* Status of mechanisms for PM&E \* Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| **Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments** | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.1 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs | 1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 1.2.2 Up to 14 ICM-IWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project | 1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| **Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM** | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.1 Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national “Ridge to Reef” Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS | 1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks | x | x | ✔ |  | ✔ | The term "institutional relationships" is vague and difficult to define and therefore problematic to measure.  The outcome refers to "established" but as noted in the text such "roundtable networks" already exist in many PICs.  An additional indicator might be: *Level of satisfaction of local communities in their influence on policies.* | |
| 1.3.2 Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions | 1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development | x | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | The target should reflect that it would be more effective and efficient to mainstream R2R into on-going and future PPP arrangements/forums. "Up to" is also ambiguous. It could be better stated as: *At least 14 National private-sector and 14 donor partnership forums (one in each PIC respectively) for investment planning reflect due consideration of priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions*  The current indicator is neither S nor R as it does not refer to R2R - only to PIC sustainable development. It would be better as: *Number of investment planning forums held that explicitly discuss opportunities for R2R investments in PIC sustainable development* | |
| **Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation** | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation** | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.1 At least 10 people with postgraduate training in R2R management. \*At least 5 people will be women At least 3 innovative post-graduate training programs for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring programme with results documented | 2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management.\*Data will be gender disaggregated | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. \*Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented | 2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | An editorial point - the indicator (and target) should be: Number of community stakeholder~~s~~ groups(~~i.e.~~ e.g. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities | |
| **Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local ‘Ridge to Reef’ expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated** | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented. | 2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented. | x | ✔ | ✔ | x | ✔ | The target bears limited relationship to the outcome that refers to "incentive structures" whereas the target refers to personnel.  "up to" is ambiguous and not a defined quantified target. | |
| 2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed. | 2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels | ✔ | ✔ | x | ✔ | ✔ | The intention of the target (to improve sustainability of project results through improved capacity retention) is important. But it is unrealistic for such a small project (on its own) to be able to have much influence on incentive structures. | |
| **Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks** | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally** | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks | 3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders | 3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
|  | 3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national ‘State of the Coasts’ or ‘State of the Islands’ reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| **Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs** | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.1Up to14 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and programme levels | 3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees | x | ✔ | ✔ | x | ✔ | The target refers to "forming" IMCs whereas in most cases these (or equivalent) already exist. Also use of "up to" is ambiguous. It is also unclear what "national networks" means.  According to the ProDoc "IMCs" are to function at a higher level than site based committees and serve primarily to promote uptake of R2R at national/regional policy level. But the status and function of IMCs has varied interpretations across the project. See further discussion in section 4.3.1 which also recommends that the project re-assess its approach to IMCs.  The target might be better as: *14 inter-ministry committees (one in each PIC) strengthened or formed, building on existing structures, including IWRM committees where feasible, that contribute to a common results framework for R2R at the project, programme and national levels*. But the project should re-assess how it is interpreting and implementing IMCs. | |
| 3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums \*50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups | 3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender | x | x | ✔ | x | ✔ | See the points raised above (target 3.2.2) regarding the status and interpretation of "IMCs). Without clarity on what an IMC is and the level at which it functions this target/indicator is problematic to assess. An improved approach would be to re-assess decision/consultation mechanisms at different scales (site, local, national) and have a clearer terminology for governance structures at each level instead of using "IMCs" for all cases.  Where an "IMC" functions at a high policy level then it is unrealistic to expect participants from youth and/or vulnerable groups, but representation of their views is required.  It is also unclear whether the effectiveness of meetings bears a relationship to the number of people present.  What is actually required is to assess how various governance structures at different scales (local to national, community to cabinet) function collectively to deliver effective participation by communities/women/vulnerable groups and deliver effective, equitable and coordinated R2R planning outcomes.  The project should re-assess its interpretation and strategy for IMCs (see section 4.3.1). Based on an interpretation that an IMC functions at a higher national policy level the target might be better as: *National decision making on R2R strengthened in each PIC through the strengthening or establishment of IMCs that include full and effective inputs of communities, women, youth and vulnerable groups through transparent and participatory dialogue from local through to national levels.*  Improved indicators might be: (1) *shifts in policy decision making mechanisms towards more inclusive approaches, from local through to national scales, and towards an R2R approach*; (2) *satisfaction of communities, women, youth and vulnerable groups with their full and effective participation in decision making*. | |
| 3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits | 3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects | x | x | ✔ | x | ✔ | See comments above (targets 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) on "IMCs".  It is not clear what "network" means. The logical interpretation is that it refers to linkages from site through local to national level in participation and information flow to enable better, more inclusive, decision-making and R2R policy outcomes. As such the target/indicator would be better if it reflected this. The proposals for target 3.2.2 (above) attempt to capture this aspect and if adopted would enable this target to be deleted.  "Community exchange visits" are a good idea and should be maintained but refer to capacity building and should be moved to under component 2. | |
| 3.2.4 At least 20 ICM members total from the 4 pilot PICs (sub- regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) gauge in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques.  \*50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups | 3.2.4 Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the *1*4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | The target is SMART as written but note comments above on the status and nature of IMCs.  The indicator is neither S nor R specifically from the perspective of measuring "change in perception" referred to in the target (it only measures those participating in change in perception activities). A better indicator would be: *Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 14 pilot PICs and those that have changed their perception on R2R as a result of the project \*Data to be disaggregated by gender*. This would need to be measured through a pre- and post- training/activity assessment (probably through structured questionnaires). | |
| **Component 4 Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management** | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects** | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs | 4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries | 4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 4.1.3 Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting | 4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting | x | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | "Up to" is not specific. The target should be: *14 national planning exercises (one in each PIC) conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting* | |
| **Outcome 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established** | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.1 Regional ‘ridge to reef’ communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project including at least 10 partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations | 4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant | 4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | A second indicator could be added: *Percentage allocation of GEF grant expended on participation in IW:LEARN and partnerships* | |
| 4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc. | 4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the ‘Pacific R2R Network’ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| **Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination** | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects** | | | | | | | |
| 5.1.1 overall R2R programme coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1) | 5.1.1 Programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall programme goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively. | 5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing. | 5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices | 5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |
| 5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network | 5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | |

