Annex 1: Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Basic contract information

Location: Home Based (depending on travel ban, travel to Solomon Islands may be required)

Application Deadline: 28 February 2021

Type of Contract: Consultancy

Assignment Type: International

Language Required: English

Starting Date: February 2021

Duration of Initial Contract: 3 months

Expected Duration Assignment: 30 working days

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project***, ‘Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)’, PIMS 4607*** implemented through Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA); Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The project started on June 2015 and is in its final year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘[Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)’

It is noted that this project is jointly implemented by UNDP and FAO. As UNDP the lead agency, the conduct of the terminal evaluation is being led by UNDP.

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4067 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 92583 | GEF financing:  | 10,000,000.00 | 10,000,000.00 |
| Country: | Cook Islands; KiribatiMarshall Islands; Micronesia; Nauru; Palau; Niue; Papua New Guinea; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu, Fiji  | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Asia & Pacific | Governments: | 84,934,375.00 | 84,934,375.00 |
| Focal Area: |  International Waters | Other: |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 84,934,375.00 | 84,934,375.00 |
| Executing Agency: | FAO & UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 94,934,375 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA), World Wildlife Fund – Pacific Programme (WWF) | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  |  June 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:June 2019  | Actual:June 2021 |

Project background and context

The objective of the full-sized project is to support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional agreements for the conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries. The objective is in-line with the IW GEF-5 goal of *the promotion of collective management of trans-boundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services*. Activities of the project's four main components relate to regional, sub-regional and national actions for ecosystem-based management, as well as the coordination and management of knowledge. The main project outcomes include: (i) Implementation of agreed SAP incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), and policy/legal institutional reforms into national/local plans; (ii) Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs demonstrate sustainability; (iii) Innovative solutions implemented for rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, and port management and produce measurable results; and (iv) Climatic variability and change at coasts and in LMEs incorporated into SAPs to reflect adaptive management. The project will build on the successes of PIOFM-I and will be implemented in partnership with FAO through FFA and other organizations such as SPC, WWF over a four-year timeframe.

Since the pandemic of COVID-19 **Solomon Islands** has had 17 reported Covid 19 cases within its borders. Entry restrictions however has been announced by the Govt of Solomon Islands ,with entry restrictions effective as of 27 March 2020-until 27 March 2021. In terms of the delivery of the project, the implementation of the project has been slow in meeting quarterly planned targets. The travel ban has affected the delivery of some procured items into the country and the travel of one international consultant to complete conduct a training course on the Environmental and Social Safeguard Policy and Strategy. The project outcomes however have not changed and still remains as is.

Objective and Scope of the terminal evaluation

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

* + - * assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project’s outcome targets),
* assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
* assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF)
* assess any cross cutting and gender issues
* examination on the use of funds and value for money
* and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf).

Terminal Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Dependent on the travel restrictions, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to (locations), including the following project sites. Location will be confirmed during inception.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

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

1. Interviews using standard questionnaire

 A set of standard questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend and finalize report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

1. In country Field Mission & validation

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Solomon Islands to FFA HQ (but noting the current pandemic situation she/he may have to conduct this remotely until travel restrictions have been lifted)*,* including the project sites*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum. Specific individual’s contacts will be discussed during inception phase:

* Pacific Islands Forum Fishing Agency (FFA)
* Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC:
* Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA)
* Te Vaka Moana (TVM):
* Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA)
* World Wildlife Fund (WWF) South Pacific:
1. Interviews of UNDP and FAO Staff

The evaluator is expected to conduct interviews of UNDP staff who have been involved in oversight of the project for context and information on how the project has evolved. This will include the staff with the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji and the Regional Technical Adviser from UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.

From the FAO Liao Chongguang and Jessica Sanders.

1. Literature/Desktop Review

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

1. Analysis and reporting

Data collated will be analyzed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. Analysis will be provided in matric, tables to be best present findings and key recommendations; Reporting to be conducted in RBM (results-based management) approach.

1. Presentation of final draft to country office and stakeholders

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

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 toSolomon Islands has been restricted from late March 2020 until March 2021 as has been recently announced by the government of Solomon islands. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE 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 TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE 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 final TE 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 TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

Detailed scope of the te

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the [Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)*.* The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

 A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in the TOR (see Annex F).

