**Terms of Reference (TOR)-Terminal Evaluation (TE) Report**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION** |
| **Project/outcome title** | Disaster Resilience in Pacific SIDS(RESPAC) Project |
| **Atlas ID** | 00111184 |
| **Corporate outcome and output** | 1. Strengthened early warning systems and climate monitoring capacity in selected PICS;
2. Preparedness and planning mechanisms and tools to manage disaster recovery processes strengthened at regional, national and local level;
3. Increased use of financial instruments to manage and share disaster related risk and fund post disaster recovery efforts.
 |
| **Country** | Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, RMI, Palau |
| **Region** | Pacific |
| **Date project document signed** | March 2016 |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| 1st June 2016 | December 31st 2020 |
| **Project budget** | **US$7,500,000** |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | **US$605,271** |
| **Funding source** | **UNDP Russia Trust Fund Development**  |
| **Implementing party[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **UNDP Pacific Office** |

**BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

The Disaster Resilience in the Pacific SIDS (RESPAC) is funded by the Russian Federation, that aims to build the overall resilience of Pacific Island countries (PICs) to address the negative impacts of climate change. RESPAC has 3 main components as outlined below, which are in addition to the Project Management component:

* Strengthened early warning systems and climate monitoring capacity in selected PICS;
* Preparedness and planning mechanisms and tools to manage disaster recovery processes strengthened at regional, national and local level; and
* Increased use of financial instruments to manage and share disaster related risk and fund post disaster recovery efforts.

RESPAC intervention complies with and seeks to support the implementation of the following regional and international agreements including frameworks, strategies, and plans regarding climate and disaster resilient development in SIDS. These include the: Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action (RFA) 2005 – 2015 (Regional DRM Framework); Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) 2006 – 2015; Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific (SRDP); Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report; Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report; Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030; and the SAMOA Pathway Outcome Document.

The initiation phase of the project started in June 2016 and the project was intended to complete its activities by December 2019, however a no-cost extension was subsequently approved in mid-2019 for closure in December 2020. Fourteen countries and one territory in the Pacific Islands region are eligible for support from this project: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Palau, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Nauru and Solomon Islands and Tokelau. The Project Board is responsible for project oversight and decides on the quantum of funding and associated technical support based on need in the respective PICs. Some of the allocation funding and in-kind support will be available to all PICs (i.e. technical assistance in recovery); other activities such as Climate Early Warning Systems (CLEWS) and national recovery planning anticipate targeting selected countries in each respective output area, according to exposure and incidence of disasters, project criteria and where the project would add maximum value. The target countries have been identified during the inception phase based on hazard and vulnerability criteria.

RESPAC intervention is modelled on two prongs: *a) regional* and *b) national* levels and has built on the existing institutional strengths and at the same time complementing the interface of resilient development, effective early warning systems continuity vis-à-vis national development. Using UNDP’s presence at the global, regional, and national levels, RESPAC provides strong working relationships with key stakeholders across the Pacific. Through RESPAC, UNDP has forged stronger partnerships at the national level as well as with regional and international agencies such as International Federation of the Red Cross, the Pacific Community (SPC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPC), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to enable project implementation that builds on respective regional strengths and initiatives.

The outbreak of coronavirus (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China in December 2019 has rapidly morphed into an unprecedented health, economic and geopolitical crisis. With over 22 million confirmed COVID-19 cases and more than 792,000 deaths worldwide, the global pandemic is wreaking havoc on the global economy; triggering severe economic downturns, sending shockwaves through stock markets, and leaving millions across the globe without jobs. The World Bank estimates that the impacts of COVID-19 could push 500 million people further into poverty, and the pandemic threatens to reverse many of the development gains achieved over recent decades.

As of 24 August 2020, 1,239 confirmed cases of COVID-19 including 10 deaths have been reported across five PICs including Fiji, French Polynesia, Guam, New Caledonia and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Although PICs have recorded a smaller number of COVID-19 cases, national governments have rapidly implemented public health emergency measures including lockdowns, curfews, physical distancing, travel restrictions, and international border closures to prevent imported cases of COVID-19.