##### Annex 8: Co-financing of the project as of the time of the MTR.

Based figures provided by the RPCU June 2019.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of co-financing** | **Name of co-financer** | **Type of co-financing** | **Amount confirmed at CEO endorsement (US$)** | **Actual amount contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)** | **Actual % of Expected Amount.** |
| UNDP Trust Fund | UNDP | In kind | 8,300,000 |  |  |
| Core budget and related projects/programmes | SPC/AGTD | In kind | 31,481,555 | 425,872 | 1.35% |
| Consolidated revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cook Islands | In kind | 1,675,736 | 7,724.30 | 0.46% |
|  | Fiji | In kind | 3,674,640 | 35,040 | 0.95% |
|  | FSM | In kind | 560,474 | 300 | 0.054% |
|  | Kiribati | In kind | 7,321,797 | 213 | 0.003% |
|  | Nauru | In kind | 1,448,275 | - | - |
|  | Niue | In kind | 1,887,967 | 1,500 | 0.08% |
|  | Palau | In kind | 1,110,000 | 40,909 | 3.69% |
|  | PNG | In kind | 3,000,000 | 100,000 | 3.33% |
|  | RMI | In kind | 3,060,925 | - | - |
|  | Samoa | In kind | 3,200,000 | 189,153 | 5.9% |
|  | Solomon Islands | In kind | 5,353,042 | 17,443.54 | 0.33% |
|  | Tonga | In kind | 3,500,000 | 202,142.03 | 5.8% |
|  | Tuvalu | In kind | 2,900,094 | 2,330.40 | 0.08% |
|  | Vanuatu | In Kind | 9,233,655 | 4,734.28 | 0.05% |
| Sub-Total (national) | |  | 47,926,605 | 601,489.55 | 1.26% |
|  |  | **Totals:** | **87,708,160** | **1,027,361.44** | **1.17%** |

##### Annex 9: Performance ratings and their descriptions

**Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)**

#6 Highly Satisfactory (HS). Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning,  finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.

