

## **MID TERM REVIEW REPORT:**

***BUILDING CAPACITIES TO ADDRESS INVASIVE ALIEN  
SPECIES TO ENHANCE THE CHANCES OF LONG-TERM  
SURVIVAL OF TERRESTRIAL ENDEMIC AND THREATENED  
SPECIES ON TAVEUNI ISLAND, SURROUNDING ISLETS  
AND THROUGHOUT FIJI PROJECT (PIMS#5589)***

**“FIJI IAS Project”**

## **FINAL REPORT**

**Date: 22 May 2021**

**Prepared by :**

**Jan Rijpma, International Consultant,  
Patrick Fong, National Consultant**

**Basic Report Information:**

<b>Project Title</b>	Building capacities to address Invasive Alien Species to Enhance the Chances of Long - term Survival of Terrestrial Endemic and Threatened Species on Taveuni Island, Surrounding Islets and Throughout Fiji Project		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5589	PIF Approval Date:	06 April 2017
GEF Project ID (PIMS #):	9095	CEO Endorsement Date:	
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00084576	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	16 May 2018
Country(ies):	Fiji	Date project manager hired:	31 July 2018
Region:	Pacific	Inception Workshop date:	26-27 September 2018
Focal Area:	BD	Midterm Review completion date:	May 2021
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	Prevention, Control and Management of IAS	Planned closing date:	July 2023
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	USD 3,502,968	If revised, proposed operational closing date:	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	Biosecurity Agency of Fiji (BAF)		
Other execution partners:			
<b>Project Financing</b>	<i>at CEO endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at Midterm Review (US\$)*</i>	
[1] GEF financing:	3,502,968	3,502,968	
[2] UNDP contribution:		101,096	
[3] Government:	26,864,514	26,736,418	
[4] Other partners:			
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	26,864,514	26,837,514	

**MTR team members:** Jan Rijpma, International Consultant; Patrick Fong, National Consultant

**Acknowledgements:**

This MTR was undertaken under challenging circumstances, with most of the work done remotely, also taking into account serious time differences between consultants. The Mid Term Review Team would therefore like to thank the Project Implementation Unit of the Fiji Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Project (Ilaisa Dakaica, Ravinesh Chand), UNDP Country Office (Floyd Robinson, Vinaisi Dilikuwau, Merewalesi Laveti, Winifereti Naninoca), the acting CEO of Biosecurity Agency Fiji (BAF), Mr. Surend Pratap, other staff of the (BAF), the UNDP-GEF Regional technical Adviser, Penny Stock, all project implementers, consultants, stakeholders and whoever we talked to for all their support.

Apologies for the late and early interviews.

Thank you, keep well and stay safe!

## Table of Contents

<b>Basic Report Information:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2. Project Description and Background Context</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3. Findings</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.1. Project Strategy</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1.1. Project Design	14
3.1.2. Results Framework/ Logframe	15
<b>3.2. Progress Towards Results</b>	<b>20</b>
3.2.1. Progress towards outcomes analysis	20
3.2.2. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	22
3.2.3. Expand benefits	23
<b>3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>	<b>23</b>
3.3.1. Management Arrangements	23
3.3.2. Work planning	25
3.3.3. Finance and co-finance	25
3.3.4. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems	26
3.3.5. Stakeholder engagement	26
3.3.6. Reporting	27
3.3.7. Communications	27
3.3.8. Gender mainstreaming in project implementation.	27
<b>3.4. Sustainability</b>	<b>28</b>
3.4.1. Financial risks to sustainability	33
3.4.2. Socio-economic risks to sustainability	33
3.4.3. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	34
3.4.4. Environmental risks to sustainability	34
<b>3.5. Lessons Learned</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4. Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.1. Conclusions</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.2. Recommendations</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5. Annexes</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Annex 1: Detailed Terms of Reference for Independent Mid Term Review of the Fiji Invasive Alien Species Project</b>	<b>41</b>

**Annex 2: Revised Work Plan MTR..... 54**

**ANNEX 3: List of documents reviewed ..... 55**

**ANNEX 4: List of persons interviewed ..... 56**

**ANNEX 5: MTR evaluative matrix..... 58**

**ANNEX 6: Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis: ..... 61**

**ANNEX 7: Ratings Scales ..... 74**

**ANNEX 8: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form ..... 75**

**ANNEX 12: MTR final report clearance form ..... 76**

**Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report ..... 77**

**Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools ..... 77**

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AFL	Airports Fiji Limited
BAF	Biosecurity Authority of Fiji
BD	Biodiversity
CI	Conservation International
COVID(-19)	Corona Virus Disease – 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
CTS	Chief Technical Specialist
DOE	Department of Environment
EDRR	Early Detection and Rapid Response
EDP	Emergency Response Plan
FIIT	Four island IAS Taskforce
FIST	Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce
FNU	Fiji National University
FRCA	Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GII	Giant Invasive Iguana
GMO	Genetically Modified Organisms
GoF	Government of Fiji
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
IBA	Important Bird Area
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IP	Implementing Partner
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
KBA	Key Bird Area
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MEPEPSC	Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprises, Public Services and Communications
MOE	Ministry of Environment, Waterways and Agriculture
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NEC	National Environment Council
NEX	National Execution
NF/MV	Nature Fiji / Mareqiti Viti (NGO)
NIM	National Implementation
NISFSAP / NISSAP	National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPD	National Project Director
PAO	Project Administrative and Finance Officer
PC	Project Coordinator
PIF	Project Identification Form
PILN	Pacific Invasive Learning Network
PIP	Pacific Invasive Partnership
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant

PSC	Project Steering Committee
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
RFP	Request for Proposal
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SESP	Socio-Economic and Environmental Screening Procedures
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SIP	Stakeholder Involvement Plan
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of Pacific Regional Environment Program
TBSO	Temporary Biosecurity Officer (BAF)
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TT	Tracking Tool
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Programme Country Office
USP	University of South Pacific
WPA	Women's Plan of Action
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

## Executive Summary

### Project Description:

Invasive alien species (IAS) are the greatest threat to biodiversity in the Pacific Islands. The isolated nature and extreme vulnerability of island ecosystems and species to impacts such as habitat destruction and invasive alien species (IAS) has resulted in many species of this region becoming endangered.

Taveuni Island and the surrounding islets of Qamea, Matagi and Laucala are considered as an important biosecurity area, with significant forest and wetland ecosystems, and endemic and other native species are better protected here than in many other areas of Fiji.

The Giant Invasive Iguana (GII: *Iguana iguana*), an aggressive invasive pest, was imported illegally into Fiji in 2000 and introduced to Qamea. Since then GII is known to have established on two adjacent islands: Laucala and Matagi. The proximity of these islands to Taveuni is of particular concern. GII has been known to proliferate and expand its range to catastrophic levels under similar climatic conditions as in Fiji, and could be expected to spread to other islands if not prevented. This could then also represent a potential bridgehead to some of the world's most isolated island ecosystems in the Pacific. GII pose a very real threat to Fiji's two threatened native iguanid species, but also inflict major negative impacts on native biodiversity, agriculture, tourism and health.

Although there are several national and local-level initiatives to address IAS in Fiji, these efforts lack adequate capacity and an overall comprehensive strategy to ensure a systematic and effective protection of biodiversity-rich and important areas. An effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort against GII, before populations grow beyond the point where they can be controlled, is currently lacking and urgently needed.

The **objective** of the project is: *To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species.*

The overarching objective will be achieved through four interrelated outcomes namely:

- **Component 1:** Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji
- **Component 2:** Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi
- **Component 3:** Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala
- **Component 4:** Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping to invasive alien species and biosecurity

This is a **5- year project that started in May 2018, with a total grant of USD 3,502,968 from the Global Environment Facility (GEF)**, and with parallel from the Government of Fiji of USD 26,736,418 and in-kind co-financing from UNDP of \$101,096. Stakeholders participating in this project include the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF), Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority, Fiji Airports Limited, Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji, Ministry of I Taukei Affairs, Non-Governmental Organizations (Nature Fiji) and Tertiary Institutions (University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University), amongst others.

The **Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF) is the project implementing partner** and is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including achieving project outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and the effective use of UNDP resources. A Project Implementation Unit (PIU) based at BAF is responsible

for executing activities on a day-to-day basis. Additional support is provided by consultants, and Field Eradication Officers and Temporary Biosecurity Officers (TBSO) at project sites.

### Project Progress Summary:

The well informed and relevant project document was signed in May 2018. The project started reasonably swiftly with project coordinator recruited in July 2018, stationed in BAF, and the Inception Workshop took place in September 2018. Partnerships were established and main consultants came on board in 2019. The GII eradication Plan was operationalized, but the overall and key National Invasive Species Framework and Action Plan (NISFSAP), Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Framework, Training Plan, communication and awareness strategies took time to initiate and these are still not finalized and under implementation. This is also caused by the COVID-19 pandemic as gatherings, workshops, consultants visits and monitoring were halted, thereby stalling implementation.

The overarching coordination around IAS is not yet functioning, with the proposed National IAS Committee not established, the Fiji Invasive Species Task Force (FIST) not meeting and the Four Island Invasive Task Force (FIIT) not yet established. Some coordination and work around IAS is taking place through ad hoc Task Forces, but this only started recently and its status is unclear.

After almost 3 years in the project, measurable progress is low, especially when measured against the project indicators. Financial delivery is also low, especially in the nationally oriented Outcomes, as compared to the Outcomes working around Taveuni, where activities have taken place.

Sustainability of the project is not guaranteed, as the main policies, strategies and coordination is not (yet) in place, and government budgets towards biosecurity and IAS are being cut.

Nevertheless, when the necessary policies and strategies are in place and are being implemented, coordinated through well functioning bodies and implemented through a strengthened PIU with effective support from consultants, BAF and UNDP, the project should be able to make headway and achieve meaningful results in preventing and controlling IAS in Fiji.

**Table 1. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table:**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	Good design, well articulated Strategy, but indicators and targets unclear or not realistic
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: 3 (MU)	New Policy and legal frameworks not in place, fair number of project beneficiaries but no training plan, marginal Tracking Tool score increase, level of government funding decreased
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: 3 (MU)	FIST not operational, EDRR not finalized.
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: 3 (MU)	No baseline. Draft Black & White lists, no Training needs assessment, trainings done but without plan. Inspection and Quarantine services on Islands unclear
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: 3 (MU)	Baselines unclear. Progress of GII Eradication Plan unclear. Community perceptions unclear. Status of native iguana reported.
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: 4 (U)	No Baseline. No national communication programme started. No progress on clearinghouse and national IAS database. Hardly any project outlays.
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	Rating: (3) MS	Implementation appreciated by stakeholders, but targets not met (due to several, including outside reasons), communication and reporting to be improved



<b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: 3 (MU)	BAF functioning and certain capacities available, but main policies, plans and new legal framework not (yet) in place and financial sustainability not guaranteed
-----------------------	----------------	---

### Summary of conclusions:

#### Project Strategy

1. The Project is well designed and the project Document well written. However, indicators are not all SMART, some baselines are missing and targets are arbitrary.
2. The focus of the project on the potential threat of the Giant Invasive Iguana was questioned by some stakeholders.

#### Progress Towards Results:

3. Good appreciation of the project objective and outcomes, however, progress is falling behind, mainly due to unsatisfactory indicators, missing baselines and targets, which makes it difficult to assess progress towards project results, and delays caused by the COVID pandemic.
4. Key policies and strategies are not (yet) delivered by the project, i.e. the NISFSAP and EDRR, which are key to effective prevention and eradication of IAS
5. Coordination around IAS is not functioning: The Fiji Invasive Species Task force (FIST) is not meeting and the Four Islands IAS Task force (FIIT) has not yet been established
6. No comprehensive Training Need Assessment and Training Plan; Tracking Tool score only marginally increased; Capacity Score Card was submitted very late and could not be verified, but capacity of BAF showed increase.
7. The awareness and outreach programme around the GII eradication has recently started, and needs to be better reported. The National communication and outreach programme has not started.
8. The work on databases and clearinghouse on IAS has not started.

#### Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

9. There is a full fledged PIU, but they seem stretched, and the Project Manager is leaving in April 2021.
10. Support from consultants was challenging without visits and remote communication and uncertain contracts.
11. BAF housed and supported the PIU and project. However, there is no full-fledged and empowered CEO in place and BAF suffered drastic budget cuts and diminished revenues.
12. The Steering Committee consists of very few members and has only met twice (in 2018 and 2021).
13. Delivery at 35% at mid-term, with higher delivery in Outcome 2 and 3, and much lower delivery in Outcome 4 and almost no delivery in Outcome 4.
14. Co-financing is reported to be at 27%, but this could not be verified, as the co-financing was submitted very late and not in correct format.
15. Result monitoring and reporting has been weak.
16. A variety of stakeholders is engaged with the project, though some only recently. The Department of Environment is not active in the project, and does not organize FIST meetings.
17. Internal and external communication in and from the project needs to be improved.
18. Although there is a "Gender Analysis and Action Plan" for the project, there is little reporting against it.

#### Sustainability

19. Reporting to risks and updated of risk logs has been minimal.
20. Financial Risks to sustainability are significant, with government and BAF suffering from budget cuts and reduced revenues.
21. Economic and social threats and costs of IAS are still unclear to many economic operators and the public in general.

22. If main policies and action plans are not in place and coordination around IAS will not function properly, this poses major risks for ecosystems and sustainable development.

#### Recommendation Summary Table

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
<b>A</b>	<b>Project Strategy</b>	
A.1	Review and revise RRF and Indicator Framework.	PIU, UNDP, BAF
<b>B</b>	<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	
B.1	Organize a Stock-take and Planning Workshop post MTR for refocusing and better implementation of the project, leading to a new multi-year workplan.	PIU, UNDP, BAF
B.2	Prioritize finalization of NISFSAP, EDRR, Training Needs Assessment, Training Plan, national awareness and knowledge & information systems in the new multi-year workplan.	PIU, BAF
B.3	Review implementation of GII Eradication Plan and propose revised action plan.	PIU, UNDP, BAF
B.4	Revive and strengthen FIST, FIIT, Project Board (including the new full-fledged CEO, more and relevant members and more frequent, well-structured meetings).	PIU, BAF
<b>C</b>	<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	
C.1	Strengthen the PIU and speed up implementation. The current Project Manager is leaving and will need to be replaced soonest by a full-fledged contracted Project Manager. An extra contracted (associate) coordinator should be contracted to take care of Outcome 2 (Prevention and Control of IAS around Taveuni) and 3 (control / eradication of GII), stationed in or around Taveuni, recruited and paid for by co-financing through BAF.	BAF, UNDP
C.2	The new and strengthened PIU should lead in the strategizing and planning exercise with all main stakeholders and partners as recommended in B. above.	PIU
C.4	The PIU should improve its internal and external communication and visibility.	PIU
C.5	The present CTA to finalize outstanding deliverables, and then re-work the TORs of CTA as a function of the new Multi-Year Plan.	CTA, PIU
C.6	As a function of the review of the GII Eradication Plan, re-work the TORS for GII Eradication Specialist and advertise.	PIU
C.7	Include more members and ensure 6 monthly meetings of the Project Board.	Project Board
C.8	Results reporting needs to be improved, possibly by using the new template of the UNDP CO.	PIU, UNDP
C.9	Financial reporting needs to be closely monitored, especially the delivery per Outcome, as these are uneven. Closely monitor and report on Co-Financing as well.	PIU, UNDP
C.10	Strengthen project oversight and guidance from UNDP: Continue to allocate a programme associate in the IGR cluster to the project, allow more time to Programme Analyst to oversee the project, and new RTA should be further engaged and visit the project (when possible).	UNDP CO, RTA
C.11	Implement and fully report on the "Gender Analysis and Action Plan".	PIU, BAF, UNDP
C.12	Building on the foundations already laid and with improved project performance following the recommendations above, it is recommended to extend the project with another 6 months (no cost extension), or to the end of 2023, in order to achieve still meaningful and sustainable results.	BAF, UNDP
<b>D</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	
D.1	Risks to project sustainability should be better monitored and reported, especially the financial sustainability.	PIU, UNDP
D.2	The national IAS awareness programmes should be urgently implemented and results used to counter any prevalent reticence and risk to the increased effort for prevention and control of IAS.	PIU, BAF

## 1.Introduction

This is the **Draft Report for the Mid Term Review (MTR)** of the Project *“Building Capacities to Address Invasive Alien Species to Enhance the Chances of Long-term Survival of Terrestrial Endemic and Threatened Species on Taveuni Island, Surrounding Islets and Throughout Fiji project”*, or *“Fiji Invasive Alien Species Project”* for short. Two consultants: Jan Rijpma, International Consultant, and Patrick Fong, National Consultant, were recruited in March 2021 to conduct this Mid-Term Review. According to the TORs for this assignment, the deliverables of the assignment are: MTR Inception Report, Presentation of initial findings, Draft Final Report and Final Report. This document presents the Draft Report for this assignment. The “Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects” mentions that: *“The MTR inception report should outline the MTR team’s understanding of the project being assessed and the methodology(ies) the team will use to ensure the data collected is credible, reliable and useful”*.