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

• National priorities and country driven-ness

• 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

• Management arrangements

ii. 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) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)

• Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

• Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome 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)

• GEF Additionality

• Catalytic Role / Replication Effect

• Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

• The TE team 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 and the GEF, 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 GEF and 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.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for**

**‘Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (PIOFMP-II)’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight  |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days over a time period of 3 months starting on the 05 March 2021.Need to revise this The tentative TE timeframe is as follow:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
|  | Application closes  |
| *26 February 2021* | Selection of TE team |
| *04 March 2021* | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| *10 March 2021– 4 days* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| *12 March 2021– 2 days* | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
|  *30 Mar 2021 – 14 days*  | TE mission (virtual as optional): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| *2 April 2021* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| *13 April 2021 – 7 days* | Preparation of draft TE report |
| *21 April 2021* | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| *28 April 2021- 3 days*  | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report  |
| *05 May 2021* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *20 May2021* | Expected date of full TE completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission should it happen. (10 March 2021) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission if it happens. (29 March 21)  | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template F) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (13 April 21) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\* + Audit Trail** | Revised report and TE audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report.  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft by 20 May 21 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[2]](#footnote-2)

TE Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is UNDP Pacific Office. The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of a remote/visual meeting should the travel ban to **Solomon Island** continue over the period of when TE is expected to start.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

Team Composition

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

The evaluation will be conducted by an *International consultant.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage*.* The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

Education

* Master’s degree in Environmental Management/Science, Natural Resource Management or equivalent.

The Consultant must present the following qualifications:

* Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies
* Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Experience in evaluating projects
* Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience and has the technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation process and has lead evaluation process for at least 5 of UNDP/GEF funded projects
* Experience working in Asia and the Pacific, especially in SIDs, and has a good understanding of the biodiversity, conservation and climate change sector in the Pacific
* Experience working with communities, government sectors, NGOs and understands local protocols and customs and has excellent communication skills;
* Experience in the policy development processes associated with environment and sustainable development issues
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.

Evaluator Ethics

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| % |  Milestone | Deadlines |
| *20%* | payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit | 22 Feb 2021 |
| *40%* | payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit |  21 April 2021 |
| *40%* | payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail |  20 May 2021 |

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, 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.

Application process

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[3]](#footnote-3) provided by UNDP;
2. **Detailed CV**;
3. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price. All travel expenses to the country (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc) will be based on reimbursement. Breakdown of costs must be provided as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of PIOFM 2 Project” by email at the following address ONLY: *(* **Consultancy Proposal (CV & Financial proposal Template) should be uploaded on UNDP Jobshop website(**[**https://jobs.undp.org/cj\_view\_jobs.cfm?cur\_rgn\_id\_c=RAS**](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm?cur_rgn_id_c=RAS)**) no later than 31 January 2021 (FJ TIME)**Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

TOR Annexes

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator
* ToR Annex C: Evaluation Questions
* ToR Annex D: TE Rating Scale
* ToR Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
* ToR Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Report Audit Trail

**Annex A: Project Logframe**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  | **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** | **Contributions of Proposed Project** |
| **Outcome 2.1:** Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles, and policy/legal/ institutional reforms into national/local plans  | **Indicator 2.1:** Adoption or implementation of national/local reforms; functioning of national inter-ministry committees  | National reforms and successful management measures will be delivered in all Pacific SIDS in the WTPWP LME to ensure sustainability of the oceanic fishery resources. |
| **Outcome 2.2**: Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability  | **Indicator 2.2:** Cooperation frameworks agreed and include sustainable financing  | The WCPF Convention and the Commission were agreed and established with GEF support implemented by UNDP through FFA. The Commission is now financially self-sustaining; the proposed project will strengthen WCPFC further by supporting countries meet their obligations to the Convention to ensure long-term sustainability. In addition, the project will support the PNA who have the most productive tuna fishing grounds, to strengthen their subregional organization and management.  |
| **Outcome 2.3:** Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation, and port management and produce measureable results  | **Indicator 2.3:** Measurable results for reducing land-based pollution, habitat, and sustainable fisheries from local demonstrations, including community benefits (disaggregated by gender)  | There will be measurable results from innovative management arrangements including rights-based cap and trade management systems, enhanced compliance and enforcement schemes including port state controls and catch tracking, and by-catch mitigation arrangements. These results will include increased benefits for Pacific SIDS. |
| **Outcome 2.4:** Climatic variability and change at coasts and in LMEs incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management and ICM principles | **Indicator 2.4**: Updated SAPs and capacity development surveys | OFM aspects of the Pacific Islands IW SAP will be updated based on a new diagnostic analysis taking into account climate change and achievements in strengthening regional and sub-regional management arrangements |