#5 Satisfactory (S). Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

#4 Moderately Satisfactory (MS). Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

#3 Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU). Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.

#2 Unsatisfactory (U). Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

#1 Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

**Ratings for Sustainability:**

#4 Likely (L). Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future

#3 Moderately Likely (ML). Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review

#2 Moderately Unlikely (MU). Significant risk that key outcomes will not continue after project closure, although some outputs and activities should continue

#1 Unlikely (U). Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

##### Annex 10: Main stakeholders and their role (from the Project Document)

| **Stakeholder**  **(identified at project start-up)** | **Project Implementation Roles** |
| --- | --- |
| A. National Government Agencies   * Cook Islands: Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning * FS Micronesia: Kosrae Island ResourceManagement Authority * Fiji: Land and Water Resource Management Division of the Ministry of Primary Industry * Kiribati: Ministry of Public Works and Utilities * Marshall Islands: The Republic of the Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Authority (RMIEPA) * Nauru: Ministry of Commerce, Industries and Resources (CIR) * Niue: Department of Environment * Palau: Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC) * Papua New Guinea: Department of Environment and Conservation * Samoa: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment * Solomon Islands: Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Meteorology * Tonga: Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and Environment * Tuvalu: Department of Environment - Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment * Vanuatu: Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management | National Implementing Partners of National Activities and Pilot Projects |
| B. NGOs | |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | National level programme partner and member of the  Regional Science and Technology Committee |
| Pacific Islands News Association | Regional organisation representing the interests of media  professionals in the Pacific region. It links radio, television, newspapers, magazines, online services, national associations and journalism schools in 23 Pacific Island will assist Project in coordination of R2R messaging at national level |
| Live and Learn | National Level Environmental Education and Awareness |
| Pacific Water & Wastes Association (PWA) | The membership comprises Pacific Island water and  wastewater utilities as well as international water authorities, private sector equipment and services supply companies, contractors and consultants assisting the project in coordinating |
| Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental  Organisations (PIANGO) | National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects |
| Pan Pacific and Southeast Asia Women's Association  (PPSEAWA) | Regional network of National NGO focal points based in 22 Pacific Island countries and territories assisting the project in coordinating National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects |
| Pacific Foundation for the Advancement of Women  (PACFAW) | Will assist the project to promote cooperation among thewomen of the pacific region. Regional organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of activities for the advancement of women in the Pacific. |
| Pacific Youth Council | Regional non-governmental youth organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of National Youth Councils across the Pacific region |
| D. Academic organizations:   * University of the South Pacific (USP) * University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) * University of Guam * University of Hawaii * International Water Center (IWC) | Partners in projects capacity building component and resource for scientific and technical support. |
| E. GEF Agencies in the R2R Programme: |  |
| United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) | Project Implementing Agency and IA for National STAR R2R Projects for FSM, Tuvalu, Samoa, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Nauru, PNG, Fiji. |
| Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) | IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Tonga |
| United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) | IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Palau and Marshall Islands |
| United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural  Organization (UNESCO) | Groundwater associated activities at a National Level |
| United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) | National level partner in WASH associated Activities |
| F. Multilateral organizations |  |
| Asian Development Bank | IA for the Coral Triangle and National Level Infrastructure developments invited participant at Annual RSC |
| World Bank | IA for several regional Disaster Risk Management and  Building Climate Change Resilience will continue cooperative partnership established in the IWRM Project |
| European Union (EU) | Development partner for National Level Infrastructure  developments invited participant at Annual RSC. |
| G. Pacific Regional Organisations  Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) | Cooperative partner in the joint Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change strategy. Invited participant at Annual RSC |