The **consultants have been recruited by the UNDP Fiji Office** and will be overseen and supervised by UNDP in Fiji (Programme Analyst, the Team Leader of the Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit and the M&E specialist) in close cooperation with the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (National Implementing Agency), and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor based in UK, supported by the UNDP-GEF programme officer in Bangkok, Thailand. Virtual meetings were held with the Project Team, UNDP Fiji and between the National and International Consultant in February and early March 2021, where some of the pressing issues were discussed, including on how to conduct the MTR during the current COVID-19 lockdown restrictions. Some relevant documents were received by the MTR team from the UNDP Fiji office.

The **main purpose of the MTR** is to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, assess any cross cutting and gender issues in contribution to achieving the objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation for the remaining period of the project), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that (who) will be use to improve the project.

The **objective** of the Mid Term Review (MTR) is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR reviewed the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability, the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management were presented to key project stakeholders. The MTR also looked at cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, inclusiveness, human rights approach, environmental safeguards, climate change, etc. Findings of this review are to be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remainder of the project’s term.

The MTR **provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful**. The MTR team followed a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, project consultants, the UNDP Fiji Country Office, the former and current UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other implementers and key beneficiaries and other stakeholders. Cross cutting issues (e.g. gender) were considered and data disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, where available and possible.

The MTR was based around a **participatory approach** that ensured the full engagement and involvement of the in-country project management team, project beneficiaries and other key in-country stakeholders. The process as a whole aimed to provide succinct and useful advice strategies and recommendations based on sound analysis.

The MTR team **reviewed all relevant sources of information that were provided in detail**, including documents prepared during the preparation phase, e.g. PIF, Project Document, Project Inception Report, Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy (SESP), Project Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), Project Workplans, Mission and Back To Office Reports, Workshop Reports, Consultancy Inception, technical and final reports, Technical and Project Steering Committee Minutes, Project Financial Statements, Project Tracking Tools<sup>1</sup>, lessons learned reports, national strategic, policy and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review, see also ANNEX 1. Some documents were received in the later stage of the MTR, notably the Co-Finance Table (also not in correct format), UNDP Capacity Development Score Card and Risk Assessments, and hence could not be properly assessed and reported upon.

**Interviews with key stakeholders** were conducted to supplement the written documentation and provide an opportunity for project management team, project beneficiaries and other key project stakeholders to present their views directly to the MTR team. A total of 36 relevant stakeholders were interviewed from 22 March to 16 April 2021 (most virtually, via Zoom and face-to-face for stakeholders based in Taveuni and Qamea). Interviews targeted a diverse array of stakeholders, especially those with project responsibilities, project beneficiaries, government representatives, civil society organizations, academia, the private sector, local government officials, and national agency officials. The National Consultant also visited the main project sites around the islands of Qamea, Taveuni, Matagi and Laucala from 8 – 10 April 2021, and spoke to the main local stakeholders. Some main stakeholders could not be interviewed, e.g. from the Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Waterways. See Annex 4 for a list of Interviews held.

For this MTR, there were some significant **limitations**. The MTR was scheduled for March – April 2021 and took place during the still ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. In 2020, lockdowns were declared in Lautoka, Labasa and Suva. As a result of these travel restriction, project field work including awareness raising and surveys was temporarily put on hold for at least 2 months in 2020. At the time of writing undertaking the MTR (March – April 2021), though some restrictions are being eased, international travel to Fiji is still restricted and not advised, and UNDP also prohibited this. Guidance for undertaking evaluations (including MTRs) during COVID from the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)<sup>2</sup> mentions that *“Planned MTRs/MTEs/TEs of Vertical Fund financed projects should proceed as scheduled using virtual means where possible”* and *“care should be taken to not place any consultant or stakeholders (national or international) in harm’s way and evaluation methodologies proposed should limit the exposure of stakeholders to the pandemic”*.

Another limitation was that interviews that required the participation of the International Consultant (apart from the site visit) were held through virtual means, and normally outside working hours, because of the **time difference of 11 hours between Fiji and The Netherlands** where the International Consultant resides. This provided only a limited opportunity for interviews each day (max. 2 interviews / day, usually during non-working hours). It proved also difficult at times to communicate effectively with the National Consultant and the Project Implementation Unit during these limited times, and requests and emails were not always adequately responded to or followed up. Some necessary documents (e.g. on Co-Financing, Capacity Score Card, Risk Assessments) were not received in time (some were finally, after several requests, received after the mission and past the deadlines) and also comments on the draft MTR from the PIU were received late.

---

<sup>1</sup> The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

<sup>2</sup> “Evaluation planning and implementation during Covid-19” by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, March 2020.

An MTR Inception Meeting was held with the main Project Protagonists (PIU, UNDP, UNDP RTA) on 18/03/2021 to give a brief about the project (UNDP), discuss the MTR methodology, clarify some possible outstanding issues and chart the way forward, especially the interview process and field visit (by National Consultant). A **Debrief** of the main MTR findings was held after the majority of interviews and field visit with the PMU, UNDP CO, RTA and selected stakeholders (some 16 participants) on 15 April, and a presentation was held for the Project Steering Committee (with 7 participants) on 21 April.

The following Evaluation Categories were assessed for project progress; further reflected and detailed in the **Evaluative Framework** in Annex 5:

- i. **Project Strategy**
- ii. **Progress Towards Results**
- iii. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**
- iv. **Sustainability**

## 2. Project Description and Background Context

**Invasive alien species (IAS) are the greatest threat to biodiversity in the Pacific Islands.** The isolated nature and extreme vulnerability of island ecosystems and species to impacts such as habitat destruction and invasive alien species (IAS) has resulted in many species of this region becoming endangered. As biodiversity is a significant source of revenue for Fiji (including tourism) and a direct source of income and livelihood for local communities, the spread of IAS has significant economic impacts. As an example, Fiji's gross earnings from tourism for the first quarter of 2009, estimated at USD 83.8 million, is at potential threat from IAS.

**The sub-section of the northern division of Fiji is considered as an important biosecurity area** under the project and includes Taveuni Island and the surrounding islets of Qamea, Matagi and Laucala. This region has retained significant forest and wetland ecosystems across its full altitudinal range, and endemic and other native species are better protected than in many other areas of Fiji. Taveuni has not yet been severely impacted by some of the numerous IAS that are established on the larger islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu. However, the Giant Invasive Iguana (GII: *Iguana iguana*), an aggressive invasive pest, was imported illegally into Fiji in 2000 and introduced to nearby Qamea, with the first free-living record is from 2009. Since then GII is known to have established on two adjacent islands: Laucala and Matagi. The proximity of these islands to Taveuni is of particular concern. Fiji's 2013 State of the Birds Report notes that it "would be a biodiversity conservation disaster" if GII were to spread to Taveuni.

Given that the **Giant Invasive Iguana** (also known locally as the "American Iguana" because of its origin) has been known to proliferate and expand its range to catastrophic levels under similar climatic conditions present in Fiji, they could be expected to spread to other islands if not prevented. This could then also represent a potential bridgehead to some of the world's most isolated island ecosystems. GII pose a very real threat to Fiji's two threatened native iguanid species, but also inflict major negative impacts on native biodiversity, agriculture, tourism and health. GII have already caused harm throughout the Caribbean where they are spreading fast and have significant detrimental effects, including on native biodiversity, agriculture and tourism. Although there are several national and local-level initiatives to address IAS in Fiji, these efforts lack adequate capacity and an overall comprehensive strategy to ensure a systematic and effective protection of biodiversity-rich and important areas. An effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort against GII, before populations grow beyond the point where they can be controlled, is currently lacking and urgently needed.

The **objective** of the project is: *To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species.*

The overarching objective will be achieved through four interrelated outcomes namely:

- **Component 1:** Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji
- **Component 2:** Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi
- **Component 3:** Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala
- **Component 4:** Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping to invasive alien species and biosecurity

**This is a 5- year project that started in May 2018, with a total grant of USD 3,502,968 from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and with parallel co-financing from the Government of Fiji estimated at USD 26,736,418 and an in-kind co-financing from UNDP estimated at \$101,096.** Stakeholders participating in this project include the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF), Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries, Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority, Fiji Airports Limited, Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji, Ministry of I Taukei Affairs, Non-Governmental Organizations (Nature Fiji) and Tertiary Institutions (University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University), amongst others.

**The project is aligned with the strategic priorities of the Fiji National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) of 2007 and its Implementation Framework that identify control of IAS as critical to the success of biodiversity conservation.** The project also contributes to the post-2015 development agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 15 to halt biodiversity loss. It will also support SDG2 to end hunger and achieve food security.

**The Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF) is the project implementing partner** and is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including achieving project outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and the effective use of UNDP resources. A National Project board is instated to approve high level documents including Annual Work Plans and provides strategic support. A Project Implementation Unit (PIU), with a Project Manager and a Project Admin-Finance Officer (based at BAF) is responsible for executing activities on a day-to-day basis. At least four Field Eradication Officers and 16 Temporary Biosecurity Officers are stationed in Taveuni and Qamea. Additional support is provided by consultants, including a Chief Technical Adviser and an Eradication Specialist.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. Project Strategy

##### 3.1.1. Project Design

**The Project Document is well informed**, well articulated and follows global designs and standards for such type of projects. It addresses a very significant development challenge, and the barriers and threats at different levels are relevant and well described. The Project's objectives fit also well in the GEF, UNDP and National Priorities. The project document includes a detailed Theory of Change, takes into account Lessons Learned in Fiji and from the region, including from NGOs such as Nature Fiji and Birdlife International, and describes partnerships in detail. Consultations were reported to be to some extent limited at times during project development, due to some reticence by key decision-makers over the aim and details of the project. But finally consultations seem to have been comprehensive and inclusive, and have sufficiently informed the project.

**The solutions and strategy for addressing the barriers are relevant and valid.** The Results Framework is fit for purpose and addresses country priorities through outcomes on: Strengthened policies and coordination; Improved inter-island prevention; Eradication of GII; Increased awareness. This is also reflected in the Logical Framework, except for the indicators, that lack “SMART”ness, are missing some baselines and have arbitrary targets.

**Country ownership is in principle safeguarded with the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF)**, the legally mandated institution to deal with biosecurity and IAS in Fiji, as the **Implementing Partner of the project**. It is noted though that information on the materialization of Co-financing was not shared in time and could not be reviewed, and in fact the budget for national allocated budget for BAF was cut, even before the onset and fall-out of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Cross-cutting issues are addressed** in the Project Document, but no clear actions have been included in the Implementation Plan, e.g. around gender (a Gender Plan is developed, but not sufficiently addressed in Outcomes, Outputs and activities and little progress on the Gender Plan is reported).

**Some stakeholders questioned the inclusion and emphasis in the project on the Giant Invasive Iguana** as IAS and its Eradication Plan. Some wondered if GII is indeed a real threat, and if other IAS are not more important. Other stakeholders stressed the threat of GII, though some questioned the effectivity of the (implementation of) the Eradication Plan. The focus on the GII has caused that some stakeholders thought the project was “*only about eradication of GII*”.

A comment was made why work on the legal framework surrounding biosecurity was not included in the project. At the moment, the **Biosecurity Law** of 2008, which also established the Biosecurity Agency of Fiji (BAF), is being revised, with the support of FAO under another project. The new law clarifies and attempts to link better to existing laws (e.g. Quarantine Act of 1985) or include elements that were previously not included in the Biosecurity Law (e.g. on plant health and animal health).

The **risks and assumptions** were well laid out in the project document and Logical Framework. However, these were not necessarily reported on (except in the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR), as mandated by the UNDP and GEF reporting structure) and/or updated.

### 3.1.2. Results Framework/ Logframe

On the whole the **Logical framework is relevant and fit for purpose** as basis for further planning, with relevant Project Objectives and Outcomes. However, the indicators, lack “SMARTness”, are missing some baselines and have arbitrary targets. Some changes in the indicators framework and the “Assumptions and Risks” were discussed and agreed by stakeholders at the Project Inception Workshop in 2018, but they were subsequently not officially approved and included in the Logical Framework and later reporting. See Table 3 below for the **proposed changes** at inception workshop, with the missing baselines highlighted, as well as some of the changes / updates to the indicators / targets that are proposed by this MTR.

Table 3: Updated logical framework (summarized; **with addition from Project Inception Workshop 2018 in yellow highlight (but not officially included); and MTR comments or proposed changes from 2021 in Red Font**

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective</b> To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species	0.1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. (UNDP mandatory indicator: IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1)	NISFSAP under development Long-term strategy for BAF non-existent Specific, targeted IAS legislation non-existent	NISFSAP completed through collaborative, multi-agency process <b>BAF long-term strategy completed</b> Include: Gaps to be identified and for FIST to report and included in the NBSAP IF	NISFSAP endorsed by national IAS Committee with committed resources for implementation BAF long-term strategy adopted and under implementation Specific legislation and regulations for IAS adopted and in place	Assumptions - Relevant agencies are willing to cooperate fully - Cabinet support for adopting legislative reforms required <b>- Include: Natural disasters and implications of project delivery</b>
	0.4: Level of government funding and revenues for biosecurity in Fiji	USD 4.5 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.0 million/year in revenues	At least 10% increase to USD 4.95 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.4 million/year in revenues. <b>May need to be revised, because of budget cuts, including because of financial / economic fall out from COVID-19 pandemic</b>	At least 20% increase to USD 5.4 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.8 million/year in revenues <b>May need to be revised, because of budget cuts, including because of financial / economic fall out from COVID-19 pandemic</b>	
	<b>Include: 0.5: SOPS for surveying GII</b> <b>Not included</b>				
<b>Outcome 1</b> Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji	1.1: National and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS, as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard	UNDP Capacity Development Score of 14 for BAF	<b>Strengthen national &amp; local capacity</b> to improve UNDP Capacity Development Score of at least 17 for BAF	<b>UNDP Capacity Development Score of at least 21 for BAF. (could not be established as Score Card was not submitted)</b>	Risks -Some agencies and/or sectors may have difficulty coordinating with other agencies and/or sectors  Assumption - Sufficient political interest for action on IAS -Willingness of institutions to share responsibilities
	1.2: Operational status of national level, multi-agency, multi-sector coordinating group for IAS activities, including biosecurity and management <b>(indicator vague)</b>	<b>Non-existent</b> <b>FIST is established</b> <b>TOR of FIST is revised &amp; awaiting endorsement by NEC</b>	TOR for multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group agreed, and group established and first meeting conducted <b>At least 6 FIST meetings are conducted</b>	Multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group established, codified by national legislation, and functioning effectively <b>FIST is functioning effectively</b>	
	1.3: Extent of biosecurity capacity for comprehensive prevention, early detection and rapid response (EDRR)	Risk assessment undertaken, but not comprehensive and do not have full coverage and data	Risks assessment conducted for <b>100% 60%</b> of all organisms for import and documentation system developed and used	100% risk assessments for all organisms for import and systematically documented	



	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Risks and Assumptions
		records scattered in notebooks or non-existent Some elements for early detection and rapid response exist but no comprehensive system available currently	<b>Identify and strengthen inspecting and detection process</b> Draft EDRR plan developed and clear concept developed for public reporting system. Field staff to implement EDRR in place and training initiated	Established EDRR capacity on Viti Levu serving as a national pilot and resources to support EDRR in place	-Insufficient rapid-response resources and funding available to support EDRR activities -Differences between daily operations and rapid-response actions are not fully recognized and/or supported
<b>Outcome 2</b> Enhanced IAS prevention, surveillance and control operations to prevent new introductions on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi	2.1: Number of new establishments of IAS species on Taveuni and islets, covering species listed in the Fiji black list and well as any high-risk IAS present in Fiji but not Taveuni <b>Inclusion of Viubani Island</b>	<b>Baseline to be established in Year 1</b> as part of Output 1.3 (national black and white lists) and Output 2.1 (four-island specific black and white lists) <b>Standardize GI survey methods based on its lifecycle</b>	National black and white lists and four-island specific black and white lists of species established No new establishments from baseline	No new establishments from baseline	Risks -Means of ensuring public access to the data are uncertain - <b>Natural disasters</b> Assumptions -Baseline surveys of IAS can be rapidly completed
	2.2: Capacity and engagement of biosecurity personnel and partners for inspection, control and management to prevent entry and inter-island IAS spread	Currently limited to 2 weeks general training Low level of biosecurity inspection of goods, persons and vectors arriving at islands  <b>International and domestic vessel and aircraft clearance training by Border Agencies (BAF, FRCA, Health, Immigration)</b>	Standardized systems and processes developed and in place for inspection of good, persons and vectors arriving at islands, required new staff for increased inspection and biosecurity are in place Comprehensive training program developed and 80% of existing frontline staff trained and undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports	100% of frontline staff ( <b>min. 20</b> pple <b>per sector ie</b> biosecurity, police, customs staff etc, of which 40% are women) trained and undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports At least <b>50% 80%</b> of goods, persons and vectors (transport vehicles) arriving at islands are subject to biosecurity inspections	Risks -Taxonomic expertise for some IAS groups may not be readily available -Market-driven changes to pathways and vectors cannot be fully anticipated -Establishment of new high-risk IAS within trade-partner countries cannot be fully anticipated -The invasiveness of many species is simply unknown, making it difficult to determine exactly which species training should focus on  Assumptions -Adequate regulations to support improved inspection services -Community support - <b>High staff turnover may impact the result on the ground</b>
<b>Outcome 3</b> Long-term measures for protection of	3.1: Status of GII seen/captured on Taveuni  <b>Baseline not quantified</b>	No search efforts for GII on Taveuni <b>Increase the No. of search efforts for GII on Taveuni</b>	Initial surveys completed in all potential GII sites on Taveuni If surveys indicate GII are present, search and eradication efforts	No. GII seen/captured on Taveuni during last year of project	Risks: - Inter-agency cooperation may be stifled by territorial rivalries