|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **End of project target** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planned Global Environmental Benefits from the Project**Conservation of the globally important transboundary stocks of tunas, billfish and other large pelagic species, and the protection of the associated transboundary non-target species, especially of sharks, seabirds and sea turtles in the WTPWPLME, while considering climatic variability and change | Status of 4 key [[4]](#footnote-4) WCPO tuna stocks | 3 of the 4 key tuna stocks not subject to overfishing, but fishing mortality is rising on those 3 stocks, measures are needed to maintain sustainability. | Scientific projections indicate that fisheries on the major target stocks expected to result under the CMMs are sustainable | SC Reports | WCPFC CMMs, PNA VDS & Implementing Arrangements & other regional & sub-regional arrangements are effectively complied withWCPFC can control fishing in the high seasAgreement on CMMs can be reached in the WCPFC with other Commission Members |
| Status of key [[5]](#footnote-5)WCPO non-target species | Status of stocks of non-target species largely unknown. WCPFC has adopted mitigation measures to reduce mortalities of key non-target species, and requirements for species-specific reporting of catches of sharks and sea turtles, captures of seabirds and interactions with cetaceans.  | Reductions in catches and/or fishing mortalities of key non-target species. |
| **Project Objective**To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement & effectively enforce global, regional & sub-regional arrangements for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries | Number of Pacific SIDS meeting WCPFC obligations  | Principal legislative & policy framework aligned with WCPFC obligations for most Pacific SIDS. But subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and licence conditions need updating. | All Pacific SIDS’ subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and licence conditions aligned with WCPFC requirements & systematic processes in place in all Pacific SIDS for adoption of new measures.  | TCC Reports |  |
| Level of benefits to Pacific SIDS, including:a) access fee revenue &b) employment by gender | * 13,803 directly employed in fishing and processing (2010)
* Access fees estimated at $111[[6]](#footnote-6) million in 2010
 | * Employment in SIDS growing by up to 5% per year. with increasing proportion of women
* Access fees increasing by up to 10% per year
 | FFA Economic Indicators Report |
| **Component 1 Regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** |
| **Outcome 1.1**: Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation & management measures (CMMs) adopted and applied by the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating rights-based and ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making & informed by sound scientific advice & information | Number of key target stocks to which comprehensive WCPFC CMMs are applied in EEZs | Two Interim CMMs in place focusing on bigeye and south Pacific albacore, and both have been identified as insufficient.No systematic measures for management of other major target stocks | Comprehensive CMMs applied to all four key target stocks in EEZs by 2017.  | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions, ,the Scientific Committee (SC) & the Technical & Compliance Committee (TCC) | Differences between WCPFC Members do not result in gridlock in the Commission WCPFC is financially sustainable WCPFC SC & scientific work is adequately resourced & functions effectively |
| Number of key non-target species impacted by WCPO tuna fisheries to which WCPFC CMMs are being applied | Four preliminary CMMs in place for protection of cetaceans, whale sharks, seabirds & marine turtles, as well as controls on shark finning, & very recently adopted CMMs to protect some shark species but their effectiveness is not known | CMMs reflecting Scientific Committee advice & best practice among tuna RFMOs in place for protection of all key non-target species  |
| **Output 1.1.1**Ecosystem-based CMMs to control fishing mortality for the 4 major target stocks & to mitigate fishing impacts on key [[7]](#footnote-7)non-target species reflecting global best practices supported by all Pacific SIDS are submitted to WCPFC for adoption | Extent of submission of proposals for CMMs on target & non-target species by SIDS, & support for proposed CMMs on target & non-target species by SIDS  | Partial & interim CMMs are in place on only two of the key target species (south pacific albacore & bigeye tuna), and both have been identified as insufficient.CMMs in place to reduce the impact of fishing on turtles, seabirds, whale sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, & cetaceans  | CMMs reflecting global best practices submitted to the Commission & supported by SIDS for conservation & management of key tuna species, & protection of all key non-target species  | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions, ,the SC & TCC, & the Finance & Administration CommitteeReports of WCPFC External ReviewsFFA briefs for WCPFC meetingsReports of FFA Management Options Consultations & other relevant ad hoc consultation | Limits of SIDS institutional & human resources capacities do not prevent them from participating effectively in the WCPFCSIDs are able to maintain positions of regional solidarity in the face of pressure from DWFNs on preparation of proposals & support for WCPFC CMMs |
| Percentage of SIDS participating in WCPFC sessions including proportion of representation & office holding, including those by gender in SIDS delegations  | Baseline study will quantify the level of participation by SIDS at WCPFC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become office holders.  | 80% participation maintained by SIDS in all relevant WCPFC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the WCPFC & its subsidiary bodies. Gender target to be established by the baseline study |
| Number of briefs prepared & preparatory working groups facilitated to support SIDS for relevant WCPFC meetings | Processes developed in Phase I for preparation of Briefs & common SIDS positions  | All request for briefing documents and preparatory working groups are completed and improved participation of Pacific SIDS  |