##### Annex 11: MTR assessment of the status of risks and assumptions in the project LogFrame.

| **Indicator** | **Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame** | **MTR observation/comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability** | | |
| **Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]** | | |
| 1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics | 1.1.1 Data and information required to conduct diagnostic analyses may not be shared by local  government agencies | Shared with "whom"?  If this outcome is nationally-driven, then the sharing would be within national/local agencies and could be reasonably assumed to take place.  The risk as stated is more likely if diagnostics are produced remotely - which is not compatible with capacity building. |
| 1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators \* Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) \* Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) \* Area of restored habitat (ha) \* Area of conserved/protected wetland \* Area of catchment under improved management (ha) Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods \* Status of mechanisms for PM&E \* Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans | 1.1.2(a) Development pressures may result  in adoption or revision of land-use policies by national or local governments which are incompatible with  activities at pilot sites  1.1.2 (b) Challenges and costs associated with demonstrating environmental stress  reduction benefits of technologies and management  measures may constrain replication and upscaling  1.1.2 (c) Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to  address gender issues and promote mainstreaming. | 1.1.2 (a) activities at pilot sites should be factoring in current and future development pressures.  1.1.2 (b) implies that the project must develop low cost stress reduction measures.  1.1.2 (c) implies that the project must have at least targeted activities on the gender sensitisation of Pacific leaders and the development of gender Champions among them. |
| **Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments** | | |
| 1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas | 1.2.1 Data and information required to conduct site  characterizations of coastal areas may not be shared by relevant sectoral agencies or other institutions | Shared with "whom"?  If this outcome is nationally-driven, then the sharing would be within national/local agencies and could be reasonably assumed to take place.  The risk as stated is more likely if diagnostics are produced remotely - which is not compatible with capacity building. |
| 1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites | 1.2.2 Engaging appropriate expertise to facilitate consensus on the selection of physical, biological  and social variables to be used in characterization of  PIC coastal areas | This is under the influence of the project. |
| **Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM** | | |
| 1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks | 1.3.1 Existing tensions between land-owners and  government agencies may limit community leader participation | This is high risk in the PICs.  The project needs to establish measures to reduce tensions where feasible - e.g. applying conflict resolution, trade-off analysis and incentive measures tools. |
| 1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development | 1.3.2 Limited private sector presence, or alignment of donor investment strategies with proposed actions, at priority R2R locations | To some extent this is under the influence of the project. |
| **Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation** | | |
| **Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation** | | |
| 2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management. \*Data will be gender disaggregated | 2.1.1 Internationally recognized institute (or consortium) able to deliver a cost effective postgraduate training course which is both accredited and regionally appropriate | No comment. |
| 2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities | 2.1.2 Adequate resourcing from national STAR projects available to support STAR project stakeholder  participation in training and capacity building activities | The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects. |
| **Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local ‘Ridge to Reef’ expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated** | | |
| 2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed; Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation; Number of capacity building support secured with results documented | 2.2.1 Securing advice and support from human resource  specialist familiar with systems of government and  barriers to sustainable development in PIC contexts | No comment. |
| 2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels | 2.2.2 Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to  address human resourcing issues for natural resource and environmental management | Beyond the ability of the project - recommended deletion (see Section 4.2). |
| **Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks** | | |
| **Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally** | | |
| 3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks | 3.1.1 Government agencies may be unwilling to participate in processes for the harmonization of  policy and legislation | To a large extent this is under the influence of the project. |
| 3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans | 3.1.2 Consultative processes will not elicit adequate  stakeholder input and commitment of support from national networks to proposed priority strategic  actions | To a large extent this is under the influence of the project and particular as it promotes and supports IMCs which are specifically targeted in the LogFrame to support institutional development. |