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Risks and Assumptions
terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi			indicate a decline in sighting/capture of GII		-Global expertise to formulate an effective plan is limited Assumption - Interest and commitment of all relevant organizations - there is no broad establishment of GII in the 5 islands
	3.2: GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, as indicated by rates of removal - include Vuibani Island	Baseline GII population size to be established in Year 1 based on eradication removal rates	Capture operations vigorously and systematically conducted to reach 100% coverage of the islands Rates of removal indicate a decline in GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala	Reduction in GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more	Risks -Not all animals can be put at risk of being killed -Animals are difficult to detect -Lethal methods are limited and require further development
	3.3: Status and trends in native banded iguana populations ( <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> ) in areas occupied by GII	Baseline to be established in Year 1	Stable populations of native banded iguana ( <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> ) in areas occupied by GII on island(s) and eradication efforts ongoing	Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana ( <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> ) in areas previously (prior to eradication) occupied by GII on island(s)	-Agency and staff interest may wane with time -Lack of understanding of the need for long-term commitment to ensure success in eradication
	3.4: Community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII, disaggregated by gender	Impacts not yet visible or reported Limited awareness of potential impact of GII No standardized assessment or understanding of community perceptions and awareness of damage or impacts from GII Standardized baseline will be established in Year 1	Baselines established of community perceptions and awareness of GII impacts and monitoring protocols for evaluating changes in community perceptions designed and being monitored Survey on Impact of GII on agricultural crops? At least 30% of sampled local population (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of GII and need for biosecurity	No/reduced community perceptions changes of damages to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication) At least 50% of sampled local population households to be sampled (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of GII and need for biosecurity	Assumptions -Resources and commitment will be available beyond the duration of the project -Improved detection and removal methods can be developed -The GIIs have not already spread too far to eradicate -Adequate capacity for monitoring native biodiversity exists -That damage from GII on food crops and livelihoods likely not occurred and use of perception study to validate it appropriate

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 4</b> Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping agents	4.1: Level of awareness of IAS and biosecurity among tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents, <b>inclusion of end users and border officials</b> <b>Include: Communications strategy</b>	Coordinated outreach on biosecurity lacking Limited awareness of impact of IAS among public <b>Baseline survey established in Year 1</b>	At least 20% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity	At least 50% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity	Risks -Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated Assumptions -Community diversity will not be a hindrance to outreach activities
	4.2: Operational status of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information to collate and make accessible IAS information to stakeholders	Partial existence of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information at Department of Environment	Enhancement of on-line clearinghouse fully scoped and improvements in progress	On-line clearinghouse completed and actively used by relevant agencies	Risks -Lack of resources, information and personnel to move project forward -Difficult to obtain IAS information - <b>Management risk of housing the clearing house mechanism.</b> Assumptions -Required information is readily available -Partnerships can be established that facilitate the sharing of existing information

It is recommended that the PIU and main project proponents and stakeholders re-look at the Logical Framework and proposed changes, when undertaking a planning exercise after this MTR. Proposed changes should be subsequently endorsed by the Project Steering Committee / Board

### 3.2. Progress Towards Results

#### 3.2.1. Progress towards outcomes analysis

Despite of a favourable image from most stakeholders of the project in terms of importance, awareness and activities undertaken, it is **difficult to assess progress**. In most cases progress in terms of assessment vis-à-vis indicators is falling behind, as is detailed in the table “Progress Towards Outcomes” in Annex 6, and also summarized and highlighted in Table 4 below.

The unfavourable progress ratings are mainly due to some **unsatisfactory indicators**, missing baselines and some unrealistic targets. In some cases, the indicators and targets are possibly no longer attainable, due to outside influences. This holds especially true of indicator O4 (*“Level of government funding and revenues for biosecurity in Fiji”*), which has fallen way behind (budget decreased, even before the COVID-19 pandemic, and since then is under more pressure because of deteriorating government fiscal space and changing priorities in the light of COVID-19 and its economic consequences). This target may therefore need to be revised, although this is still a good indicator to highlight a problem and serve as a possible wake up call for Government and stakeholders that indeed finances towards biosecurity and preventing and controlling IAS may need to be increased. There are problems with achievement of other targets as well, especially for those indicators where no baselines were established (Indicators 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1).

There have of course been **delays** in implementation of the project because of the COVID-19 pandemic, where some activities came to a halt, gatherings were not possible, monitoring became difficult and consultants could not travel to Fiji (until this day). Even the consequences of the impending opening up and recovery measures after the pandemic subsides are uncertain at the moment.

The main drawback is that some of the **key policies and strategies were not delivered** / validated / promulgated. This holds especially true for the National Invasive Species Framework Strategy and Action Plan (NISFSAP or NISSAP), which is key in stimulating further, more effective coordination and action, and thereby achievement of results. This holds also true for the Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) plan, which is key for achievement and is also an indicator for Outcome 2. The MTR understands that both documents are in draft form, but not yet fully validated and promulgated. No economic study on the impact of selected IAS as envisaged has been undertaken (consultant not recruited). Although of importance for the policy and legal framework, the Biosecurity Law was not worked on by the Project. Instead revision and developing a new Biosecurity Law is undertaken by BAF with support from FAO.

Furthermore, the **coordination around IAS in Fiji is not functioning**. The National IAS Committee as mentioned in the Project Document is not put in place. Instead, stakeholders agreed to continue with the Fiji Invasive Species Task Force (FIST) as overarching coordination committee. But FIST, with BAF as chair and DoE as Secretary, has not met since 2018. The Four Island IAS Task Force (FIIT) that is instrumental in prevention and control of IAS around Taveuni and the surrounding islands and the achievement of Outcome 2, has not yet been established. The MTR understands the TORs for the FIIT are in (almost?) draft form but not yet reviewed and discussed. New Task Forces on IAS Research and Awareness have been established by the project over the last couple of months (and these are appreciated), but their mandate, official standing and sustainability are unclear, also because IAS stakeholders had decided against formalising these two task forces as this would increase more bureaucracies and reporting burden. BAF has existing MoUs with a number of stakeholders on different aspects of biosecurity (including IAS), e.g. Ministries of Forestry, Agriculture, Fiji Revenue and Customs, Fiji Ports Corporation Limited, etc. Some stakeholders that are important and could be instrumental in the prevention of IAS are only since recently involved, e.g. FELA, etc., who are now part of the new Task Forces.

**Capacity development** around biosecurity and IAS took place, several trainings were held, but seemingly ad hoc, without a full training needs assessment done and an underlying training plan. The Tracking Tool (Indicator for the Project Objective No. 3) that measures the capacities for Prevention, Control and Management of IAS only marginally increased at Mid-Term point with 4 points, instead of the stated target at MTR of 8 points. The indicator 1.1. *“National and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS, as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard”* showed a self-reported increase of capacity by BAF, but this could not be verified, as this score card was submitted very late, after the mission and deadlines for reporting.

The status and effectivity of the **GII Eradication Plan**, central to achievement of Outcome 3, is not clear. The GII eradication effort gained much attention, and surely many activities happened in terms of capacitating this effort (putting manpower in place on the islands - Field Coordinators and (Temporary) Biosecurity Officers, providing tools, materials and training). But since no baselines were established, it is not possible to measure progress or success against eradication targets, though informal eradication reports and anecdotal evidence shows that a (significant?) number of GII have been caught and exterminated.

The IAS project **awareness and outreach programme** supporting the GII eradication in the Northern Islands started late, since consultants were recruited late in the project (only late 2019). Most planned activities could then not progress because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Since late 2020, a number activities have been undertaken by the NGO “NatureFiji–MareqetiViti” (NF/MV), including awareness surveys and trainings. Status and progress of this awareness programme were not easy to summarize. Although from the reports it seems that people in the communities know about the GII, further community perceptions are unclear and no baselines in line with the project document have yet been established. As far as the MTR can verify, the National Outreach programme has not started, and no baseline has been established (basis for Output 4.1. under Outcome 4).

The **status of Clearinghouse, Databases, and generally the Information and Knowledge Management around IAS is unclear**, no project related activity around these has taken place. Most of these seem to have waited for consultants who so far have not been recruited or started work. Some information on IAS and Biosecurity is already in place, e.g. scattered data on IAS, but this is not organized and does not inform proper communication and outreach.

Table 4. Summary of main project progress results (See Annex 6 for full Results).

Project Strategy	Indicator	Mid Level Assessment*	Achievement Rating **	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective:</b> To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species	<b>Indicator 1:</b> Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems		MU	New Policy and legal frameworks drafted but not in place, fair number of project beneficiaries, though no training plan, marginal tracking tool capacity increase, level of government funding substantially decreased
	<b>Indicator 2:</b> Number of direct project beneficiaries			
	<b>Indicator 3:</b> Comprehensiveness of national level IAS management framework and ability to prevent IAS of high risk to biodiversity from entering Fiji, as measured by IAS Tracking Tool			
	<b>Indicator 4:</b> Level of government funding and revenues for biosecurity in Fiji			

<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji	<b>Indicator 1.1:</b> National and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS, as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard		MU	Training Plan and Capacity score card not available, FIST not operational, EDRR not finalized, economic study not done. Some biosecurity capacities available.
	<b>Indicator 1.2:</b> Operational status of national level, multi-agency, multi-sector coordinating group for IAS activities, including biosecurity and management			
	<b>Indicator 1.3:</b> Extent of biosecurity capacity for comprehensive prevention, early detection and rapid response (EDRR)			
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations at the island level on Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala	<b>Indicator 2.1:</b> Number of new establishments of IAS species on Taveuni and islets, covering species listed in the Fiji black list and well as any high-risk IAS present in Fiji but not Taveuni		MU	No baselines, no official Black & White lists, no Training needs assessment. Trainings done but without plan. Level of Inspection and Quarantine services on Islands unclear.
	<b>Indicator 2.2:</b> Capacity and engagement of biosecurity personnel and partners for inspection, control and management to prevent entry and inter-island IAS spread			
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in the selected islands	<b>Indicator 3.1:</b> Status of GII seen/captured on Taveuni		MU	Baselines unclear. No latest numbers of GII eradication. Progress of GII Eradication Plan unclear. Status of native iguana reported. Community perceptions?
	<b>Indicator 3.2:</b> GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, as indicated by rates of removal			
	<b>Indicator 3.3:</b> Status and trends in native banded iguana populations ( <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> ) in areas occupied by GII			
	<b>Indicator 3.3:</b> Community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII, disaggregated by gender			
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Strengthened awareness, knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation in regards to invasive alien species and biosecurity	<b>Indicator 4.1:</b> Level of awareness of IAS and biosecurity among tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents		U	No Baseline. No national communication programme started. No progress on clearinghouse and national IAS database. Hardly any project outlays.
	<b>Indicator 4.2:</b> Operational status of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information to collate and make accessible IAS information to stakeholders			

\*Indicator Assessment Key: **Green**= Achieved; **Yellow**= On target to be achieved; **Red**= Not on target to be achieved;

\*\*HS: Highly Satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; MS: Moderately Satisfactory; MU: Moderately Unsatisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory; HU: Highly Unsatisfactory.

### 3.2.2. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The **remaining barriers** to achieve the project objective are linked to the indicators that are deemed “Not on Track”, as indicated above, which are basically most indicators scattered around all outcomes. The main barriers revolve around the following:

- **Main Policies / Strategies / Plans for improved IAS prevention and eradication are not available** (notably NISFSAP, EDRR<sup>3</sup>). These documents are still in draft form and need to be reviewed and finalized as they guide effective biosecurity and IAS implementation.
- **Coordination around IAS is not in place.** The FIST is still not meeting, which seems to revolve around the Ministry of Environment not calling for a meeting (MoE is Secretary, BAF is chair of FIST). Terms of Reference of the FIIT have been drafted, but not yet reviewed and finalized. New Task Forces have

<sup>3</sup> Although the EDRR as stipulated in the Project Document and Indicators has not (yet) been established, Emergency Response Plans for Plant and Animal Health related emergencies are finalized and shared with the Project CTA to assist with EDRR development.

been recently set up (around IAS Research and Awareness, with support from stakeholders), but their status and mandate is unclear.

- **Progress of the GII eradication efforts on Taveuni and surrounding islands is not clear.** Reporting is scattered, implementation of the Eradication Plan seems insufficient and there is no specialist to guide and oversee the eradication effort.
- **The awareness with main stakeholders and communities of the threat of IAS (and GII in particular) seems not widespread** and sufficient enough for effective IAS prevention and eradication. No national communication and outreach around IAS started, and databases and clearinghouse not in place.
- **Sustainability of project activities is not guaranteed.** Although BAF is fairly well capacitated and functioning, and in principle can take over and continue the activities that have been started, there are still capacity shortfalls and worrying cuts in budgets. Especially the financial sustainability is a question mark, where hence the project activities may not be longer sustained because of financial shortfalls (e.g. training, staff - Temporary Biosecurity Officers -, etc.).

### 3.2.3. Expand benefits

Some of the benefits of the project are the **budding partnerships and stakeholder interest** that has been created, although only recently for some (Min. of Agriculture, Min. of Forestry, Fiji Environment Legal Association and others have only in 2020-2021 come on board). These partnerships can be further expanded, deepened and formalized for more effective implementation of activities.

There **are solid drafts available** of the NISFSAP, EDRR, GII Eradication Plan, main IAS risks, Black & White Lists, surveys on community perceptions of GII and studies on native iguanas and ecosystems favoured by iguanas on the Northern Islands, etc. These documents should (if not yet finalized) be finalized and be the basis of project activities in the remaining part of the project.

The above barriers and benefits point to the fact that despite the appreciation of many stakeholders about the relevance and importance of the project, and that activities have taken place, progress is difficult to assess and significantly lags behind the indicators and targets. It seems therefore time to **re-assess and re-prioritize the project**. The available results (either in draft form or validated) should be taken into account to critically review the indicator framework and targets, and develop a revised and realistic multi-year workplan towards the end of the project, without changing main outcomes and outputs, but critically reviewing indicators and targets. This may also be opportune with possible new leadership in the PIU (new Project Manager) and a formal and empowered CEO of BAF (instead of CEO in acting capacity over the last years).

## 3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

### 3.3.1. Management Arrangements

The day-to-day administration of the project implementation responsibilities rests with the **Project Management Unit** or **Project Implementation Unit (PMU, PIU)** set up within BAF. The Unit consists of a Project Coordinator (Manager), Administration Officer and an intern. The project staff has BAF contracts and is overseen by the BAF CEO. This arrangement seems to work reasonably well, and also ensures operational sustainability within BAF. The Project Team seems to be positively regarded by most stakeholders, with a knowledgeable project Manager and solid administrative support. Especially the organization of workshops is commended.

There have of course been also **delays in implementation because of the COVID-19 pandemic**. In 2020, lockdowns were declared in Lautoka, Labasa and Suva, as well as travel restrictions in the country. As a

result of these travel restriction, project field work including awareness raising, surveys and monitoring was temporarily put on hold in 2020. International travel to Fiji was also still restricted and consultants were not able to travel and implement or oversee their activities.

The Project Team is supported by a Chief **Technical Adviser (CTA)** who provides the required technical input. The CTA is mainly involved in producing certain deliverables that are mentioned in his TORs, e.g. plans, strategies, assessments and some training. The CTA does not seem to provide further general technical, management and reporting backstopping. There are also other technical consultants, notably the Eradication Specialist, who is involved in developing and overseeing the implementation of the GII eradication plan. Most of the other planned consultants have not yet been recruited (e.g. economist, database specialists, canine trainer, telemetry specialist, etc.).

Stakeholders acknowledge that the PIU is “stretched”, and that the **team may need strengthening** (e.g. by putting in place “Outcome Coordinators” that are responsible for the different outcomes). Another very recent development is that the **current Project Manager is leaving the PIU** and BAF in April 2021 (the project, UNDP and MTR were only informed in mid-April). Seemingly an interim PM will be appointed first and the position for full time PM is already advertised, but there is a definite risk that the PIU will be without full-fledged leadership for some time. Although it is a challenge to lose the PM at this point in the project, this could also be an opportunity for a new PM to take the helm and re-focus and plan for the remainder of the project period together with stakeholder and supported by the new partnerships that are put in place.

**Support from BAF** to the PIU and the project has been forthcoming, e.g. with the provision of Field Coordinators and TBSOs on Qamea and other islands, though maybe not in the desired numbers (some 20 TBSOs were hired, instead of the 40 requested). However, BAF still doesn’t have a full-fledged CEO, the current incumbent is still acting (for already > 1 year). BAF also suffered from severe budget cuts; there were major reductions of BAF's budget in 2019 and 2020.

In general **Government ownership** is forthcoming in terms of support for the PIU and project implementation. But strategic guidance (through Steering Committee / Board Meetings, revival of FIST and finalization and promulgation of NISFSAP), co-financing and increased budgets for IAS have not materialized sufficiently.

The **UNDP Country Office** through its NEX/NIM Modality and as per the signed Letter of Agreement with the Government, is responsible for provision of financial and audit services; recruitment of project staff, consultants and other service providers; procurement of goods and services; and oversight over project expenditures against approved project annual workplans and budgets. Given the workload of the Resilience and Sustainable Development Team, with programme analysts having around 10 projects to manage, and a still acting cluster leader, this cluster seems stretched and may need more support. A UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, based in UK, provides technical and quality oversight, including reporting to GEF. The oversight suffered because of limited amount of visits that were possible through 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Remote technical advice and oversight proved to be a challenge, also because of apparent poor communication from the PIU.