| **Output 1.1.2** WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms in 8 key areas (see EOP target) to implement CMMs effectively & deter IUU fishing prepared &/or supported by all Pacific SIDS  | Status of key WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms operationalized. | WCPFC Vessel Monitoring System (VMS), Regional Observer Programme (ROP) and high Seas Boarding I Inspection Programme (HSBI) in early phase of partial implementation, Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) under trial, no Port State Measure or Catch TrackingFFA MTCs out of date.Niue Treaty Implementing Arrangements developed but not in effect. | WCPFC VMS, ROP &HSBI operational, CMS operational & Port State & Catch Tracking CMMs adopted.FFA MTCs updatedNiue Treaty Implementing Arrangements in effectReporting to WCPFC streamlined/automatedCooperative surveillance & enforcement enhanced under Niue Treaty  | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions & the Technical & Compliance CommitteeReports of FFA Consultations on WCPFC & relevant FFC reports | Distant water fishing members of the WCPFC are not able to obstruct efforts to deter IUU fishing Additional & effective sources of assistance to SIDS in MCS capacity building are identified & taken up |
| Extent of preparation & support of proposals for WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms by SIDS | Progress on CMS is constrained, & progress on Port state & Catch Documentation CMMs is severely constrained by considerations related to SIDS capacities | SIDS submit, or support proposals for CMS & relevant CMMs, including CMMs for Port State & Catch Tracking, & streamlined/automated procedures for reporting to the WCPFC |
| Patterns of participation by SIDS in WCPFC & TCC sessions including extent of representation & office holding, including participation by gender in SIDS delegations  | There is a high level of participation by SIDS at TCC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become TCC office holders. | At least 85% participation by SIDS in all TCC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the Commission & its subsidiary bodies |
| **Outcome 1.2:**Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change (CC) | Extent to which understanding of impacts of CC is reflected in management arrangements, including impacts on jurisdiction | There is a general understanding of the expected overall impacts but the information available has not been sufficiently specific to be reflected in management arrangements  | Management arrangements including jurisdictional arrangements have been reviewed to take into account effects of CC  | Project ReportsFFA, PNA, TVM & WCPFC Records | Analysis of impacts of CC demonstrates need for management to be adapted |
| **Output 1.2.1** CC forecasts & vulnerability of the Pacific SIDS region assessed in relation to 4 key target stocks and 6 key bycatch species & results & recommendations communicated to managers of potential impacts on oceanic fisheries  | Forecasts of sub-regional CC impacts on major target species made available and accessible | WCPO-wide forecasts prepared for skipjack & bigeye tuna  | Forecasts of sub-regional CC impacts on 4 major target species available by year 3  | Project reportsSPC scientific reports | Appropriate technical experts can be recruitedAvailable data supports finer scale (sub-regional) forecasts & analysis) |
| Number of assessments of CC impacts on key bycatch species | No information | Preliminary assessments of CC impacts for 6 key bycatch species by year 4 |
| **Output 1.2.2** *S*ea level rise impacts on fisheries jurisdictions assessed for 14 Pacific SIDS & Pacific SIDS governments informed on priority areas of action and policy option*s,* with related initiatives & related training of at least 45 personnel  | Scope & quality of technically sound information made available by the Project on the implications of sea level rise/CC on jurisdictional claims, including country-specific information  | Some general legal and academic analyses undertaken, but no country-specific or SIDS region-specific work known | Analyses available of legal, political & economic implications of sea level rise/CC for the Pacific SIDS on their jurisdictional claims & sovereign rights with policy and strategy options, with priority to SIDS most vulnerable to inundation.  | Project reports, including reports of national & regional consultations | SIDS attach priority to addressing the effect of sea level rise on fisheries jurisdiction SIDS can reach agreement on a regional approach |
| Availability of national country assessments and technical reports including impact studies and the regional strategy through a knowledge hub  | These analyses available through a knowledge hub |
| No. of SIDS personnel trained in relevant fields.  | No record of training in these areas | At least 45 policy, legal and maritime boundaries personnel trained in legal and socio-economic implications of climate change for oceanic fisheries jurisdiction. |  |  |
| Increased awareness of jurisdictional implications of CC demonstrated | Broad concerns held but no real awareness of possible responses | Jurisdictional implications of CC addressed at appropriate regional & global fora  | Reports of regional & global fora, including the Pacific Islands Forum, & media coverage | Relevant global fora attended by Pacific SIDS high level government representatives |
| **Output 1.2.3** Updated TDA for oceanic fisheries & updated oceanic fisheries management aspects of the Pacific Islands IW SAP  | Status of the revised TDA endorsement and implementation  | Transboundary issues analyses undertaken in 1997 | Revised TDA including climate variability and change adopted by the end of Year 2  | Updated TDA finalized & endorsed by Pacific SIDS | Technical expertise can be sourced to update the technical elements of the TDA & SAPSIDS have time in a crowded regional calendar to consider the updated TDA & SAP elements  |
| Status of the revised SAP endorsement and implementation | South Pacific SAP adopted in 1997 | Revised SAP incorporates new information on stock status, institutional & economic developments, & climate variability and change prepared by the end of Year 2  | Ministerial level adoption of a declaration to update relevant sections of the SAP by year 3 |