| 3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national ‘State of the Coasts’ or ‘State of the Islands’ reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment | 3.1.3 Strong and high-level government commitment is  generated, sustained and willing to use ‘State of Islands’ reporting as an instrument for change | The assumption here is that a "State of the Islands" is required to promote change. The risk is that focusing on the SOI output distracts the project from identifying immediate opportunities for mainstreaming. |
| **Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs** | | |
| 3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees | 3.2.1 Provincial and local governments may perceive IMC approach as being driven by central government | See discussion on IMCs in Section 4.3 |
| 3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender | 3.2.2 Appropriately qualified national staff available to provide adequate Secretariat support to IMC work | No comment |
| 3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects | 3.2.3 Adequate cooperation is fostered among IW  pilot project and national STAR project staff to build  stakeholder confidence in benefits of integration | The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects. |
| 3.2.4 Number of inter-ministry committee members meeting within the 4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques \*Participation data to be disaggregated by gender | 3.2.4 R2R is accepted at the national level as a legitimate framework for a multi focal area approach to GEF investment for PIC sustainable development | This is already agreed since PICs have endorsed the Pacific R2R Programme which intends to do exactly as stated.  The actual risk is that R2R will not be taken up as a framework for future GEF investment. |
| **Component 4 Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management** | | |
| **Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects** | | |
| 4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme | 4.1.1 (a) Design of national STAR projects include  targets and related indicators aimed at achievement of R2R programme goals and outcomes; (b) legal agreements between national lead agencies and GEF implementing  agencies for STAR projects include explicit requirement for project management units to meet R2R programme reporting requirements | The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects.  This leaves the question of how will "legal agreements" be enforced?  See Section 4.3 on coordination. |
| 4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries | 4.1.2 Sustained commitment of senior government officials with oversight of IW and STAR projects to  develop and test a harmonized results approach for GEF investment in PICs | The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects. |
| 4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting | 4.1.3 National planning and finance ministry staff are  sufficiently well engaged in national planning exercises | The actual assumption here is that the R2R results framework is compatible with and supports national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting. To some extent this is under the control of the project. |
| 4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations | 4.2.1 (a) Willingness of regional and national media outlets prepared to partner with R2R programme implementation; and (b) adequate resourcing from  national STAR projects to the development of media  products required to effectively communicate the benefit of integrated R2R approaches | A risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects. |
| 4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published | 4.2.2 Retention of national and regional level staff required to resource the documentation of experiences and lessons learned as IW:LEARN experience notes | No comment. |
| 4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the ‘Pacific R2R Network’ | 4.2.3 Interconnectivity in national and regional  project offices is adequate to support the efficient online compilation and sharing of information and data | To some extent this is under the influence of the project since design of IT support should take into account such adequacy and the "sharing of information and data" should be kept within the limits of outcome 4.2 (see Section 4.2). |
| **Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination** | | |
| **Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects** | | |
| 5.1.1 Programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained | 5.1.1 Regional executing agency ability to recruit and  retain appropriately qualified staff for programme coordination unit | There is an assumption that the range of technical expertise of the RPCU is appropriate to that required to execute the project.  See 4.3 particularly sub-section on *Other performance of the Executing Agency (RPCU) Technical expertise of the RPCU* |
| 5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit | 5.1.2 Adequate resourcing available to programme  coordination unit to meet support requests of national  STAR projects | The project is designed so that it has adequate resourcing. Its RPCU already has such support in its ToR and it is assumed that the budget reflects this. |
| 5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing | 5.1.3 IW pilot and STAR project [staff] are retained to enable the longer-term development and local exchange of national project management and reporting capacity | It is assumed that this refers to - within the time duration of the project. Thereafter there will be no project staff. |
| 5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories | 5.1.4 Internet connectivity in national and regional  offices of programme/project stakeholders adequate to support use of online training tools | To some extent this is under the influence of the project because the IT system developed by the project should take into account internet connectivity etc. |
| 5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting | 5.1.5 National and regional organisations assign sufficient importance to engagement with planning and  coordination initiatives of the project | To some extent this is under the influence of the project. |