The **Project Steering Committee (PSC) or Board**, has met only twice in the project lifetime – in 2018 before the Inception Workshop, where 4 participants attended, and on 21 April 2021, with 7 participants from 3 entities (BAF, UNDP, DoE). This has caused that there was limited independent oversight of the project, and progress reports and annual workplans were not officially endorsed.

Despite above stated challenges, there have been examples of laudable innovations and adaptive management, e.g. (a) use of trail cameras which have improved detectability of GII, (b) Identification of areas with high population GII, (c) vegetation ecology survey of Qamea which identified dry forest as



preferred habitats for GII, (d) forming of 2 task forces to enhance IAS coordination in absence of FIST/national coordinating body.

### 3.3.2. Work planning

There were slight delays in commencement of the project, with recruitment of PIU staff in July 2018 after signing of the Project Document in May 2018, which was delayed, and the Inception Workshop was held in September 2018. **Workplans** were developed on the basis of the Multi-Year Workplan from the Project Document and compared to yearly progress and approved by UNDP. However, there was no detailed Project Implementation Plan developed during the Inception Phase, and subsequent workplans were not checked and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee / Board, as the Board did not meet annually in the Project lifetime thus far (as it was intended to do in the project document). This also meant that the workplans and subsequent reporting were not always result-based and contributing to achieving the Indicator Targets and stated Project Outcomes and Objectives, as the project result framework was apparently not always followed.

As can be noted from the Progress of Results (Chapter 3.2) and the financial delivery numbers (see paragraph 3.3.3. and the table here below): There was **generally low and skewed delivery over the outcomes**. To date there is much higher delivery in Outcome 2 (45%) and 3 (51%) as opposed to Outcome 1 (13%) and Outcome 4 (only 3%), whilst Management costs seemed overspent (87%) at Mid-Term. The higher delivery is in the outcomes that are mainly geared to the prevention and eradication in the Northern islands, rather than the work at national level in Outcomes 1 and 4. This may have been a result of the delays that were caused by the pandemic, which also resulted in that consultants working on national issues were not able to visit the project or not able to join (e.g. CTA, Database (several), Economist, Outreach, etc.). However, this may have also been caused by inconsistent planning and poor budgeting, which should improve in the second half of the project.

### 3.3.3. Finance and co-finance

Project financing management and controls seem in order, as also evidenced by the Project audit and Spot Check. The **Spot Check** of 31/12/2019 only noted some problems with the inventories. Two Kayaks that were purchased were incorrectly classified as inventory instead as equipment. And 2 open fibre glass boats with engine and accessories were purchased directly by UNDP but have yet to be included in the listing of assets and equipment.

The only **audit** of the project was done for 2020 and reported in April 2021. This audit resulted in an: "Unmodified Audit opinion". One issue with "High Risk" was reported: "Negative statement of cash position balance". This was reportedly rectified in January 2021 with UNDP's Quarter 1 advance of funds to the Implementing Partner. A second observation with "Medium Risk" was that 6 assets did not have proper tags; these have reportedly been attached again.

The project **financial status** is as follows (report from 16/04/2021)

Outcome	Pro Doc Allocation	Expenses	Balances	Delivery (%)
<u>1</u>	1.010.000,00	134.970,75	875.029,25	13%
<u>2</u>	721.000,00	320.945,84	400.054,16	45%
<u>3</u>	1.203.000,00	608.093,03	594.906,97	51%
<u>4</u>	403.000,00	13.577,02	389.422,98	3%
<u>Management</u>	165.968,00	143.990,36	21.977,64	87%
<u>Exchange Loss</u>	0	(11.139,52)	11.139,52	
<u>Total</u>	<b>3.502.968</b>	<b>1.210.437</b>	<b>2.292.531</b>	35%

		<b>Project Net Bal ( - outstanding advances)</b>	<b>2.045.893,28</b>	
--	--	--	---------------------	--

The actual project **delivery rate as at 16 April 2021** (after officially some 32 months out of 60 months project) is at **35%**. The very low delivery in Outcome 1 (13%) and Outcome 4 (3%!) are noteworthy, even as the high delivery in Management costs (87%). Given the results not yet achieved at MTR, the delays and uncertainties caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that delivery is still at 35%, it can be recommended that the project life is extended with possibly some 6 months, until the end of 2023, so that there was a full 5 years of operation as intended (project started in earnest with the Inception Workshop in September 2018) and to cater for the delays that occurred from the COVID-19 pandemic.

The original co-financing mentioned in the project document of USD26,864,514 is reported from 1 source only, "Government of Fiji", and not specified per Government entity. Despite several requests, the information on **actual Co-Financing** was submitted to the MTR team after the mission and even past the deadlines for comments. The template provided was also not followed, but as far as the MTR team can see, a total of USD 7.262.119,71 (i.e. 27%) was reported, mainly as staff time (in workshops, training sessions, document review), awareness materials, equipment, etc. The PMU and UNDP are urged to follow up on this, and monitor the co-financing closely for the remainder of the project.

#### 3.3.4. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The project document contained a detailed **Monitoring and Evaluation Plan** and Budget. A Project Inception Workshop and good number of monitoring visits (not reported how many) by the Project Manager, CTA, other consultants and UNDP CO team have been conducted, especially to the Northern Islands. Back To Office reports from UNDP CO staff were produced and shared, as well as from consultants. No PIU monitoring reports were seen, through reports on GII eradication efforts were produced, but these lacked some detail and comparison with targets. Normal Project Quarterly, Annual Reports and PIRs were produced on time and are of reasonable (Progress reports) and good (PIRs) quality. The Tracking Tool was updated by the PMU during the MTR, but not the UNDP Capacity development Score Card.

#### 3.3.5. Stakeholder engagement

There were reportedly some restrictions on stakeholder engagement during the project development phase (2016-17). Nevertheless, a **wide enough range of stakeholders was consulted**, including ministries, NGOs, private sector and civil society. These stakeholders were also present in the Inception Workshop which took place in September 2018 (4 months after signing of Project Document, the signing itself had been delayed). Since then the PMU has continued to place commendable efforts on engaging stakeholders at national and sub-national levels, across a range of agencies, with local communities and with other stakeholders (e.g. NGOs, lodge and tour operators in four-island area). Stakeholders interviewed during the MTR are generally appreciative of the project efforts, although some private sector (hotels on Matagi and Laucala) not being fully supportive of firearms being used to eradicate iguanas as this is likely to disrupt the privacy of guest and peaceful surroundings guests usually expect. Some important stakeholders mentioned they were only recently actively engaged in the project (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Forestry, FELA, Ministry of *I Taukei* Affairs and others).

A main stakeholder, the **Ministry of Agriculture, Waterways and Environment<sup>4</sup>**, and does not seem to **have actively been engaged or supported the project**. This is worrying, as the Ministry houses the GEF Focal Point (PS, Mr. Joshua Wycliffe), and the Ministry of Environment is custodian of the NBSAP, which also includes elements of IAS. Furthermore, the Ministry is the Secretary of the Fiji Invasive Specie Task Force (FIST) but has not called any meetings since 2018. The FIST falls under the National Environment

<sup>4</sup> As per new ministerial assignment of 2020

Council, which is chaired by MoE. Despite several attempts the MTR was not able to interview the Ministry of Environment.

**Two NGOs are actively involved** (Nature Fiji and Birdlife; Nature Fiji also as implementer of the Outreach activities under Outcome 3), as well as some researchers / academics (involved in several studies). Involvement of private sector has so far been limited to resort operators in the Northern Division, where some are more involved and enthusiastic about the project activities than others. Due to the reticence of the resort owner on Laucala island, entrance to this island is restricted, even if GII are reportedly present there.

### 3.3.6. Reporting.

The usual, mainly annual, **Project Progress Reports** were produced. These Progress Reports generally report on activities but not towards results. If this would change with more result based reporting, this will also have as benefit that the PIU will have to look at and review the progress vis-à-vis the result indicators and targets. This could have avoided the challenge that the project and MTR team is in, i.e. that no progress was reported vis-à-vis indicators and targets, and hence these are difficult to monitor and progress is difficult to assess. The UNDP CO has mentioned that a new progress report template is under development with better results-based reporting elements.

Other progress reports were also produced e.g. **eradication progress reports** from the team of Field Coordinators and TBSOs on Qamea and other islands. These eradication reports are however difficult to interpret as these do not usually give cumulative numbers.

The annual mandated **PIRs** are well developed and give substantive and relevant information (also for MTR and other reviewers). It is unclear how these PIRs were used nationally, as these were not discussed in Project Board Meetings (since these were not held). Apart from in the PIRs, there is no reporting vis-à-vis risks, and no risk updates have been undertaken.

### 3.3.7. Communications

The **internal communication** between project proponents seems to have been challenging at times. The communication between the project and consultants (in particular the CTA and the Eradication Expert) proved tedious at times, especially when the consultants were home based since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, and this seemed to have caused frustration and delays. At some point in the project this improved with more, weekly remote communications, but this has subsequently fizzled out again. This caused a situation where consultants mention that they are not up to date with the project progress and don't know how to support / assist. The MTR itself also found communication with the project and proponents at times difficult, when often requests, especially through emails, were not pro-actively responded to and dealt with.

**External communication** of results should also be improved. Some interviewees were not sure "what was happening in the project". Reports of activities undertaken were submitted, but results were not succinctly reported and disseminated to stakeholders. For instance, the community awareness programme by NF/MV was very detailed, but difficult to interpret and compare with indicators for success, as were the reports of the GII eradication efforts. The Communication and outreach work under Outcome 4 should start urgently.

### 3.3.8. Gender mainstreaming in project implementation.

A **Gender Analysis and Action Plan** was developed and included in the Project Document. This Plan included specific "gender mainstreaming targets". However, there has been little reporting vis-à-vis this plan, only the NGO NF/MV reported on specifics on gender inclusion in their Outreach Plan in the Four

Northern Islands (with at least 50% of activities implemented and received by women), and BAF gave a breakdown of the Gender distribution of its staff (around 50%). But further reporting on the Gender Analysis and Action Plan in all activities in the project is not available and its actioning is therefore not clear.

### 3.4. Sustainability

#### i. Risk Management:

As per standard UNDP requirements, the PIU should monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office, and the The UNDP CO will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high. Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR. However, as far as the MTR has established, updates of the Risk Log were not done or recorded for this project, except qualitatively in the PIRs. The projected risks, impacts and mitigation measures as reported in the Project Document are discussed in Table 3 below, with in the last column an update as given by the MTR.

Table 5: Project Risks, Impacts and proposed Management Measures.

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Update UNDP / PIU (May 2021)	Notes MTR (May 2021)
Conflicts of interest and different priorities of stakeholders constrain implementation of activities	Political	Local communities might display resistance to the killing of GII, which may have a profound impact of locating and eradicating GIIs. Consequently, the long term impact might be the non-containment of GIIs within the four islands and elsewhere in Fiji P=3; I=3 (Moderate)	Needs and priorities of stakeholders will be identified, and constructive dialogue, joint planning and problem solving will be promoted through the multi-stakeholder, inter-sectoral coordination mechanism. Interest will also be fostered among stakeholders by making the economic case for strengthened biosecurity measures to prevent and control IAS.	BAF	Project adopts an inclusive approach in the execution of project activities ensuring that communities are informed, aware and in support: -Provincial Office (DO Taveuni) is updated regularly of the eradication works and is also included in the IAS Project stakeholder meetings. Additionally, the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs has participated in national consultations s. -NatureFiji MareqetiViti has been contracted to develop and implement a community awareness and outreach strategy including information dissemination on eradication of giant invasive iguanas (GIIs).. -There is keen community interest in the project. For example, villagers have requested for a "GII eradication project exhibition" for further awareness raising	This risk has indeed played out. Some private lodge owners, notably on Luacala Island, have been critical of and even refused to execute the GII eradication efforts. There complaints centered around the use of rifles, and perceived cruelty to animals.  Another risk is the non-committal of MoE towards the and biosecurity in general. This may have to do with perceived "ownership" or "overstepping of mandates" and/or personality issues (this could not be established by the MTR).

Insufficient funding to continue necessary IAS management after the project ends	Financial	The lack of funding can have a serious impact on improving biosecurity measures in Fiji, in particular the control and spread of IAS between islands as well as sustaining the eradication effort beyond the life of the GEF project, which is necessary to completely eradicate GILs from the country. P=1; I=4 (Moderate)	Governmental support for biosecurity and IAS management has increased in recent years along with an increased awareness of the economic/ environmental impacts of IAS. While, this is encouraging and likely to continue, significant additional budgetary resources would be required in the future to deal with the expanding threat of IAS, including strengthening inter-island biosecurity, developing early detection and rapid response systems, strengthening awareness and improving risk assessment for organisms proposed for import. The project will take advantage of the government commitment to biosecurity to continue to raise awareness, and bring in further information to guide decision making on investments, including providing with detailed analysis of the overall cost of IAS to the Fiji economy and promote increased and efficient government budget allocations and revenue generation for IAS management over the long-term.	Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprise, Public Services and Communication (MEPEP SC)	To ensure sustainability, in its 2021-2025 Strategic Plan, BAF is placing key emphasis on IAS management under Goal 1: Safeguard Fiji's Biodiversity and Livelihood. BAF is looking at establishing an IAS unit for continuity of the IAS management program including capacity building, awareness and emergency response. -The cooperation established between stakeholders through this project is already allowing for more collaborative work and fluidity in pooling resources; this will be important moving forward. -BAF has invested in strengthening inter-island biosecurity through setting-up of new offices and having biosecurity presence in strategic locations -Biosecurity early detection systems are installed for many exotic/invasive pests and emergency response documents are finalized -Global catastrophes such as the COVID19 pandemic stretch government resources (especially grants) and this can affect plans put in place	This risk has indeed played out and is a major risk towards sustainability of the project interventions. The operating budget of BAF has been cut by government, even before the advent of COVID-19 and this has been aggravated in 2020 because of the budget and economic constraints because of COVID-19. BAF Revenues have also drastically been reduced, because of less external and internal travel (less fines).
Governmental agencies/ private companies unwilling to share information/ data	Organizational	The lack of a comprehensive IAS informational sources at the national level, constraints the effective prevention, management and awareness of IAS in Fiji as existing knowledge and information will not be readily accessible to all stakeholders and no comprehensive source of information will exist. P=3; I=2 (Moderate)	Information and knowledge generation, management and dissemination are a key component of this project. Open-access and the mutual benefits of information sharing will be included in all agreements for databases, websites, etc. sponsored by the project.	Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprise, Public Services and Communication (MEPEP SC)	-The formation of the "Awareness Taskforce and the "Research Taskforce" are indicative of strong stakeholder participation. Stakeholders regularly share formal and informal updates and information and have fostered new relationships that are continuing to augment IAS management work - BAF has MoUs with many agencies/organizations such as the Fiji Revenue & Customs Services, Ministry of Forestry, Bird Life International, Fiji Airports Limited, Sugar Research Institute of Fiji, Fiji Crop and Livestock Council, Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji, etc. through which exchange of	This risk still prevails. Activities around clearinghouse, databases and knowledge & Information systems in general have not progressed. This mainly because of limited attention to these elements in the project and the lack of (and difficulty of joining of) consultants (e.g. on Communication & Outreach and Database development)

					information and resources, joint training and awareness raising is practiced -BAF is also launching its revamped website in 2021; the project aims to use this platform as a central site for IAS related information storage and dissemination	
Local knowledge and personnel resources may not be adequate to guarantee comprehensive planning and implementation	Organizational	While BAF and its partner agencies have significant numbers of front-line staff, training opportunities are limited. Front-line staff do not have full knowledge in terms of pest identification, control measures, eradication methods, etc. Mid-level staff that should be involved in policy setting tasks appear limited. Technical capacities to identify pathways, commodities and organisms that present an IAS risk, or to measure the threats and impacts of IAS, are still rudimentary. Information on the economic impacts of IAS (on biodiversity, livelihoods and key economic sectors) and the costs of different interventions is not available P=2; I=3 (Moderate)	A needs assessment for capacity building of government, district and local community organizations would be undertaken, following which a comprehensive training strategy and plan for front-line staff and local communities would be designed and developed early during project implementation. International experts will be hired to facilitate the conduct of the training programs, as well as staff will be able to participate in regional training programs. Training programs would be regularly evaluated for their effectiveness and adjusted to meet the needs. BAF will recruit and/or promote and train a coterie of mid-level planning staff. In addition, BAF will recruit additional front-line staff who would be sufficiently trained and posted to improve its capacity on the four islands site for reducing the potential for unwanted non-native species to enter and establish within the country or portions of the country for those IAS which are already established but not wide spread. A comprehensive strategy for GII eradication would be developed and implemented, along with specialized training to improve staff skills at survey and detection of GIIs and in improved eradication methods.	BAF	International consultants were recruited to provide technical support and specialist training. Some technical experts could not be contracted due to the COVID19 travel restrictions. Aside from the four eradication field coordinators funded through the project, BAF continues to employ more than 10 temporary biosecurity officers who are also based in Qamea. These officers have undergone capacity building including a recent firearms training and certification -BAF has improved significantly in its technical team composition (8 x Plant Scientists and 4 x Veterinarians) that undertake pathway/risk analysis, horizon scanning provide advice on risk mitigation. This is supported through Plants and Animals pest/disease diagnostics laboratories capable of molecular/serological work. Trainings in this area have been obtained through partnerships with other funding agencies such as NZAID.	Risk is still apparent. Ad hoc trainings by BAF and some partners took place, but targeted and tailored capacity development around IAS supported by the project has not taken place. There has been no comprehensive Training Needs Assessment and hence no actionable Training Plan.
Not all GIIs are likely to be killed	Environmental	The arboreal and shy nature of the GII makes detection of animals very	Iguana detection is very difficult, but capture probability can be improved by targeting	BAF	-Four firearms were imported. To date, the Fiji Police Force and Military have trained at least 6	Definitely not all GII have been killed, and progress in eradication is even