|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **End of project target** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 2 Sub-regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** |
| **Outcome 2.1** Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements are operationalized & enforced, including rights-based cap & trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability & incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications | Status of Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements | PNA purse seine VDS in early stages of implementation, other sub-regional arrangements broadly agreed or emerging but not yet implemented | Sub-regional arrangements, including cap & trade arrangements in purse seine & longline fisheries & eco-certification arrangements are in operation & contributing to fishery sustainability | Project recordsRecords of PNA, TVM & other sub-regional groupings | Sub-regional & arrangements strengthen, & do not undermine sustainable development of oceanic fisheriesSIDS remain committed to sub-regional management arrangements |
| **Output 2.1.1**Recommendations of the external review of the PNA VDS being implemented and applied to 1 million tonnes of catch annually in the EEZs of 7 of the 9 participating SIDS, including 20,000 tonnes of MSC-certified catch  | Status of rights-based cap & trade vessel-day schemes, & other PNA management arrangements | PNA purse seine VDS beginning to operate with acknowledged weaknessesExternal review of the purse seine VDS plannedPNA longline VDS in trial phase | VDS recommendations implemented and applied to catch of 1 million tonnes in the EEZs of 7 of the 9 participating SIDS Longline VDS in operation.Other PNA management arrangements in operation  | PNA RecordsMSC Audit reports | PNA Members maintain solidarity on key issues |
| Volume of MSC-certified catch supplied to the market  | PNA free school purse seine skipjack fishery certified but no catch marketed | 20,000 tonnes of MSC-certified catch supplied to the market annually | Industry find it attractive to provide certified catch |
| **Output 2.1.2**National harvest rights established and monitored for the 5 SIDS TVM participants  | Status of harvest rights & related management regimes for TVM fisheries | No formal national harvest rights established for TVM tuna fisheries | National Harvest rights for TVM longline & purse seine fisheries agreed & beginning to be used | TVM, FFA & WCPFC (TCC & Commission meeting) records | TVM & other SIDS able to agree on compatible in-zone management arrangementsDWFNs prepared to cooperate in management of key stocks occurring in the high seas |
| Status of monitoring arrangements & operational activities for TVM fisheries | Monitoring arrangements are operational at national level, but these need to be applied to monitoring harvest rights | Monitoring of use of harvest rights for TVM tuna fisheries beginning to be implemented  |
| **Output 2.1.3**Enhancements to other sub-regional management arrangements  | Status of other sub-regional management arrangements | Additional sub-regional management arrangements are emerging. MSG FTAC operations initiated, but limited in impact to date | Technical capacity of FTAC strengthened, outcomes and outputs mainstreamed for implementation. Other sub-regional arrangements contributing to sustainable development of oceanic fisheries where appropriate | Project RecordsRecords of other sub-regional management arrangements | SIDS perceive other sub-regional arrangements as contributing to sustainable development of oceanic fisheries  |
| **Component 3. National Actions for Ecosystem-Based Management**  |
| **Outcome 3.1**Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans & policies & with international, regional & sub-regional commitments & other relevant instruments  | Number of Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations  | Almost all Pacific SIDS have revised national laws to include obligations associated with the WCPFC Convention, but substantial lags exist in implementation of agreed arrangements through national plans, regulations and licence conditions, particularly for bycatch | At least 11 Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports WCPFC Reports |  |
| **Output 3.1.1** 9 new national oceanic fisheries management plans and/or policies in support of ecosystem-based management adopted with enhancement of fisheries management skills of 60 SIDS fisheries management personnel in all 14 SIDS  | Number of Pacific SIDS that have adopted new or revised oceanic fisheries management plans and/or, policies | 9 SIDS have been identified as requiring assistance to enhance national plans and policies  | New national management plans and/or policies adopted in at least 9 SIDS in support of ecosystem-based management | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports  | SIDS remain committed to regional & sub-regional management arrangementsCountries willing to host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments. Appropriate national personnel able to participateNational specialists available to take part |
| Number of fisheries management institutional & human resources capacity building activities by SIDS | New skills needed as management arrangements become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex | National capacity building & awareness raising activities conducted in all 14 Pacific SIDS | Project progress reports |
| Number of fisheries management planning & policy personnel trained by SIDS & gender | Large number of new management personnel appointed during Phase I requiring training | At least 60 management personnel in 14 SIDS trained in fisheries management, planning & policy | Training/ workshop/ attachment reports |