##### Annex 12: Milestones for national level implementation of the project. The official start date of the project was August 2015.

Initial hiring of the Project Manager refers to the date of appointment of the first Project Manager (in some cases project managers resigned and have been replaced).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PIC** | **Timeline of Milestones** | | | **Length of delay from project start** |
| **Cook Is** | MOA signing |  | Sep 15, 2016 | 1 year |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Sep 28, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Sep 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Feb 27, 2017 | 1 year 6 months |
| Demo Project |  | Management of Muri Lagoon - waste management, PPP, knowledge and capacity on stress reduction measures |  |
| **Fiji** | MOA signing |  | Mar 10, 2017 | 1 year 7 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Oct 6, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Oct 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year 2 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Oct 29, 2018. | 3 year 2 month |
| Demo Project |  | Catchment Management (Waimanu) including preparation of catchment management plan |  |
| **FSM** | MOA signing |  | Dec 28, 2016 | 1 year 4 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Oct 6, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Feb 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year 6 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Nov 27, 2017 | 2 year 3 months |
| Demo Project |  | Dry Litter Piggery demonstration in Lelu to control e coli contamination of water catchment and Terracing/SALT farming technology to control sediments in Tofol, Kosrae.  Preparation of Community Water Resources Management to be integrated into an overall state level Freshwater Management Plan for Kosrae. |  |
| **Kiribati** | MOA signing |  | Mar 10, 2017 | 1 year 7 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Sep 5, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Feb 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 6 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | N/A | N/A |
| Demo Project |  | N/A | N/A |
| **Nauru** | MOA signing |  | May 26, 2016 | 8 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Aug 5, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Feb 2017 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 6 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Jun 13, 2016. | 10 months |
| Demo Project |  | Dry Litter Piggery (Interview) Coastal re-vegetation with SALT and drought tolerant species at 10 critical sites (Interview) |  |
| **Niue** | MOA signing |  | Feb 7, 2017 | 1 year 6 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Mar 16, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Sep 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 years |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Feb 20, 2017 | 1 year 6 months |
| Demo Project |  | Reduction of municipal waste and reduction of pollution to aquifers |  |
| **Palau** | MOA signing |  | June 13, 2016 | 10 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Jun 20, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Oct 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 2 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Oct 9, 2016 | 1 year 2 months |
| Demo Project |  | Support to Belau Watershed Action Planning and Implementation PME Planning and Implementation for Ngardok Nature Reserve Public-private partnerships for ecotourism compliant with national guidelines for IW and Coastal Land Management |  |
| **PNG** | MOA signing |  | Jan 9, 2017 | 1 year 5 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Mar 2, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | May 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 9 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Nov 9, 2017 | 2 year 3 months |
| Demo Project |  | Habitat Restoration - MPA Declaration of Tuna Bay of Port Moresby CBD Area including MPA Management Planning |  |
| **RMI** | MOA signing |  | Jun 13, 2016 | 10 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Jun 20, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Mar 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year 8 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Jun 27, 2017 | 1 year 10 months |
| Demo Project |  | Reduction of pollution of coastal water and groundwater in Laura and Maujuro thru Dry Litter Piggery technology, including formulation of Integrated Coastal Management Plan for Laura informed by a State of the Coast assessment |  |
| **Samoa** | MOA signing |  | Mar 10, 2017 | 1 year 8 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Sep 27, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Nov 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year 3 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Sep 11, 2017 | 2 year 1 month |
| Demo Project |  | Improved catchment management, including revegetation of mangroves and formulation of Watershed Management Plan for Letongo Fagali'l Catchment |  |
| **Solomon** | MOA signing |  | Sep 1, 2016 | 1 year 1 month |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Fund released on Jan 10, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Jan 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 5 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Feb 1, 2017 | 1 year 6 months |
| Demo Project |  | Management of wetland habitat (Mataniko River which is a major river in Kovi/Kongulai Catchment. ), including formulation of Mataniko Catchment Management Plan for 100has  Water quality monitoring  Formulation of ecotourism development plan (Interview) |  |
| **Tonga** | MOA signing |  | Sep 1, 2016 | 1 year 1 month |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Sep 13, 2017 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Feb 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 2 year 6 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Aug 1, 2017 | 2 year |
| Demo Project |  | Reduction of municipal waste and reduction of pollution to aquifers through ECOSAN Water Quality Monitoring  Conservation/protection of fish habitat through MPA/refuge establishment |  |
| **Tuvalu** | MOA signing |  | Jun 1, 2016 | 10 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Nov 2, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Dec 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 4 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Aug 1, 2016 | 1 year |
| Demo Project |  | Dry Litter Piggery demonstration to reduce pollution to aquifers (Interview) |  |
| Formulation of MYCWP |  | Updated on Jul 30. 2018 (Per file copy shared by RPCU to the MTR Team) |  |
| **Vanuatu** | MOA signing |  | Jun 1, 2016 | 10 months |
| First Fund Tranche |  | Jul 12, 2016 |  |
| Inception Meeting |  | Dec 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report | 1 year 4 months |
| Initial Hiring of PM |  | Sep 6, 2018 | 3 years |
| Demo Project |  | Improved catchment management including formulation of the Tagabe Catchment Management Plan, capacity building for participatory monitoring and evaluation and revegetation of buffer areas Water Quality Monitoring |  |