during an eradication operation because animals are difficult to detect		difficult. As a result, it is yet unknown whether most animals can be placed at risk of removal. I = 3; P = 3 (Moderate)	females at nesting sites and by using canine teams. Use of rifles will greatly improve removal rates, and low-cost conservation drones will be tested for their ability to improve GII detectability.		eradication officers in the use of firearms. -Through the introduction and deployment of trail cameras, detectability of GII has increased significantly. Therefore, priority areas of GII populations have been identified and subject to surveillance/monitoring. Comprehensive maps are better planning tool for eradication work	hard to establish. This activity will need to be sustained after project completion, but there is a real risk of cuts in funding for the GII eradication after the project finishes.
Eradication activities of Giant Invasive Iguana (GII) under the project may pose a risk to native endangered species (Fiji banded iguana; <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> ) if not conducted properly.	Environmental	Because juveniles of the native and invasive Iguana species are similar in appearance, there is potential for inadvertent removal of native Iguanas during the eradication process I = 2; P = 1 (Low)	All personnel involved in eradication are properly trained in identification and distinction of the two species (there are differences in morphology and behavior). The project will also support awareness campaigns to increase public understanding of the differences between the native and invasive iguana and the risks posed by the invasive. A risk assessment of the eradication plan developed by the project will be conducted, and corresponding management and mitigation measures incorporated into the eradication plan.	BAF	Eradication Field Coordinators (EFCs) as well as the TBSOs have been trained on key distinguishing characteristics between GII and native iguanas. -Through community outreach programs, members of the public, especially communities in the impacted area to call BAF officers on any iguana sighting. - NatureFiji have developed awareness materials (posters) which illustrate the key distinctive features of GII and the native iguanas. The posters also have a toll free number (linked to BAF GII Team) which members of the public can call to report iguana sighting and seek BAF's advice. Posters have been extensively distributed as part of awareness raising, especially differentiating GII and Fiji's endemic iguana species.	No records of this. This probably has not occurred.
Inability to fully predict all aspects of species invasiveness and establishment is a challenge	Technical	Because the ability to anticipate IAS entry and establishment to the country is unpredictable, its management and control requires adequate preparedness and resources to respond to any eventuality I = 3; P = 3 (Moderate)	The development of an Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) plan, initially as a trial in Viti Levu, will include: (1) a database of baseline information on IAS already established on Viti Levu and their distributions, (2) an EDRR plan for Viti Levu that assigns roles and responsibilities of all EDRR partners, (3) a protocol for how rapid-response actions will be implemented, (4) a central hotline that the public can use to report suspicious new plants and animals, (5) a regime of regular monitoring surveys at likely introduction sites	BAF and partners	-An Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) plan is being developed, expected to be ready by June 2021. BAF has developed Plant and Animal Emergency Response plans that does take into account IAS and even domestic incursions (occurrence of threats in new areas).	Risk still present. EDRR has not been finalized. Draft and informal IAS baselines are available, but these are not validated yet. New IAS Task Force on Research may take this up.

			for IAS (e.g., ports, nurseries) to discover new incursions, (6) an outreach strategy to inform residents and institutional stakeholders of the need for vigilance and rapid reporting of new pests, (7) a training program for rapid responders, and (8) a dedicated rapid-response fund to pay for program activities. Once trialed in Viti Levu, it would be expanded nationally based on the initial learning.			
Climate change may alter the threats and risks associated with IAS	Environmental	While, this is very unlikely, climate change may raise the threat of IAS by increasing the frequency/severity of fires, floods, and other natural events and thereby decreasing ecosystem resilience and creating conditions where invasive species can more easily become established. The exact ways and timeframes over which climate change impacts will emerge are largely unknown, however they are expected to increase over time, most likely affecting localized expansion of suitable IAS range and species introductions in the short to medium-term. I = 3; P=3 (Moderate)	Climate change may raise the threat of IAS by increasing the frequency/severity of fires, floods, etc. and thereby decreasing ecosystem resilience and creating conditions where invasive species can more easily become established. Climatic parameters will be included in the IAS risk analysis activities to be undertaken in the project as well as in the National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP).	MOE and BAF	Fiji has a Green Growth Plan and has implemented policies to promote sustainable development in the country,. Fiji has pledged to transition completely to renewable energy sources by 2030 and has adopted a reforestation policy intended to store carbon from freshly planted trees. Fiji has activated efforts to monitor and launch rapid response to climate-related risks	As climate change continues, this also continues to be a potential risk. Unclear if this is tackled in the NISFSAP. In any case NISFSAP is not yet validated / promulgated.

ii. Social and environmental safeguards:

The UNDP Environmental and social safeguard requirements have been followed in the development of the this project. In accordance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure, the project is categorized as medium risk and is not expected to have significant negative environmental or social impacts that cannot be effectively managed through simple risk management actions. Subsequent PIRs of 2019 and 2020 have added some risks, see table below:



Table 6. New risks reported in PIRs

PIR	Types of Critical Risks	Critical risk management measures undertaken this reporting period
2019	Political	The Fiji Government budget for 2019/2020 resulted in a massive reduction in BAF's operating budget, which is therefore going to affect the recruitment of additional TBSOs for the eradication program i.e. instead of 40 only 16 Temporary Biosecurity Officers are supported for now.
	Social and Environmental	Non access to Laucala Island: Laucala Island management is reluctant to grant access to eradication field teams. Laucala Island management is denying any existence of GII on the island. BAF will pursue continued dialogue and Ministerial assistance is this persists.
	Social and Environmental	Working at Heights: The eradication teams were at risk of injuries working at heights (rock cliffs and tall trees). This has been improved when the National Fire Authority of Fiji (NFA) conducted repelling training for all eradication personnel.
2020	Social and Environmental	Because of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 there was a the travel restriction imposed by Government of Fiji since March. The project was directly affected with technical experts not able to travel to Fiji, e.g. the Chief Technical Adviser, Eradication Specialist, Canine Trainer and Telemetry Specialist. The CTA and Eradications specialist are flexible and have agreed to provide technical guidance remotely, until the borders reopen. The other consultancies are temporarily delayed as consultants are required to provide training in country, as its specialized training which cannot be done remotely
	Financial	Due to budget restrictions in most government ministries and COVID 19 crisis in Fiji co-financing component of the project may not be realized for some time. Case in point would be BAF with 2 million FJD for 2019/2020 budget (i.e. 1 million operating and 1 million capital) and 1 million for 2020/2021 financial year budget. Therefore, this is insufficient to support BAF's co-financing cash commitment at the moment however BAF continues to support in-kind for the project.

The PMU should shift to a quarterly discussion of risks and mitigation measures since some of these could prove critical for the overall success of the project. The project should also maintain an updated SESP that reflects new risks.

#### 3.4.1. Financial risks to sustainability

As mentioned in the above in different places, there is a **major risk to financial sustainability**. BAF budgets and revenues have already significantly reduced, which already caused delays and reduction in numbers of TBSOs that were recruited to implement and monitor GII eradication activities. The COVID-19 pandemic has put even more strain on government budgets and decreased revenues, and the further consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and its recovery are yet to be felt.

#### 3.4.2. Socio-economic risks to sustainability

As already seen in the above, there has been some reticence from certain private sector operators to engage in or support the GII eradication effort, as it was felt that these were not in line with the tourist experience. In general, the **economic and social threats and costs of IAS are still unclear to many economic operators** and the public in general, and this may negatively influence IAS prevention and eradication efforts. This therefore needs a ratcheted up effort for effective communication and outreach around the threats and impacts of IAS.

### 3.4.3. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

As the main Policy and Strategy documents are not yet in place, the **institutional and policy environment is not conducive for effective IAS prevention and eradication**, and hence this is not sustainable. Coordination mechanisms are also not operating at the moment (notably the FIST and FIIT, and this needs to be fixed for more effective and sustainable coordination.

### 3.4.4. Environmental risks to sustainability

Without more effective prevention and control of IAS, the **environmental risks** to sustainability are major. For instance, if the GII is not eradicated, or at least controlled in the Northern Islands, this threat can spread to the main islands of Fiji and act as a bridgehead to other islands in the Pacific, with major consequences. It is clear that the GII eradication effort will need to be sustained (much) beyond the lifetime of the project for it to be successful (even if not completely eradicated, but at least controlled / confined). This holds also true for other IAS that already do have an effect (e.g. African Tulip, Taro Beetle) on ecosystems and biodiversity, and will have further consequences when allowed to spread.

## 3.5. Lessons Learned

The following are some of the lessons learned distilled from the findings above and other experiences of the consultants / reviewers with this and similar projects:

- During project development, pay special and sufficient attention to developing the Logical Framework, especially the Results Framework, including the Indicators, Baselines and Targets. In this project the Results Framework was not well developed with non-specific indicators, missing baselines and unclear Targets, and this created challenges in implementation and reporting.
- The Results Framework should be critically reviewed during the Inception Workshop. If baselines are missing (which is possible if data are missing), the completion of these baselines should be prioritized during the beginning of the project (e.g. before the first annual report).
- All changes and actions agreed at the Inception Workshop should be clearly stipulated in the Inception Report and included in later reporting (e.g. when changes to the Results Framework and immediate actions are agreed)
- The membership of the Board should be broad and inclusive, and timing and frequency of Board Meetings adhered to. This should be clearly spelled out in the Board's TORs and adhered to.
- Reporting should be Results Based, and thereby inform the Board Meetings and PIRs, so that well-informed decisions can be taken and adaptive management be ensured.
- Financial delivery should be monitored closely and clearly reported in Board Meetings and PIRs. This should include Co-financing as well, including mobilization of more co-financing and recommendations for its use.
- Consultancies should be well planned, with clear Terms of Reference, that should also include capacity development of local consultants, staff and stakeholders.
- A yearly stocktake and planning workshop can be organized with all relevant stakeholders and where guidance and oversight can be provided and priority planning for next cycle spelled out.
- Ensure updated and clear internal and external communication, including main results achieved, challenges and risks to effective project implementation.
- When implementing pilot projects, or activities far from the PIU (like in this project in the Northern Islands), this should be well coordinated, possibly through appointed and empowered managers / coordinators, that report regularly to the PIU and Implementing Partner(s).

## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following are the conclusions from the MTR team, drawn after going through all relevant documents, undertaking interviews with a wide array of stakeholders and further in-depth analysis. These conclusions are derived from the main findings from the previous chapter. These conclusions respond to the evaluative framework that was developed, and are structured around the main categories: Project Strategy; Progress Towards Results; Project Implementation and Adaptive Management; and Sustainability.

### 4.1. Conclusions

#### Project Strategy

1. The Project is well designed and the project Document well written. However, the indicator framework was found to be weak, with some indicators lacking “SMARTness”, no baselines and arbitrary targets. Some changes were already proposed during the Project Inception Workshop but were never formalized.
2. Some stakeholders questioned the focus in the project on and the potential threat of the Giant Invasive Iguanas, arguing threats of other IAS are more severe.
3. The legal aspects of IAS were not addressed by the project. BAF has requested UNDP to review policies, and BAF with support of FAO is revising the Biosecurity Law.

#### Progress Towards Results:

4. There is good appreciation of the project by the main stakeholders and interviewees. However, progress is falling behind and is not well reported and communicated. This unfavourable progress is mainly due to unsatisfactory indicators, missing baselines and targets, which makes it difficult to assess progress towards project results.
5. Delays caused by the COVID pandemic have also played a role in unsatisfactory progress, with main consultants not being able to travel or join the project, and meetings, workshops and monitoring visits not taking place.
6. Key policies and strategies are not (yet) delivered by the project, i.e. the NISFSAP and EDRR, though drafts are available, which are key to effective prevention and eradication of IAS
7. The national Coordination around IAS is not functioning. The proposed National IAS Committee is not established, the Fiji Invasive Species Task force (FIST) is not meeting and the Four Islands IAS Task force (FIIT) has not yet been established. Two new IAS Task Forces have been established by the project, but their status is unclear.
8. There is no comprehensive Training Need Assessment and Training Plan that works towards capacity building around more effective prevention and control of IAS. The Tracking Tool and Capacity Score Card (though not submitted in time) report some increased capacity, but this could not be verified.
9. The awareness and outreach programme of the project is “spotty”. An awareness and outreach programme around the GII eradication in the Northern has recently started, implemented by the NGO Nature Fiji, and is showing some impact, but needs to be better reported. The National communication and outreach programme has not started.
10. The work on improved Knowledge and Information systems around IAS has not started, as consultants are not recruited. Some elements are already in place (scattered data on IAS), but this is not organized and does not inform proper communication and outreach.

#### Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

11. There is a full fledged PIU (with Project Coordinator / manager, Administration Assistant, Intern) in place that develops and tries to follow the workplans but seems stretched. Project implementation has also suffered from the COVID-19 pandemic which made implementation and monitoring difficult. The Project Manager is appreciated for his technical knowledge, but has left the project in April 2021.

- An interim Manager is appointed and a new full-fledged project manager will be recruited (job description already advertised).
12. Support from consultants is difficult when these are not able to join or visit. Remote communication proves to be challenging and contract status of consultants is unclear.
  13. BAF has showed support to the PIU and project. However, there is no full-fledged and empowered CEO in place, with the present incumbent already in an acting position for over a year. BAF is also in financial difficulties, with recent drastic budget cuts and diminished revenues.
  14. UNDP country office provides pro-active support through the focal point (programme analyst). However, the staff in the cluster seems stretched, with (too) many projects being managed in Fiji and throughout the Pacific Region, and the Cluster Leader is also still in an acting position. The previous UNDP Regional Technical Adviser supporting the project has recently left, and a new RTA is in place, based in the UK.
  15. The Steering Committee consists of very few members and has only met twice (in 2018 and on 21/04/2021), and is therefore not fulfilling its oversight function. Latest Board Meeting recommended to increase meeting frequency to 2 meetings / year and include Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of I Taukei Affairs and Fiji Revenue Customs Authority as members. Board TORs to be amended.
  16. There is at present moderate delivery at 35% at mid-term, with skewed delivery over outcomes: higher delivery in Outcome 2 (Prevention on Northern Islands: 45%) and 3 (Eradication of GII: 51%) as opposed to Outcome 1 (National Policies and coordination: 13%) and Outcome 4 (National awareness and outreach: 3%), whilst Management costs seemed over spent (87%)
  17. One spot-check and 1 audit have taken place, which didn't show any major issues (a "negative statement of cash balance" was solved) and only minor remarks around inventories.
  18. Co-financing statements were not submitted and cannot be assessed. Given the budget constraints of the Government of Fiji and BAF in particular, it is expected that co-financing delivery is low.
  19. Monitoring has taken place at activity level. However, monitoring at Project Outcome and Objective level has been weak, with progress reports not reporting towards results and targets. The Tracking Tool has been filled and submitted at mid-term, but the capacity score card has not been submitted, and risk logs were seemingly not updated.
  20. Reporting and communication about results in the project is weak, which makes that some stakeholders, but also relevant policy-makers, development partners and reviewers are not well aware of the project undertakings and results.
  21. A variety of stakeholders was consulted throughout project development and implementation, although some important stakeholders only recently engaged meaningfully with the project. Most communities and stakeholders in the Northern Islands were aware of and supported the GII eradication efforts, though some resort owners were not supportive. The active engagement of the Department of Environment seems lacking in the project.
  22. Internal and external communication in and from the project needs to be improved, for more effective implementation and dissemination of results, and creating awareness.
  23. Although there is a "Gender Analysis and Action Plan" for the project, there is little reporting against it.

### **Sustainability**

24. Risks were comprehensively laid out in the project document, including the Social & Environmental Safeguards. Although reported in the PIRs with some new risks emerging, reporting to risks and updated of risk logs has been minimal.
25. Financial Risks to sustainability are significant. The government and BAF suffer from budget cuts and reduced revenues. Combined with further uncertainties around the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, this will have repercussions on the IAS prevention and control efforts.
26. Economic and social threats and costs of IAS are still unclear to many economic operators and the public in general, and this may negatively influence IAS prevention and control efforts in the future.

27. If main policies and action plans are not in place and coordination around IAS will not function properly, this poses major risks for ecosystems and sustainable development.
28. Environmental risks of non-effective prevention and control of IAS are serious. Not only for Fiji, but indeed the wider Pacific region, with endemic and vulnerable ecosystems at further risk from entry of IAS

## 4.2. Recommendations

The following are the main recommendations from the MTR team, based on the conclusions and further findings articulated above. The recommendations respond to the main evaluation categories: Project Strategy; Progress Towards Results; Project Implementation and Adaptive Management; and Sustainability

### Project Strategy

1. Relook at RRF and Indicator Framework and revise, following the proposed changes at the Inception Workshop, recommendations of MTR and priorities and results already achieved going forward.