| **Output 3.1.2**11 revised national laws and regulations, &/or strengthened MCS programmes, and updated licence conditions in all 14 SIDS to operationalise WCPFC CMMs & other relevant conservation & management instruments with support through skills enhancement of law and compliance in 14 SIDS   | Number of Pacific SIDS that have adopted new or revised national laws, regulations, license conditions & strengthened MCS programmes | Almost all national laws revised to include obligations associated with becoming Party to the WCPFC Convention, but 11 SIDS identified as requiring assistance to include in national laws& regulations additional requirements arising from WCPFC CMMs & other sub-regional & regional instruments.Related improvements needed in licensing conditions in all 14 SIDS  | Revised national laws, regulations &/or strengthened MCS programmes adopted in at least 11 SIDS (to apply WCPFC CMMs, & regional & sub-regional arrangements including PNA Implementing Arrangements, MTCs, & the Niue Treaty subsidiary arrangement).Updated licence conditions in all 14 SIDS | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports  |
| Number of national legal & MCS reviews, consultations & workshops by SIDS | New skills needed as CMMs & MCS arrangements become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex, & the threat of IUU fishing increasesLarge numbers of new legal & MCS personnel requiring training | National legal & MCS reviews, consultations & workshops conducted in all 14 SIDS |
| Number of legal, MCS & enforcement training activities & personnel trained by SIDS & gender | At least 55 legal & 320 compliance officers trained to implement WCPFC CMMs, FFA MTCs & national laws | Training Reports |
| **Output 3.1.3**Mitigation measures for key[[8]](#footnote-8) bycatch species, including key shark species, integrated into national management planning processes by at least 11 SIDS | Number of National Plans of Action & National Management Plans for bycatch, & revisions to national laws, regulations & license conditions related to bycatch | Known shortfalls & delays in SIDS implementation of monitoring of bycatch, especially key shark species, & bycatch mitigation measures.Weak regional standards for shark conservation | At least 11 SIDS have integrated bycatch mitigation into national management planning processes at the national level & aligned national requirements with relevant sub-regional or regional measures or global instruments. Better understanding of potential contribution of bycatch to food security | Project documentationWCPFC Compliance Monitoring reports | Sufficient priority attached to bycatch mitigationImproved information on bycatch rates & mortalities becomes availableResources available for bycatch mitigation monitoring & research  |
| **Outcome 3.2**Integrated data & information systems & scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring & compliance | Use of oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis by Pacific SIDS. | Most SIDS have operational monitoring, licensing & MCS (VMS) data systems in place, but their use is limited gaps, weaknesses & lack of integration of data systems. Phase I outputs, including National Tuna Fisheries Status Reports, national scientific webpages & scientific inputs into ecosystem-based management plans provide a basis with enhanced skills for increased use of scientific advice in Phase II  | Enhanced oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis being used by all 14 Pacific SIDS, reflecting upgraded data & information systems in at least 10 Pacific SIDS, and newly integrated systems in at least 4 SIDS.  | Project recordsFFA, SPCWCPFC Reports | SIDS capacity constraints do not unduly constrain their participation in data & scientific work |
| **Output 3.2.1** Upgraded national data & information management systems developed & operationalized in 10 SIDS with training for around 350 personnel |  Level of development of SIDS national integrated data & information systems | Most SIDS have operational monitoring, licensing & MCS (VMS) data systems in place, but with some gaps & weaknesses & they are not integrated.  | Upgraded data & information systems in operation in 10 SIDS. | Project reports | Countries can afford to release staff for training & attachments. |
| Number of monitoring & data staff trained in each SIDS & gender balance in participation  | Large number of new monitoring & data personnel requiring training | Training provided to around 350 national monitoring & data personnel  |
| **Output 3.2.2** National scientific analysis & support for ecosystem-based management provided to all 14 Pacific SIDS, with training for around 120 personnel  | Number of comprehensive scientific advice provided to all Pacific SIDS | Basic stock assessment work now financed by the Commission, allowing a shift in emphasis to providing national advice building on Phase I progress.  | Scientific advice & analysis on oceanic fisheries applied by all 14 SIDS | SPC ReportsProject reports | All SIDS seek national scientific advice |
| Number of participation by SIDS in SC sessions including extent of representation & office holding, including participation by gender in SIDS delegations | There is a high level of participation by SIDS at WCPFC & SC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become office holders. | 85% participation maintained by SIDS in SC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the SC  | SC reports | Limits of SIDS technical & scientific capacities do not prevent them from participating effectively in the SC |
| Number of technical & scientific staff trained in each SIDS by gender | Regional workshops, attachments & in-country training in Phase I have established the foundation for scientific analyses. | Around 120 national technical & scientific personnel trained in stock assessment methods & interpretation & ecosystem assessment & monitoring | Project reportsSPC presentations to SIDS for WCPFC & SC meetings, & relevant SPC & FFA meetings  | Countries can afford to release staff for training & attachments. |
| **Component 4. Stakeholder Participation & Knowledge Management** |