##### Annex 13: Tasks identified to be undertaken in preparation for, and issues to be considered by, the next Regional Steering Committee Meeting.

| **Task** | **Who** |
| --- | --- |
| ***Necessary prior to the RSC:*** | |
| Check and where necessary update each national project LogFrame including targets. Check status of approval by RSC (in writing/official records) | RPCU and National Project Managers |
| Compile relevant national LogFrames for approval (if necessary) at next RSC | RPCU |
| Map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities.  Identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks.  Identify approaches to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks. | RPCU and national project counterparts (and where feasible national PSCs) |
| Compile and synthesise results of the above mapping (etc.) into a coherent strategy for mainstreaming R2R and present to the RSC | RPCU |
| Consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministry committees" (IMC) as per the Project Document fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed. | RPCU and national counterparts (and where feasible national PSCs) |
| Compile national situations and proposal regarding IMCs vis-a-vis project requirements and present to the RSC | RPCU |
| Assess the current situation, needs and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC vis-a-vis other on-going efforts (e.g. SoE) and with regards to the timing of information needs for other processes. | RPCU, national counterparts and national PSCs. |
| Compile the strategy for IDAs and SoCs and present to the RSC | RPCU |
| Identify the strategy for delivering outcome 4.2 at national level and present to the RSC | RPCU |
| *Optional - time and resources permitting.*  (1) Organise training on Ecosystem Goods and Services approaches and valuation at a regional workshop at the RSC  (2) Organise training workshop at the RSC on mapping the potential contributions of the project to the SDGs, identifying relevant linkages and interdependencies and investigating common or relevant indicators in use by both the project and the SDGs. | RPCU |
| ***Topics to be considered by the RSC:*** | |
| Consider and approve current national LogFrames (as necessary). | RSC |
| Consider and approve the mapping of existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities, immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks and approaches to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks. | RSC |
| Consider and approve strategies and proposals to deliver IMC functions by the project. | RSC |
| Consider and approve the revised IDA/SoC strategy | RSC |
| Consider and approve the strategy to deliver outcome 4.2 at national level. | RSC |
| Discuss and agree on: what is required from the RPCU regarding programme coordination; identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies; the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered. | RSC, RPCG and RPCU |

##### Annex 14: The MTR Mission Schedule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mission member** | **Location** | **Dates** |
| Coates + Lucero | Arrive Fiji | 13 March 2019 |
| Coates | Mission Fiji | 14 - 15 March 2019 |
| Coates | Mission Cook Islands | 16 - 23 March 2019 |
| Lucero | Mission Fiji | 14 - 23 March 2019 |
| Coates + Lucero | Mission Vanuatu | 24 - 30 March 2019 |
| Coates + Lucero | Mission Tuvalu | 31 March - 04 April 2019 |
| Coates + Lucero | Mission Fiji | 05 - 09 April 2019 |
| Coates + Lucero | Progress update Fiji | (08 April 2019) |
| Coates + Lucero | Home travel | 10 April 2019 |
| Lucero | Mission Palau | 23 - 27 April 2019 |

##### Annex 15: Brief BIOS of the MTR Team