### Progress Towards Results

2. Organize a comprehensive Stock-take and Planning Workshop post MTR for refocusing and better implementation of the project. This should include review of indicators, targets, modalities, partnerships, delivery, COVID-19 recovery, gender aspects, etc. This should lead to a refocused and prioritized multi-year workplan until the end of the project. These proposed changes to Logical Framework and Multi-Year Workplan should be presented to and endorsed by the Project Board.
3. Prioritize finalization and promulgation of NISFSAP, EDRR, Training Needs Assessment and Training Plan in the new Multi-Year Workplan.
4. Review implementation of GII Eradication Plan and propose action plan to speed up or modify or re-prioritize the plan for implementation towards the end of the project and beyond the project lifetime. Investigate also the validity of the “Emergency Declaration” by the Government under which this eradication effort takes place, and propose a solution if not longer valid.
5. Revive and strengthen FIST, FIIT, Project Board (including the new full-fledged CEO, more and relevant members and more frequent, well-structured meetings).
6. Speed up implementation of Outcome 4 (Increased Awareness), with setting up of clearinghouse mechanism, databases and national communication and outreach plan.

### Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

7. The **project Implementation Unit will need to be strengthened** for more effective and sped up implementation. The current Project Manager is leaving and will need to be replaced soonest by a full-fledged contracted Project Manager. Further strengthening is proposed, e.g. through an extra contracted (associate) coordinator taking care of Outcome 2 (Prevention and Control of IAS around Taveuni) and 3 (control / eradication of GII) which take up a lot of time. This position could even be stationed at or around Taveuni. The new Full PIU Project Manager can then dedicate him/herself to Outcomes 1 and 4 at National level (which need speeding up as these lag behind in delivery), and the general project reporting and monitoring. The management costs for such strengthened PIU will need, however, to be considered, as at Mid-Term Review the management budget has already taken up 87% of its intended full budget. It is therefore recommended that BAF should recruit and pay for the second (or associate) project manager that could be based at Taveuni from its co-financing. Otherwise a budget revision from UNDP and GEF will need to be requested, which may not be approved, as under GEF rules only 7 % of the total GEF budget can be dedicated to management costs<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Please verify this.

8. The new and strengthened **PIU should lead in the strategizing and planning exercise with all main stakeholders and partners** as recommended above.
9. **PIU may consider adopting the Fiji GEF-funded Ridge to Reef (R2R) project approach** by contracting local institutions to take the lead in the implementation of project activities that are relevant to each of them.
10. The PIU should also **improve its internal and external communication and visibility**. This could be helped by further attention to implementation of Outcome 4 (Awareness) which has been lagging behind and needs speeding up.
11. The **involvement of consultants should be reconsidered**. The involvement and delivery of the CTA has not been ideal, because he could not travel to Fiji to oversee and verify and deliver his Outputs. It is recommended that the present outputs that the CTA still has to deliver (final NISFSAP, EDRR, TORs for FIIT) are urgently finalized. The TORs for the CTA could then be revised to include remaining key outputs and deliverables, following the newly planned Multi-Year Plan. The revised TORs for CTA could then also include more strategic overview and technical support in planning, and reviewing outputs from the project.
12. The **GII Eradication Plan will need to be critically reviewed**, including by practitioners and experts in Fiji. As a function of this review, TORs for monitoring and follow up of the GII eradication can be developed and advertised nationally and internationally<sup>6</sup>.
13. The **Project Board' TORs to be amended** to reflect inclusion of Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of I Taukei Affairs and Fiji Revenue Customs Authority, and to have at least 2 board meetings per year. This should step up the Board's oversight and pro-active guidance during the remaining period of the project, given that progress until at mid-term now is unsatisfactory, not sustainable and needs re-strategizing and speeding up.
14. **Progress Reporting needs to improve and become more meaningful** in monitoring and guiding the project to its intended results. The newly developed Project Progress reporting template by the UNDP office with better reporting against results could help. This template should be rolled out immediately and guidance and possible training should be provided to the PIU. Updating and reporting against Risks in Risk Logs, SESP would need to be included and acted upon when needed.
15. **Financial reporting need to be closely monitored**, especially the delivery per Outcome, to avoid that the project and outcome delivery falls behind, and with some outcomes spending much more of allotted budget than others. This also holds true for the Co-Financing which should be more closely monitored and better used, e.g. towards the management cost.
16. **Project oversight and guidance from UNDP could be strengthened** by continuing to allocate a programme associate in the RSD cluster to the project, who should assist in administration and finance of the project. The focal programme analyst could dedicate more time to this project, which is lagging behind in progress, but which is important for sustainable development in Fiji and beyond. The new RTA should try to further connect to and increase her involvement with the project for better guidance and steering, including a visit when this is possible.
17. **Implement and report fully on the Gender Analysis and Action Plan**.
18. Given the low progress and delivery to date, also due to the COVID-19 pandemic, but also considering that a reasonable foundation has been laid by the project, with budding partnerships and main policies / strategies in final draft form, and given that with above recommendations implementation can become more effective and sped up, **it is recommended to extend the project with another 6 months (no cost extension)**, or to the end of 2023, in order to achieve still meaningful and sustainable results.

### Sustainability

19. **Risks to project sustainability should be monitored**, especially during these economically and financially difficult times, with already occurring national budget cuts and decreasing revenues, mainly caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The on-going programmes for COVID recovery could be

---

<sup>6</sup> should also be proposed to the previous GII Eradication Expert of the project

screened to see if biodiversity conservation and IAS prevention and control feature in there, and include these when and where relevant.

20. **The national IAS control awareness programmes should be urgently implemented** and results used to counter any prevalent reticence and risk to the increased effort for prevention and control of IAS. The on-going support from the UNDP Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) programme could also help in identifying and providing scenario analyses to provide economic and social arguments in favour of IAS prevention and control (e.g. of GII but also other IAS). However, key stakeholders seem not yet convinced on the usefulness in Fiji of TSA , and this needs further reflection and discussion.

## **5. Annexes**

1. MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
2. Revised Workplan for MTR
3. List of Documents Reviewed
4. List of persons interviewed
5. MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
6. Progress towards outcome analysis
7. Ratings Scales
8. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct
9. MTR final report clearance form

*Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report

*Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools



## Annex 1: Detailed Terms of Reference for Independent Mid Term Review of the Fiji Invasive Alien Species Project

<b>Location</b>	Homebased
<b>Project Name</b>	Fiji Invasive Alien Species Project
<b>Consultancy Position</b>	Team Leader (Mid Term Review)
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Individual Contractor
<b>Post Level</b>	International Consultant
<b>Languages required:</b>	English
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	24 days commencing no later than February 10 and completion by April 12, 2021

### BACKGROUND

#### Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled *Building Capacities to Address Invasive Alien Species to Enhance the Chances of Long-term Survival of Terrestrial Endemic and Threatened Species on Taveuni Island, Surrounding Islets and Throughout Fiji* project (PIMS#5589) implemented through the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on the 16 May, 2018 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance on Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Project* - [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance\\_Midterm%20Review%20\\_EN\\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)

#### Project Background and Information

Invasive alien species (IAS) are the greatest threat to biodiversity in the Pacific Islands. The recent introduction of Giant Invasive Iguana – GII (*Iguana iguana*) – to Fiji represents the first established population of this species in the Pacific and is a potential bridgehead to some of the world’s most isolated island ecosystems. GII have already caused harm throughout the Caribbean where they are spreading fast and have significant detrimental effects, including on native biodiversity, agriculture and tourism. Although there are several national and local-level initiatives to address IAS in Fiji, these efforts, lack adequate capacity and an overall comprehensive strategy to ensure a systematic and effective protection of biodiversity-rich and important areas. An effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort against GII, before populations grow beyond the point where they can be controlled is currently lacking and urgently needed.

The objective of the project is to improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species. It is a 5- year project with a total grant of USD 3,502,968 from the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The overarching objective will be achieved through four interrelated outcomes namely:

- **Component 1:** Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji
- **Component 2:** Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi

- **Component 3:** Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala
- **Component 4:** Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping to invasive alien species and biosecurity

Aside from the GEF grant, the planned parallel co-financing from the Government of Fiji is estimated at USD 26,736,418 and in-kind co-financing from UNDP is estimated at \$101,096. Stakeholders participating in this project include the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fisheries, Fiji Inland Revenue and Customs Authority, Airports Fiji Limited, Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji, Ministry of *I Taukei* Affairs, Non-Governmental Organizations (Nature Fiji) and Tertiary Institutions (University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University).

The Biosecurity Authority of Fiji is the project implementing partner and is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

A National Project board meets at least once annually to approve high level documents including Annual Work Plans and provides strategic support. On a daily basis, a Project Implementation Unit (based at BAF) is responsible for executing activities. A Project Manager and a Project Admin-Finance Officer is based in Suva. At least four Field Eradication Officers and four Temporary Biosecurity Officers are stationed in Taveuni and Qamea. Additional support is provided by consultants which has included a Chief Technical Adviser, and an Eradication Specialist.

Fiji was affected by the COVID 19 pandemic. Between March and April, lockdowns were declared for at least 2 weeks in Lautoka, Labasa and Suva. As a result of these travel restriction, field work including awareness raising and surveys was temporarily put on hold for at least 2 months. In March, a national wide curfew was put in place by government from 8pm – 5am daily. These have now been relaxed to 11pm – 4am. Social gatherings is now restricted to 100 persons. To date, 35 cases of COVID 19 have been recorded. Most cases are recorded from individuals returning to Fiji and in still in quarantine. Unfortunately, 2 deaths were recorded but these were from inside quarantine zones.

### **MTR Purpose**

The main purpose of the MTR is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, assess any cross cutting and gender issues in contribution to achieving the objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation for the remaining period of the project), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that (who) will be use to improve the project.

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

### **MTR Approach and Methodology**

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

The MTR 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, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core

Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>7</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Fiji Inland Revenue Customs Authority, Ministry of Agriculture, Fiji Police, Maritime Safety Administration Authority of Fiji, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fishery, National Disaster Management Authority, Ports Authority of Fiji, Provincial Office/Ministry of I Taukei Affairs, Nature Fiji, Ministry of Environment, Airports Fiji Limited, National Trust of Fiji, Ministry of Health, Rural and Maritime Development, Ministry of Defense and National Security, Ports Authority Fiji Limited, Conservation International, University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University, National Fire Authority, Birdlife International, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (Land Resources Division), Rural and Maritime Development, Temporary Biosecurity Eradication Officers, community leaders, community participants, private sector (Matagi Resort, Lacucala Island Resort, Qamea Beach Resort) and UNDP.

Additionally, the MTR team may require to conduct field missions to the following project sites of Qamea, Taveuni, Matagi and Laucala. If travel restrictions are still in-place, the stakeholder consultations with stakeholders will be done by virtual means. All documents will be made available online.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must 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 MTR report. Hence, the bidders for this MTR consultancy assignment must be required to present their proposed methodology for the MTR.

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

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

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 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2020 and travel within the country is managed. For gatherings, there is a limit of 100 persons in total. Currently there are no lock downs in country but daily curfews from 11pm – 4am continue. Individuals entering Fiji are expected to undergo a 14-day quarantine period. Health authorities continue to provide updates and advice.

If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR 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 MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the MTR 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

<sup>7</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR 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.

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 MTR schedule.

## DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### Scope of Work

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

#### i. Project Strategy

##### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
  - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

##### Results Framework/Log frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

## ii. Progress Towards Results

### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

Project Strategy	Indicator <sup>8</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>9</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>11</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>12</sup>	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective:</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

### **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved      Yellow= On target to be achieved      Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits

## iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

### Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

<sup>8</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>9</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>10</sup> If available

<sup>11</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>12</sup> Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

#### Work Planning:

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

#### Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		<b>TOTAL</b>			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are

they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

#### Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks<sup>13</sup> (in the SESP).
  - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

#### Reporting:

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

#### Communications & Knowledge Management:

<sup>13</sup> Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

#### **iv. Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

##### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

##### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

##### Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

#### **Lessons Learned**

The Evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.



- On the basis of the outcome of the evaluation, detailing recommendations on how implementation of project can be expedited
- The recommended future project strategy is expected to feed into the integrated overall work plan for the project
- Assess possible links to other existing national and regional agencies and provide recommendations for potential areas of partnership
- Opportunities to strengthen project implementation (through staff training, capacity building or networking or improved management systems) should be identified

### Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

### Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Fiji IAS Project)**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description	Team
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A		
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Etc.		
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)		
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)		

### Composition

- A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one local expert from the country of the project.
- The International Consultant (the team leader) will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Mid Term Review Report. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

*The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team 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 MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners*

#### **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission <b>Date:</b> 19 February January 2021	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission <b>Date:</b> 10 March 2021	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft MTR Report</b>	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission <b>Date:</b> 24 March 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft <b>Date:</b> 12 April 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

#### **Institutional Arrangement**

- The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Pacific Fiji in close cooperation with the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji.
- The consultant expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules.
- The consultant is expected to provide his/her own computer.

#### **Supervision/Reporting**

- The consultant will report directly to UNDP Head of Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit and/or her/his representative and UNDP Regional Technical Specialist/Advisor based in / Bangkok, Thailand.
- UNDP will ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted, and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email).

- The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.
- Project team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/virtual meeting if travel to project site is restricted.

#### Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 24 working days over a time period of 9 of weeks, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	No. OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	2 days	19 February 2021
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	9 days	10 March 2021
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	1 day	18 March 2021
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	7 days	24 March 2021
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	5 days	12 April 2021

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

#### Duty Station

The consultant will be homebased and will be expected to provide support remotely based on the current travel restrictions from COVID 19

### COMPETENCIES

The following competencies are required:

- Demonstrates integrity and commitment to UN principles and values and ethical standards;
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
- Ability to work well as part of a multi-cultural team and displays gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Ability to work in a team;
- Self-management, emotional intelligence and conflict management;
- Analytical and strategic thinking/results orientation;
- Experience in participating and following the project cycle, creative capacity solving problems;
- Computer literacy (e.g. Microsoft Word, Excel, and Power Point) is a prerequisite;
- Ability to engage various partners and stakeholders and build strong relationships with clients and other stakeholders;
- Demonstrates strong commitment and patience to deal with competing deadlines, demands, and interests.

### REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

**Educational Qualifications:**

- A Master's degree in conservation, biology, sustainable management, or other closely related fields

**Experience**

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience in evaluating GEF and/or donor funded initiatives;
- Experience working in Pacific region;
- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years - biodiversity conservation, climate change/ Invasive Aliens Species management
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity conservation/
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

**Language requirements**

- Fluency of English language is required (verbal and written).

**Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery and approval of MTR Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit by February 19, 2021
  - 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit by March 24, 2021
  - 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail by April 12, 2021
- Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

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

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

**Evaluation Method and Criteria**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both: a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and b) offering the lowest price/cost.

**Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points)**

- Criteria 1: Relevance of Education – Minimum Master's degree in conservation, biology, sustainable management, or other closely related fields (Max 15 points)
- Criteria 2: Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years - biodiversity conservation, invasive alien species management, climate change adaptation (Max 20 points)
- Criteria 3: Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (Max 5 points)
- Criteria 4: Experience in evaluating GEF and/or donor funded initiatives (Max 20 points)
- Criteria 5: Experience working in Pacific region (Max 10 points)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews maybe conducted for shortlisted bidders only as part of the technical evaluation process to validate the technical evaluation scores maybe adjusted accordingly.

## Annex 2: Revised Work Plan MTR

TASK	DELIVER- ABLE	RESPON- SIBLE	MONTH / WEEK													NOTES  (new notes in red font – 01/04/2021)
			MARCH			APRIL				MAY						
			1 - 7	8- 14	15- 21	22- 28	29- 4	5- 11	12- 18	19- 25	26- 02	03- 06	10- 16	17- 23	24- 30	
Sign Contract	Signed contracts	UNDP Fiji, MTR Team	X													Team Leader (TL) signed 01/03, National Consultant (NC) 08/03. <b>Contract duration until 30 April.</b>
Kick-Off Meeting		MTR Team, UNDP, PIU	X													Zoom Meetings on 15/02 and 03/03
Prepare Inception Report	Inception Report	MTR Team		X	X											Inception Meeting on held on 18/03.
Document Review	Review Notes	MTR Team		X	X	X	X									Documents provided by PMU and UNDP
Interviews	Interview Notes	MTR Team				X	X	X	X							In person by NC, remote by TL+NC.
Site Visit	Field Notes	Saki						X								National Consultant to Taveuni and islets, 8 – 10 April
Prepare Draft MTR	Draft MTR	MTR Team							X	X	X					MTR Team will compile <b>by 30/04</b>
Presentation of Findings / Draft MTR	Presentatio n(s)	MTR Team							X	X						<b>De-Brief to main stakeholders on 15/04. Presentation to Steering Committee (21/04)</b>
Review of Draft MTR	Consolidat ed Comments	Key Stake- holders / UNDP / PSC									X	X				Consolidated Comments provided in time (<2 weeks)
Final MTR	Final MTR	MTR Team											X			Include comments audit trail ( <b>Final MTR by 14/05</b> )
Review Final MTR		UNDP, IP												X		
Provide Management Response	Manage- ment Comments	UNDP (CO, PIU, RTA)													X	

### ANNEX 3: List of documents reviewed

- PIF
- UNDP Initiation Plan
- UNDP Project Document
- Co-Financing Letters
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Project Inception Report
- All Project Implementation Reports {PIR's}
- Annual / Quarterly Workplans
- Quarterly / Annual progress reports
- Audit reports
- Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
- Monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- UNDP country programme document(s)
- Minutes of the Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings, Technical Committee Meetings)
- Project site location maps
- Consultancy Reports (TORs, Inception, Technical, Final)
- Mission and Back to Office Reports
- Training Reports
- Any additional reports as relevant
- Technical Working Groups / Meeting Reports, e.g. Fiji invasive Species task Force (FIST) and Four Islands IAS Task Force (FIIT)
- Co Financing Table
- Etc.