COVID-19 new normal has brought about an interface which has become increasingly complex, uncertain and interconnected. It has affected the modus operandi of project design, development, formulation and implementation across the PICs who often lack reliable and fast connectivity or even mobile phone access. The advent of COVID-19 has restricted mobility and altered human interaction with our stakeholders across PICs. For RESPAC, Low Value Grant (LVG) Agreements, Letter of Agreements have been signed with Tonga, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Tuvalu without in-country verification by our experts. Whilst it is deemed cost-effective on the surface, it has repercussions to sustaining the high standards and maintaining sustained partnerships with Governments, development partners and communities contextualizing the modus operandi in PICs. The consolation however is the established close partnerships and networks in all countries in the areas of Climate Science, Disaster Management Offices and the Ministry of Finance & Planning that makes continued remote implementation and support possible.

**OBJECTIVES.**

The primary objective of a Terminal Evaluation report is to assess the following:

* achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draws lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid overall enhancement of UNDP programming;
* the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan and contribution of project results towards the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) and the United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF;
* Assess any cross cutting and gender issues; and
* Examine the use of funds and value for money.

The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assess the extent of project accomplishment including performance, visibility and viability of the project as per the DAC criteria on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

**SCOPE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework. The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP. The Findings[[2]](#footnote-2) section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex 1. The TE will cover the programme countries listed earlier in Page 1[[3]](#footnote-3).

**Aspects of Intervention**

1. Project Design/Formulation
* National priorities and country driven processes;
* Theory of Change;
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment;
* Social and Environmental Safeguards;
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators;
* Assumptions and Risks;
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design;
* Planned stakeholder participation;
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector; and
* Management arrangements or governance structure
1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation);
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements;
* Project Finance and Co-finance;
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment of M&E;
* Implementing Agency (UNDP), overall project oversight/implementation; and
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards.
1. Project Results
* Assess the achievement of outputs against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and output indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements;
* Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and overall project outcome ;
* Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability;
* Country ownership;
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment;
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant);
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect; and
* Progress to impact.
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned
* The TE will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Questions should be grouped according to the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used).

The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions and these dimensions need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (see page 77, table 10 of [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](http://unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616)).

**METHODOLOGY**

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

Noting that the eventual candidate selected to carry out the Terminal Evaluation of the RESPAC Project will need to, as part of the selection criteria, define an acceptable approach and methodology, the objective of this paragraph is simply to define some of the fundamental tenets that needs to be adhered to in good faith:

1. **E-consultation & on-site field validation:** Given the advent of COVID-19 and travel restrictions affecting mobility,e-consultationwill have to be undertaken across the Pacific and the 15 participating countries. the consultant should be able to consult with stakeholders concerned and provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. National consultants will be hired in specific representative countries to support evidence-based data collection and field validation visits. This methodology will be detailed out at the inception stage. The Fiji consultation can be facilitated in-person with NDMO, Fiji MET, SPC and other relevant stakeholders by the national consultant.
2. **Desk Research:** The Consultant should review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the project preparation phase and its 4 years of implementation. **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia
	* Project document (contribution agreement).
	* Theory of change and results framework.
	* Programme and project quality assurance reports.
	* Annual workplans.
	* Activity designs.
	* Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
	* Results-oriented monitoring report.
	* Highlights of project board meetings.

Technical/financial monitoring reports.

1. **Semi Structured e-Interview (either telephonic, skype or conference all)** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
	* **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
	* Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
	* All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
2. **Data Review and Analysis:** Data collected will be analysed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. It can be presented in the form of graphs, tables and figures to best represent the findings and key recommendations;
3. **Final Report:** The final project evaluation report should include descriptions of the approach and methodologies and the rationales for such including making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses.