| **Outcome 4.1** Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national & regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement & participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities | Percentage of participation by industry & other civil society stakeholders in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities, including INGO & ENGO participation  | PITIA & WWF participated in Phase I & both have recently strengthened their programmes in oceanic fisheries management Major progress under Phase I in external communications by the Project needs to be built on | Greater understanding of the need for management & the issues involved with proactive contributions from industry & other elements of civil society to the conservation effort  | Project reports PITIA & WWF websitesPITIA, WWF, FFA/FFC, SPC & WCPFC reports  | High degree of political commitment to transparency & inclusivityProject activities & outcomes are effective in contributing to focusing increased attention on oceanic fisheries, especially management & conservation issues |
| Number of national consultative or advisory processes/committees created or strengthened & operational  | National consultative & advisory processes are variable & often weak if they exist at all | Formal advisory committees established & operational in at least 10 SIDS |
| **Output 4.1.1** Broader stakeholder (Pacific SIDS, regional institutions, fishing industry & business sector, environmental NGOs, local NGOs, civil society, among others) awareness & involvement  | Pacific Island tuna industry contribution to oceanic fisheries management | PITIA has begun to play a fuller role in 2012.  | Widespread understanding among industry of the oceanic fisheries management issues important to the Pacific Islands tuna industry PITIA providing info on the value of Pacific fisheries to national economies & the importance of management & conservation efforts | PITIA website Media statements made through agreed collective industry positionsPITIA promotional material Reports of PITIA meetings  | PITIA remains active & able to participate in Project activitiesPITIA able to use the knowledge & expertise of its Board & members to contribute to this process  |
| Extent of WWF & other ENGO engagement in oceanic fisheries management | WWF has recently strengthened its engagement in WCPO tuna fisheriesGrowing interest by ENGOs generally in WCPO tuna fisheries management | Activities of WWF & other ENGOs contribute to improved oceanic fisheries management, including through raising awareness & supporting eco-certification | Websites of WWF & other ENGOsENGO media statements & promotional material | WWF & other ENGOs able to maintain a focus on WCPO tuna fisheries  |
| **Output 4.1.2** Increased awareness & coordination through project workshops & meetings contributing to wider support for national, sub-regional & regional project activities with increased participation by women | No. of SIDS participating in Project Meetings  | Level of participation in PIOFMP-I  | Full participation by SIDS  | Reports of Project activities and MeetingsProject Gender Analysis | Senior SIDS personnel can find time to participate in the Inception Workshop & RSC meetings |
| Percentage of participation of women in such events based on sex-disaggregated data | Level of participation in PIOFMP-I  | Increasing nos. of women participating as SIDS representatives |
| Key FFA and FAO staff from PIOFMP-II and ABNJ Tuna Projects participate in respective PSCs, where PIOFMP-II/ABNJ Tuna Project coordination is discussed | Key FFA, SPC and FAO personnel have been involved in the development of the PIOFM-II and ABNJ Tuna Projects | FFA CTA attends Tuna ABNJ Project PSCFAO Tuna Project LTO attends PIOFMP-II RSCPIOFMP-II/Tuna ABNJ coordination is discussed at respective PSCs |
| **Output 4.1.3** Effective project implementation through M&E with feedback mechanisms utilizing the regional & sub-regional arrangements & existing national mechanisms | Use of M&E Information | N/A | M&E information being used to ensure effectiveness of project activities & being fed into regional fisheries processes | RSC, FFC & SPC Heads of Fisheries ReportsMid-term and Final Evaluation Reports | SIDS participate effectively in M&E processes |
| **Outcome 4.2** Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource & ecosystems management & impacts of climate change | Level of media coverage of relevant issues | Phase I & the early period of operation of the WCPFC have generated greatly increased interest, focused on iconic non-target species, especially sharks. Awareness of associated with target stocks is inadequate in relation to their regional & global importanceGeneral awareness of the expected impacts of CC on oceanic fish stocks & fisheries, but key institutional & legal aspects have not been raised. | Widespread, well informed coverage in Pacific Islands media of issues associated with conservation management of target & non-target species, & CC impacts  | Internet searchesProject documentationTechnical Reports & media coverage | Project activities & outcomes are effective in contributing to focusing increased attention on oceanic fisheries, especially management & conservation issues |
| No. of communiques from relevant regional fora, including Pacific Island Leaders’ meetings covering oceanic fisheries | Oceanic fisheries management regularly addressed in Leaders’ communiques | Communiques from Pacific Leaders’ meetings & other regional fora |
| Continuing donor interest in funding oceanic fisheries agencies & projects  | Donors, including the ADB & World Bank shied away from fisheries as catches approached their limits because of perceived lack of potential development gains.  | Success in this Project & related activities encourages increased donor interest in Pacific Islands oceanic fisheries, attracted by the scope for increasing value through better management,  | Donor reports |