## ANNEX 4: List of persons interviewed

Date	Fiji	Time NL	Confirmed?	Person	Agency	Function	Contact details	Interviewer
Mon 22/03	6 pm	7am	Yes. Done	Ilaisa Dakaica	UNDP / BAF PIU	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:ilaisa_gef@baf.com.fj">ilaisa_gef@baf.com.fj</a>	Jan + Saki
				Ravi		Project administration		
Wed 24/03	6pm	7am	yes	Nunia Thomas-Moko	NFMV	Director	<a href="mailto:nuniat@naturefiji.org">nuniat@naturefiji.org</a>	Jan + Saki
Thu 25/03	am	14:00	Yes	James Stanford	UNDP / PIU	Biosecurity Consultant (CTA)	<a href="mailto:jsecology@gmail.com">jsecology@gmail.com</a>	Jan
	6pm	7am		Alifereti Naikatini	Native Iguana Consultant	USP – PhD Student	<a href="mailto:naikatini@gmail.com">naikatini@gmail.com</a>	Jan + Saki
Fri 26/03	am	14:00	Yes	Fred Kraus	UNDP / PIU	Consultant (Eradication Expert)	<a href="mailto:fkraus@umich.edu">fkraus@umich.edu</a>	Jan
	6pm	8am	yes	Akosita Valamalua	Principle Customs Officer	Fiji Revenue and Customs Services	<a href="mailto:avalamalua@frcs.org.fj">avalamalua@frcs.org.fj</a>	Jan + Saki
				Jone Mainayau	Principle Customs Officer	Fiji Revenue and Customs Services	<a href="mailto:jmainayau@frcs.org.fj">jmainayau@frcs.org.fj</a>	
Mon 29/03	6pm	8am	yes	Steve Cranwell Miliana Ravuso	Birdlife		<a href="mailto:steve.cranwell@birdlife.org">steve.cranwell@birdlife.org</a> <a href="mailto:miliana.ravuso@birdlife.org">miliana.ravuso@birdlife.org</a>	Jan
Tue 30/03	5pm	7am	yes	Saiasi Buluta	iTaukei Affairs Board	Manager Conservation	<a href="mailto:saiasi.buluta@govnet.gov.fj">saiasi.buluta@govnet.gov.fj</a>	Jan + Saki
	6pm	8am	yes	Winifereti Naninoca	UNDP Fiji	Cluster Leader Inclusive Growth / Resilience	<a href="mailto:wini.naninoca@undp.org">wini.naninoca@undp.org</a>	Jan + Saki
Wed 31/03	07:30am	21:30	Yes	Henriette, Floyd, Manon,	UNDP	TSA	<a href="mailto:henriette.friling@undp.org">henriette.friling@undp.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:marlon.flores@undp.org">marlon.flores@undp.org</a>	
	pm	10am	yes	Penny Stock	UNDP	RTA	<a href="mailto:Penny.stock@undp.org">Penny.stock@undp.org</a>	Jan
	6pm	8am	yes	Surend Pratap	BAF	A/CEO	<a href="mailto:spratap@baf.com.fj">spratap@baf.com.fj</a>	Jan + Saki
Thu 01/04	pm	4pm	Yes	Lisa Farroway	World Bank	Ex UNDP RTA	<a href="mailto:lfarroway@worldbank.org">lfarroway@worldbank.org</a>	Jan
	6pm	8am	yes	Merewalesi	UNDP	M&E specialist	<a href="mailto:Merewalesi.laveti@gmail.com">Merewalesi.laveti@gmail.com</a>	Jan + Saki
Tue 06/04	5pm	7am	Yes	Mereia Fong	Ministry Agriculture	Dir. Research	<a href="mailto:Mereia.fong@govnet.gov.fj">Mereia.fong@govnet.gov.fj</a>	Jan
Thu 08/04  Saki Field Visit	pm		Yes	Iosefo Tikomaisolomoni	Island Community Leaders	Local chief		Saki
			Yes	Jovesa Takiveikata	BAF	Field Coordinator		Saki
			Yes	Vika Raiwalui	BAF	Field Coordinator		Saki



Date	Time		Confirmed?	Person	Agency	Function	Contact details	Interviewer
	Fiji	NL						
			Yes	Iliaseri Nakora	BAF	Field Coordinator		Saki
			Yes	Luisa Serevi	BAF	Field Coordinator		Saki
	5pm	7am		Kiji Vukikomola	Fiji Env. Law Association	Executive Director	<a href="mailto:kiji.vukikomoala@fela.org.fj">kiji.vukikomoala@fela.org.fj</a>	Jan
Fri 09/04  Saki Field Visit	am		Yes	Dausiga Nakaora	Commissioner Northern's Office	District Officer Taveuni		Saki
			Yes	Savirio Tolo	BAF	Taveuni BAF Leader		Saki
			Yes	Seremaia Bolaitamana	Island Community Leader	Village leader		Saki
			Yes	Mataiasi Tagivetaua	BAF	TBSO		Saki
			Yes	Sepo Toduadua	BAF	TBSO		Saki
			Yes	Apenisa Seduadua	BAF	TBSO		Saki
	10am		yes	Jason Kumar	Qamea Island Resort	Operation Manager	+679 8692423	Saki
	12pm		yes	Mr and Mrs Douglas	Matagi Island Resort	Owners	+679 778 0061	
	5pm	7am	yes	Floyd Robinson	UNDP	Programme Analyst	<a href="mailto:Floyd.robinson@undp.org">Floyd.robinson@undp.org</a>	Jan
Mon 12/04	am							
Tue 13/04	6pm	8am		Ilaisa, Ravi	PIU	Project Manager, Administration	<a href="mailto:idakaica_gef@baf.com.fj">idakaica_gef@baf.com.fj</a> ; <a href="mailto:rchand@baf.com.fj">rchand@baf.com.fj</a>	Jan + Saki
Wed 14/04	5pm	7am		Mere Vukialau	Ministry of Forestry	Division of Silviculture	<a href="mailto:Vukialau.mere3189@gmail.com">Vukialau.mere3189@gmail.com</a>	Jan
Thu 15/04	6pm	8am		UNDP, PIU, RTA			<a href="mailto:idakaica_gef@baf.com.fj">idakaica_gef@baf.com.fj</a> ; <a href="mailto:Floyd.robinson@undp.org">Floyd.robinson@undp.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:Merewalesi.laveti@gmail.com">Merewalesi.laveti@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Penny.stock@undp.org">Penny.stock@undp.org</a>	Jan + Saki
Fri 16/04	5pm	7am		Nanise Kuridrani	Fisheries?	Senior Fisheries Officer	<a href="mailto:Nanise.kuridrani@govnet.gov.fj">Nanise.kuridrani@govnet.gov.fj</a>	Jan

## ANNEX 5: MTR evaluative matrix

The following is the evaluative matrix, specifying the main review criteria, and the indicators or benchmarks against which the criteria will be assessed. The “Evaluative Questions” are to be considered as “Guiding questions”. Not all of these questions need to be asked in every interview (some interviewees may be strategically, technically or more management oriented and hence only the relevant questions may be asked), and the wording can be adapted based on the interview circumstances.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
Is the project relevant to Fiji's environment policies?	Relevant changes to Project design	Project Document, National strategy documents; Interviews	Desk Reviews and analysis; interviews
Is the project relevant to United Nations Pacific Strategy for Fiji and the UNDP Sub Regional Program Document?	Biodiversity and Biosecurity challenges articulated	UN and other Regional / Pacific Strategies	Desk Reviews and expert interviews
In what ways is the project engaging stakeholder participation	Stakeholders awareness / engagement	Project Inception Report; Progress Reports; Stakeholder views; Project Briefs; media coverage	Desk / Document review; Media review; Interviews
In what ways is the project addressing targeted beneficiaries?	Activities undertaken; Beneficiaries engagement and participation + benefits	Project Inception Report; Progress Reports; Stakeholder / expert views Project Briefs	Desk / Document review; Interviews
Is the project specifically addressing gender issues ?	Gender Marker; Gender activities undertaken	Project Documents; Project Reports Progress reports / PIR Reviews ; stakeholder opinions	Desk Reviews, expert and stakeholder interviews
Are stakeholders actively supporting implementation of the project in the northern division .e.g. Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi	Project activities undertaken with stakeholders; Stakeholder views and participation	Project Inception Report; Progress Reports; Interviews Project Briefs Communication & Advocacy materials	Desk / Document review; Interviews
What changes could be made in project design to improve effectiveness?	Changes proposed / documented	Project Document Project Inception Report; Progress Reports / PIRs; Risk logs Stakeholder / expert views Project Briefs	Document reviews; Expert opinions; Stakeholder interviews
What changes could be made within remainder of project to improve achievement of objectives?	Changes proposed to Logframe MTR Review	Project Document; Inception Report; PIRs Risk logs	Document reviews; Expert opinions; Stakeholder interviews
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
Are activities and outputs of the project consistent with project goals and objectives?	Quality assurance report; SMART indicators Tracking Tools	PIF; Project Document; Inception Report; PIRs Tracking Tools	Desk review, document analysis; Stakeholder interviews

What is progress against indicators in terms of expected targets against outcomes?	PIR assessments	Project Document; PIRs Project monitoring Reports	Desk review; Document analysis; Stakeholder interviews
How was risk managed?	Changes in risk assessment and activities documented and actioned	Project Document; SESP; PIRs	Desk Review; Document analysis; Stakeholder and expert interviews
What lessons can be drawn in term of effectiveness?	Changes in project strategy and activities	PIRs Lessons Learned Reports Project Briefs Risk Logs	Desk Review; Document analysis; Stakeholder and expert interviews
How could the project be more effective in achieving results?	Stakeholder and expert opinions	PIRs; Lessons Learned Reports; Project Briefs; Reviews; Risk Logs	Desk Review; Document analysis; Stakeholder and expert interviews
What are remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?	Barriers Identified	Project Document, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
What are ways in which the project can further expand results and benefits already achieved?	Recommendations for way forward identified and reported	Project Document, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Interviews	Analysis of Project Documents; Progress Reports; Expert and stakeholder views
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:</b>			
Was the project logical framework, work plans and risk logs used as management tools during project implementation? Were there any changes applied to any of them?	Changes to Logframe and Risk Log documented	Project Document & Inception report, Project Workplans, Project progress reports, PIRs.	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far?	Timely workplans and progress reports; Non-qualified audits	Project Document & Inception report, Project Workplans, Project monitoring and progress reports, PIRs, Audits, spot checks.	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Were adaptive measures needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?	Changes made and documented	Project Document & Inception report, Project Workplans, PSC minutes, Project monitoring and progress reports, PIRs, audits, spot checks	Analysis of Project Documents; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of reports and implementation	Project Document & Inception report, Project Workplans, PSC minutes, Project monitoring and progress reports, PIRs, audits, spot checks	Analysis of Project Documents; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures?	Changes documented and made	SESP, PIRs, Risk Logs	Analysis of Project Documents, Progress Reports, Reviews

Were progress reports produced in a timely manner?	Dates of submission and approval	Progress Reports	Desk review, interviews project management unit, UNDP
Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks?	Changes documented and followed	PIF, Project Document, SESP, Risk Logs	Analysis of Project Documents, Progress Reports, Reviews, Interviews
Was co-financing leveraged and to what extent?	Amount leveraged	PIRs, Progress Reports, Audits, Spot Checks, Interviews, CF Table	Analysis of Project Documents; PIRs; Progress Reports; PSC minutes; Expert and stakeholder views
Is there a Stakeholder Engagement Plan and is it being implemented? If not what are the challenges?	Stakeholder engagement plan; Stakeholder aware and engaged.	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports
Were partnerships and networking facilitated amongst stakeholders?	Stakeholder engagement plan; Partners engaged	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports, Interviews
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
What is the impact of the project in terms of awareness raising and participation in the project?	Stakeholders aware and participating	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports, Interviews
Was sustainability, including cross-cutting issues, adequately identified at project design?	Changes in project strategy and activities	PIF, Project Document, SESP, PIRs, Lessons Learned, Risk Log	Desk review, stakeholder opinions, interviews
What opportunities are there to maximizing partnership and enhancing project delivery?	Partners aware and participating	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports, Interviews
What are the main risks to actions/interventions initiated by the project and how can/are they being addressed?	Risks documented and actioned	PIF, Project Document, SESP, Risk Logs	Analysis of Project Documents, Progress Reports, Reviews, Interviews
What is the level of influence and visibility of the project in terms of IAS management, including eradication of Giant Invasive Iguanas?	Targets achieved, documented and shared	PIRs, Risk Logs, Progress Reports, Policy Briefs, Press and awareness materials, media coverage	Desk Reviews, media coverage, interviews
What is the level of stakeholder support and commitment towards documents like the eradication plan and draft National Invasive Alien Species Strategy Action Plan?	Partners aware and participating	Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Communication Plan, PIRs, Progress Reports, Interviews	Analysis of Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports, Interviews

## ANNEX 6: Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	Level in PIR 2019	Level in PIR 2020	Update March / April 2021	Mid-term Target	End-of-project Target	Mid-Term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for Rating
Objective: To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species	0.1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. (UNDP mandato	NISFSAP under development  Long-term strategy for BAF non-existent  Specific, targeted IAS legislation non-existent	1. This process has been delayed due to the late recruitment of project team. 2. The NISSAP is reliant on the full establishment of the National IAS Committee where the NISSAP can be discussed in a collaborative platform. 3. A draft NISSAP will be developed in 2019 once the National IAS Committee is established. 4. Work on the BAF Long-term Strategy will be developed before the next Midterm review. 4. The GEF 6 IAS Chief Technical Advisor will be overseeing this process and closely assisted by the Project Coordinator.	1. The NISFSAP first draft was completed on the 6 January 2020. 2. The NISFSAP has been circulated for comment to BAF and project stakeholders for comments. 3. A NISFSAP validation workshop was scheduled in April 2020 however due to COVID 19 restrictions in Fiji this has been postponed. The NISFSAP validation workshop is now scheduled from 14 – 18 September 2020.	National Invasive Species Framework and Action Plan submitted by chief technical adviser. Validation to be led by BAF so that its finalized in 2021. BAFs new Strategic Action Plan (2021 - 2025) developed and submitted for endorsement by BAF project Board. This strategic plan includes the establishment of an IAS unit within BAF by 2023. A review of the Biosecurity Act 2008 under review in progress/ongoing, according to BAF to be ready for promulgation in 2021.	NISFSAP completed through collaborative, multi-agency process  BAF long-term strategy completed  Legislative framework related to IAS reviewed and needed legislative revisions identified and drafted	NISFSAP endorsed by national IAS Committee with committed resources for implementation  BAF long-term strategy adopted and under implementation  Specific legislation and regulations for IAS adopted and in place		M U	NISSAP , new Biosecurity Law and BAF Strategic Plan available in draft form and being worked on.  Trainings held, though reports are also from regular BAF and

	ry indicator : IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1)									other suppor ted trainin gs, not necess arily project organi zed. No Trainin g Needs Assess ment and Trainin g Plan.  IAS Trackin g Tool score margin ally increas ed, far below the MTR target. The NISSAP drafte
	0.2: Number of direct project beneficia ries (UNDP mandato ry indicator )	0	1. 41 BAF Officers have been trained on GEF 6 IAS Project through awareness workshops. 2. 48% of the participants were women. 3. Additional training/workshops is planned for the rest of 2019	1.The PMU held a stakeholder workshop on the project for BAF Officers and key stakeholders in November 2019 in Taveuni. There were 70 participants in total with 10 BAF staff in attendance. 35% of the participants were women. 2. The PMU also organized a GII Eradication Team meeting and workshop on January 2020 in Labasa, Vanua Levu. A total of 32 participants comprising of TBSOs, Field Coordinators and BAF Officials which also included the attendance of the BAF CEO, BAF Manager Operations and BAF Manager Human Resources. This workshop was held to review the GII Eradication progress and re-establish priorities early in 2020. 3. The PMU organized a 2nd GII Eradication Team consultation meeting on 12-14 August 2020 in Taveuni. The workshop was aimed at reviewing implementation progress and opportunity for all to view their opinions regarding the eradication plan and daily activities. A total of 18 TBSO, 4 Eradication	National Invasive Species Project Stakeholder workshop of September 2020: at least 40 participants of at least 40% being females who participated in review of draft copy NISSAP. March 2020: 180 BAF and Ministry of agriculture staff trained in identifying and responding to incursion of Swine Flu February - March: BAF Animal Disease Response Plan training involving 180 people National Forestry inventory training conducted for 30 officers in Taxonomy & included identification of Invasive alien species in forests. Training conducted by University of the South Pacific (USP Herbarium -Marika Tuiwawa) January 2020: Training on IAS conducted by Nature Fiji in Ovalau for 1BAF officer, 2 Conservation International Officers and 3 community	At least 170 BAF and other relevant government staff engaged in training and awareness activities (40% of which are women) At least 500 local people in four islands area are engaged in project activities (40% of which are women)	At least 270 <sup>14</sup> BAF and other relevant government staff engaged in training and awareness activities (40% of which are women) At least 800 <sup>15</sup> local people in four islands area are engaged in project activities (40% of which are women)			

<sup>14</sup> Includes 200 national BAF and partner agency staff, 20 BAF and partner staff in Taveuni and three islets and 50 staff trained specifically for the eradication work in Outcome 3.