**KEY DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINES:**

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control. The Terminal Evaluation period will be 15 working days.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timeline** |
| **Inception Report including a workplan and evaluation schedule (10-15 pages)** | The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators. | No later than 1 week beforethe commencement of evaluation |
| **Audit trail**  | Audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarification have been addressed |  |
| **PowerPoint****Presentation & other knowledge products** | Initial Findings | End of Project Evaluation |
| **Draft Final Project Evaluation report** | Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) withannexes | Within 2 weeks of the MTR mission |
| **Final Project Evaluation report**  | Revised final Project Evaluation report taking on board comments received and providing key recommendations for consideration of the UNDP Russia Trust Fund Development Unit and UNDP Pacific Office. | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft |

EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**Educational Qualifications:**

Minimum Advanced degree (Post Graduate Diploma or Master) in Environmental or Climate Science, Development Studies, Project Management or related disciplines.

**Experience:**

* 10 years in Climate Early Warning, climate change Adaptation, DRM, Data Analysis and/or Information Management.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience with the design and implementation of international development projects and/or programs. Working experience with multi- country/regional projects and projects supported by UNDP would be an asset.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience undertaking external reviews/evaluations of international development projects and/or programs.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Working experience in Pacific Island Countries would be an asset.
* Experience in implementing evaluations remotely

**Language requirements**

Strong verbal and written skills in English.

**COMPETENCIES**

* Strong interpersonal and communication skills for varied cultural contexts.
* Ability to work independently with minimal supervision.
* Displays gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* Computer literacy (e.g. Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint) is a prerequisite.
* Additional skills and knowledge of prototyping tools and technology will be useful.

**EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'. [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

**MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

These describe the organization and management structure for the evaluation and define the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

The M&E Analyst will act as the primary supervisor for the TE and will be the first point of contact for the assignment[[4]](#footnote-4). The UNDP DRM Advisor and RESPAC will ensure the evaluability of the RESPAC Project, provide inputs/advice on the detail and scope of the terms of reference for the evaluation and ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations. The Associate Project Managers and the Programme Support IC will provide other ancillary support to the TE exercise.

**TOR ANNEXES**

**ANNEX 1: STANDARD OUTLINE FOR AN EVALUATION REPORT.**

 Annex 1 provides further information on the standard outline of the evaluation report. In brief the minimum contents of an evaluation report include:

* Title and opening pages with details of the project/programme/outcome and of the evaluation team;
* Project and evaluation Information details: project title, Atlas number, budgets and project dates and other key information;
* Table of contents;
* List of acronyms and abbreviations;
* Executive summary: a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality standards and assurance ratings;
* Introduction and overview. What is being evaluated and why;
* Description of the intervention being evaluated. Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and evaluability analysis result, assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results
* Evaluation scope and objectives. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions;
* Evaluation approach and methods. The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis;
* Data analysis. The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation question;
* Findings and conclusions. Evaluation findings should be based on an analysis of the data collected and conclusions should be drawn from these findings;
* Recommendations. The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make;
* Lessons learned. As appropriate and as requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention; and
* Annexes.

**ANNEX 2: PROJECT EVALUATION SAMPLE QUESTIONS**

**Relevance:**

* To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, Sub Regional Programme Document, United Nations Pacific Strategy, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
* To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
* To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**Effectiveness:**

* To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
* To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
* To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**Efficiency:**

* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability:**

* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
* To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustain?

**Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions**

**Human rights:**

* To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

**Gender equality:**

* To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
* Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

**Annex 3:** Project documents including Theory of Change and Results Resource Framework

**Annex 4**: Key stakeholders and partners list

**Annex 5**: Documents to be consulted

* A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
	+ Relevant national strategy documents,
	+ Strategic and other planning documents (e.g., programme and project documents).
	+ Monitoring plans and indicators.
	+ Partnership arrangements (e.g., agreements of cooperation with Governments or partners).
	+ Previous evaluations and assessments.

UNDP evaluation policy, UNEG norms and standards and other policy document

**Annex 6:** **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

**Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub questions** | **Data sources** | **Data-collection methods/tools** | **Indicators/ success standard** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, RMI, Palau [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP will be supporting the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the RESPAC team. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)