| **Output 4.2.1** Knowledge management (KM) & information systems (IS) that support communications and advocacy efforts by Pacific SIDS for the best management of their oceanic fisheries resources, including creation of a project website, publications, participation in relevant UNDP, FAO and GEF events and information exchanges particulary in IW;LEARN | KM & IS strategy developed and adopted | Phase I strategy provides a basis but needs further development | Strategy developed in year 1 and implemented by Year 2 |  KM & & IS strategy documentation | Skilled media expertise can be attracted to work with the Project Sufficient interest among stakeholders to make website \effective means of communication & information dissemination |
| Project website established and launched in Year 1 | Website from Phase I still in operation, but needs updating | Website is in operation by Year 2, and routinelyupdated, capturing resultsfrom Project activities, and providing links to key sources of information on regional oceanic fisheries  | Measures of website use |
| Number of Pacific SIDS using quality promotional materials  | Some experience in Phase I, with some successes, that can be built on, but this was an area identified as needing greater priority in PIOFMP-II | Project promotional materials being used by all 14 SIDS | Project CDs, pamphlets, videos, publications & giveaways |
| Number of staff participation in relevant UNDP, FAO & GEF events (especially IW:LEARN) | Partnership developed with UNDP & GEF now needs to be complemented by association with FAO | Number of Project staff & counterparts participating in GEF, UNDP & FAO events especially biennial IW Conferences | Project Documents including travel reports | Counterparts available to participate in these events |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
|  | *Add documents, as required* |
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Annex D.Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  | * ~~Is the project relevant to Nauru’s environmental policies & Nauru development plan?~~
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to United National Pacific Strategy for the country?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to UNDP Pacific’s Sub Regional Programme Document?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project specifically addressing gender issues and any other
 |  |  |  |
|  | * • How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the country/region?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * • Is the project internally consistent in its design?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent has the delivered project outputs contributed to the achievement of its expected outcomes?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the project’s expected targets against the outcomes achieved?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How was risk managed during the project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Which changes could have been made in project’s design to improve its effectiveness?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Was adaptive management needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * • Were progress reports produced in a timely manner and in compliance to project reporting requirements?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders? Be specific to mention any legal agreements or memorandum of understanding signed to ascertain partnership.
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? And if such partners/stakeholders were identified, which ones were they?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the region?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * • How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt to ensure quality reporting to the global platforms?
 |  |  |  |
|  | **Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * How likely is the project to achieve its long-term goal?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Are stakeholders more aware about the project’s contribution towards setting up an EMIS and ensuring that it is operational? Which ones?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What is the impact of the project for the citizens of ~~Nauru~~ in terms of awareness about the government’s commitment to reporting its updated environmental data to the global platforms of the Rio conventions?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the level of influence and visibility of the project in ~~Naur~~u in promoting sustainable development?
 |  |  |  |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).



# Annex F: TE Rating Scales

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance | Sustainability ratings:  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomingsUnable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment | 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainabilityUnable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

Annex G: Terminal Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:****Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of Implementing a “*Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) PIMS 4607.***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/****Organization** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team****response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Includes bigeye, skipjack, south Pacific albacore and yellowfin tunas, which make up over 95% of the commercial catch in SIDS waters [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Includes 13 species of sharks impacted by fishing, 5 species of sea turtles, seabirds and cetaceans [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. FFA Economic Indicators Update, October 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See footnote 33 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See footnote 33 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)