<sup>15</sup> Includes (i) 50 local villages directly hired for eradication work, (ii) estimated 600 community members actively engaged in volunteering searching for GII and hence benefit from their eradication, (iii) and estimated 150 tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents directly participating in IAS prevention and control.

			Field Coordinators, 2 BAF Taveuni Staff and BAF Manager National Operations attended the meeting.	Ringgold Islands training- Post Rat Eradication Monitoring (Vatu-i-ra (4 persons) & Monuriki Island (5 persons) – training conducted by NFMV & Birdlife International Koro Island- Invasive Alien Species Survey conducted and results presentation to community including 50 community representatives Yabu Island Biosecurity protocol training (30 adults and 20 kids) • Pre-rat eradication (2018) • Post-rat eradication (2020) • Birdlife International - Vatuira Post-Eradication Monitoring (2018 & 2020) Vatuira Biosecurity Training Workshop • BAF – Asian Sub Terrain Termites training of BAF staff in Lautoka and Labasa. Other BAF training conducted dealing with IAS.				d but not reviewed in detail and validated.  No recent BAF budget figures provided. But anecdotal evidence from 2019 and 2020 shows already
0.3: Comprehensive ss of national level IAS management framework and ability to prevent IAS of high risk to	IAS Tracking Tool Score of 4 (out of total of 27) due to lack of national coordinating mechanism; no IAS strategy;	1. This indicator will be reviewed at the mid-term point. 2. This indicator is reliant on the completion of the NISSAP which will then coordinate the implementation of IAS strategies and improvement of international and domestic border for the prevention of IAS entering Fiji.	1. This indicator is reliant on the completion of the NISSAP which will then coordinate the implementation of IAS strategies and improvement of international and domestic border for the prevention of IAS entering Fiji. 2. The NISFSAP has been postponed due to COVID 19 travel and social gathering restrictions in Fiji. The workshop is envisaged to commence in the 3rd quarter of 2020.	Tracking Tool submitted. TT Score = 8, i.e. an increase of 4 points	An increase score of at least 8 in IAS Tracking Tool with established national coordination mechanism, IAS strategy exists, priority pathways identified,	An increase score of at least 12 in IAS Tracking Tool with national coordinating mechanism overseeing IAS actions codified by law; IAS strategy		y drastic budget cuts. This allegedly worsened during the COVID-19 crisis, and

	biodiversity from entering Fiji, as measured by IAS Tracking Tool	detection surveys non-existent; priority pathways not actively managed, etc	3. BAF has been undertaking comprehensive border inspections and patrol to ensure no new introduction of IAS occurs. BAF staff have undergone awareness workshops on the IAS project and how their work prevents the introduction of IAS in Fiji	The IAS tracking tool will be next completed prior to the MTR.		detection survey methods agreed, and criteria for prioritization of species and infestations defined	under implementation: regulations in place to implement National IAS strategy; priority pathways actively managed; detection surveys conducted regularly, etc		revenues were also drastically reduced.
	0.4: Level of government funding and revenues for biosecurity in Fiji	USD 4.5 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.0 million/year in revenues	1. BAF is a co-financier to the project. BAF has assisted the project with office space at BAF HQ, transportation through BAF fleet and technical advise. 2. BAF has catered for the salaries of 20 TBSO's working on the Green Iguana Eradication amounting to \$FJD 180,000.00 per annum 3. There was a major reduction of BAF's budget in 2019 which resulted in a operating budget of FJD 1 million. Expectation was to make further TBSO recruitment however this is not immediately possible. BAF will review its financial situation and revert on a desired plan	1. BAF is a co-financier to the project. BAF has assisted the project with office space at BAF HQ, transportation through BAF fleet and technical advise. 2. BAF has catered for the salaries of 20 TBSO's working on the Green Iguana Eradication amounting to \$FJD 180,000.00 per annum 3. There was a major reduction of BAF's budget in 2020/2021 which resulted in a operating budget of FJD 500,000. Expectation was to make further TBSO recruitment however this is not immediately possible. BAF Board and Management have agreed to temporarily cease additional recruitment of TBSO's. 4. This situation is made worse given the introduction of COVID 19 which has drastically decreased revenue for BAF. Further recruitment have been put on hold	Budget situation worse because of Corvid 19 situation. Main source of revenue generation for BAF is fee generated from inspections/issue of certificates/clearance at ports of entry. There has been a request to review this indicator, but MTR proposes to leave it and thereby showcase these drastic reductions and make a case for improvement.	At least 10% increase to USD 4.95 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.4 million/year in revenues	At least 20% increase to USD 5.4 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.8 million/year in revenues		



			for additional recruitment of TBSO's	and will be reassessed once the income decline improves. BAF has co-financed the project in the amount of USD171,000. This has gone towards transportation requests, rent of the office and salaries of staff for drivers and TBSO.  In total the estimated amount of expenditure on transportation amounts to \$7,000 including the fuel costs, driver costs & maintenance of the vehicle cost. Expenditure on the office rent amounts to \$95,000 from April 2018 till June-2020. Therefore total estimated expenditure amounts to \$171,000						
Outcome 1: Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji	1.1: National and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS, as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard	UNDP Capacity Development Score of 14 for BAF	1. Capacity will be developed through the establishment of the National IAS Committee and the Four Island IAS Taskforce will eventuate by the end of 2019 2. TOR's for this committee is work in progress and will eventuate by the end of 2019. This is on track to meet the mid-term target	The Strategic Action Plan in the NISFSAP outlines the Capacity Building mandate where training needs assessment is the baseline for various training to be organized. This includes training in IAS management, biosecurity training, communications training and development of database for IAS activities and results. The capacity building programs will be supported by the Government of Fiji and its various ministries/departments, supporting organizations including those of higher education etc.  The capacity development scorecard will be next assessed prior to the MTR.	PIU submitted Capacity Score Card very late, after the mission ended and after deadline for comments (despite repeated reminders). Score is 33. This is self-reported by BAF and could not be verified.	UNDP Capacity Development Score of at least 17 for BAF	UNDP Capacity Development Score of at least 21 for BAF		MU	Capacity Score Card submitted, but could not be verified and score is questioned.  NISFSAP not yet in place. FIIT not yet

1.2: Operational status of national level, multi-agency, multi-sector coordinating group for IAS activities, including biosecurity and management	Non-existent	1. This indicator will be developed before the next Midterm review. 2. This work will be done by the Chief Technical Advisor and will be closely assisted by the Project Coordinator with strong collaboration from BAF Management	The establishment of national IAS coordinating committee is reliant of the adoption of the NISFSAP.  The NISFSAP workshop was supposed to be held in April 2020 however due to COVID 19 restrictions this has been postponed to September 2020. It is anticipated that members of the National IAS Coordinating Committee will be chosen during the NISFSAP validation workshop.	Fiji Invasive Alien Species Task Force (FIST) exists but has not met since 2018. BAF had attempted several times to initiate/revive FIST meetings through the Ministry of Environment.  In response, IAS Project formed two groups namely the Awareness Task Force and a Research Task Force. Basically, IAS project stakeholders divided into these two groups. Terms of references developed. There is strong representation from government, NGOs, statutory organizations, regional organizations, Tertiary Institutions. Whilst the FIST is a high level technical advisory body, the two task forces formed under support IAS work at activity level.	TOR for multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group agreed, and group established and first meeting conducted	Multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group established, codified by national legislation, and functioning effectively  FIST is functioning effectively		established.  NISFSAP not in place. National IAS Committee not established. FIST not operational. FIIT not established. Project established 2 Task Forces (on IAS Research and Awareness) but status is unclear.
1.3: Extent of biosecurity capacity for comprehensive prevention, early detection and rapid response (EDRR)	Risk assessment undertaken, but not comprehensive and do not have full coverage and data records scattered	1. This indicator is reliant of the establishment of NISFSAP, the National IAS Committee and Four-island IAS Taskforce. 2. TOR's for this committees is work in progress and will eventuate by the end of 2019. 3. The EDDR plan is being developed by the Chief Technical Advisor and is on track to meet the mid-term target.	1. The Desktop IAS Exercise for Fiji has been developed by CTA. This has been circulated among BAF technical heads for their comments. This is an important exercise as IAS recorded in Fiji has been documented. 2. TOR's for this committees is work in progress and will eventuate by the end of 2020 3. The EDDR plan is being developed by the Chief Technical Advisor and is on track to meet the mid-term target.	Draft EDDR submitted by CTA? Other Emergency Response Plans developed (e.g. Pest and Disease under BAF and other agencies including National Disaster Management Office)	Risks assessment conducted for 60% of all organisms for import and documentation system developed and used  Draft EDDR plan	100% risk assessments for all organisms for import and systematically documented  Established EDDR		Numbers of risk

		<p>d in notebooks or non-existent</p> <p>Some elements for early detection and rapid response exist but no comprehensive system available currently</p>	<p>4. Work on supporting risk assessment will be headed by the Chief Technical Advisor by linking BAF to IAS databases and assessing capacity needs.</p>	<p>4. Work on supporting risk assessment will be headed by the Chief Technical Advisor by linking BAF to IAS databases and assessing capacity needs.</p> <p>5. CTA trips to Fiji has been delayed due to COVID 19 travel restrictions</p>		<p>developed and clear concept developed for public reporting system. Field staff to implement EDDR in place and training initiated</p>	<p>capacity on Viti Levu serving as a national pilot and resources to support EDDR in place</p>			<p>assessments not provided (for MTR Target)</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations at the island level on Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala</p>	<p>2.1: Number of new establishments of IAS species on Taveuni and islets, covering species listed in the Fiji black list and well as any high-risk IAS present</p>	<p>Baseline to be established in Year 1 as part of Output 1.3 (national black and white lists) and Output 2.1 (four-island specific black and</p>	<p>1. This indicator will be handled by the National IAS Committee given the various expertise that will be involved and will be able to prioritize the black and white list. The list of IAS present in Fiji is available and has been identified out of the 100 World's Worst Invasive Alien Species. Most of these species are present in the 4 island area.</p> <p>2. Given that the black list will indicate species that need to be addressed such as eradication, this list needs to be considered carefully as</p>	<p>This work will progress in the later stage of 2020. The black and white list are on track to be established by the mid-term point.</p> <p>CTA trips to Fiji has been delayed due to COVID 19 travel restrictions. As a result of this, technical consultant( who will lead development of white list and black list) cannot travel to Fiji.</p>	<p>IAS Project stakeholders have considered listing of 500 Invasive Alien Species (IAS) from a report (either from IUCN or SPREP), narrowing this down to 65. From this list of 65, next step is to form a black and white list. A black and white list will also be developed for Taveuni</p>	<p>National black and white lists and four-island specific black and white lists of species established</p> <p>No new establishments from baseline</p>	<p>No new establishments from baseline</p>		MU	<p>No baseline developed, no new IAS established on Islands ? National IAS Committee not established. FIST</p>

	in Fiji but not Taveuni	white lists)	the impact would touch monetary and trade areas. 3. This work will progress in the later stage of 2019 and early 2020. The black and white list are on track to be established by the mid-term point						not operational. New Task Forces established in 2021, but status unknown. Informal Black and White lists drafted, not yet validated.
	2.2: Capacity and engagement of biosecurity personnel and partners for inspection, control and management to prevent entry and inter-island IAS spread	Currently limited to 2 weeks general training Low level of biosecurity inspection of goods, persons and vectors arriving at islands	1. An initial scoping mission was conducted by the Chief Technical Advisor and the Project Coordinator in Feb-March 2019. 2. Further work on this will be done in late 2019. That is Biosecurity Training programs will be developed after a Training Needs Assessment is conducted to identify areas needing capacity building at BAF and partner agencies. 3. Training is expected to start in 2020 but standards developed by the next Midterm review	For this indicator to eventuate a training needs analysis exercise needs to be completed. As such in early August 2020 the BAF Manager Human Resources has circulated a Training Needs Analysis Form for Department Heads to identify training needs. From this outcome as an addition to endorsement of the NISFSAP Strategic Action Plan the PMU and CTA will develop training topics and engage specialist to conduct relevant training on IAS management in Fiji. The TNA exercise will be finalized by the end of August 2020 and will a platform to organize training for biosecurity personnel and partners.  Given that PMU is housed under BAF the TNA exercise explained is assurance to organize capacity building and is in line with the Fiji Ministry of Economy audit parameters.	Status not clear.	Standardized systems and processes developed and in place for inspection of good, persons and vectors arriving at islands, required new staff for increased inspection and biosecurity are in place  Comprehensive training program developed and 80% of existing frontline staff trained and undertaking random	100% of frontline staff around 20 biosecurity, police, customs staff etc, of which 40% are women) trained and undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports  At least 50% of goods, persons and vectors (transport vehicles) arriving at islands are subject to biosecurity inspections		Trainings undertaken, but ad hoc. No Training Needs Assessment and Training Plan.

						inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports				Inspections take place but level unclear.
Outcome 3: Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in the selected islands	3.1: Status of GII seen/captured on Taveuni	No search efforts for GII on Taveuni	1. Surveys have been done on Taveuni and surrounding islets. 2. GII sites have been confirmed in Qamea, Matagi Is, Laucala Is and Taveuni. GII has been found in 43 sites on Qamea Island, GII has been found all over Matagi Is, a few sites in areas on Laucala Is that is closest to Qamea and has been seen at 4 locations in Taveuni. 3. With increased detection tools the team will be able to establish if there are breeding population on Taveuni.	1. Surveys have been done on Taveuni and surrounding islets. 2. GII sites have been confirmed in Qamea, Matagi Is, Laucala Is and Taveuni. GII has been found in 43 sites on Qamea Island, GII has been found all over Matagi Is, a few sites in areas on Laucala Is that is closest to Qamea and has been seen at 4 locations in Taveuni. A total of 60 sites have been surveyed thus far where 17 sites were confirmed as inhabitable for the GII due to very high elevations with constant low temperatures. 3. With increased detection tools the team will be able to establish if there are breeding populations on Taveuni. . In July 2020 the Eradication teams trialed the use of trail cameras in Qamea and the result is remarkable since the cameras confirmed locations of existing populations, previously unknown mating spots and time/date and temperatures they like to forage. 4. The project also engaged a local consultant (botany specialist) in July 2020 to do a vegetation survey and mapping. As a result the specialist was able to determine a niche habitat for the GII which is dry	BAF has reports of GII capture in Qamea.  Additional indicator could be considered i.e. number of GII captured, sighting, eggs removed on western end of Qamea & point of Taveuni directly facing Qamea	Initial surveys completed in all potential GII sites on Taveuni If surveys indicate GII are present, search and eradication efforts indicate a decline in sighting/capture of GII	No GII seen/captured on Taveuni during last year of project		MU	GII Eradication Plan developed. Basis for eradication but with some delays and shortfalls. Several activities and surveys done on islands.  Reports of sizeable captures of GII in

				forest areas. The next strategy for installing trail cameras is in these areas.						Qamea . However reports not clear and not linked to baseline and targets .
	3.2: GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, as indicated by rates of removal	Baseline GII population size to be established in Year 1 based on eradication removal rates	1. 1,215 GII destroyed (includes adults, juveniles and eggs) 2. Approximately 60 sites (includes Qamea, Matagi and Taveuni) visited and surveyed. 3. Draft eradication plan has been approved but eradication efforts has not yet been fully implemented. 4. Approval has been given by the Fiji Police Commissioner to import 6 air rifles together with accessories. Importation expected in early August 2019. 7. According to Dr. Fred Kraus, estimating the population size at this point would be impossible given the low numbers in removal rates. With consistent data recording and increased catches over time then this would be possible. PIU will be able to establish a population size by the next mid-term review	1. 1,977 GII removed (includes adults, juveniles and eggs) 2. Approximately 60 sites (includes Qamea, Matagi and Taveuni) visited and surveyed. 3. Draft eradication plan has been approved but eradication efforts have not yet been fully implemented. This is due to delay in air rifle licensing-a long process in Fiji and with COVID 19 restrictions on travel key documents from selected individuals in the eradication teams was delayed. The teams have undergone 2 shooting training and 3 practice sessions. It is anticipated that air rifles will used in the field from September 2020. Other aspects of the eradication is ongoing e.g. community awareness raising and capacity building. 4. Air rifles were imported in July 2019. 1st Air rifle training was done in early December 2019 conducted by the Fiji Shooting Club. 5 shooting practice was done in January and February 2020 and results were submitted to PC for vetting for Fiji Police licensing.		Capture operations vigorously and systematically conducted to reach 100% coverage of the islands Rates of removal indicate a decline in GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala	Reduction in GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more			Currently no eradication specialist to guide and support efforts  Survey on native Iguana done  Community surveys and outreach activities
	3.3: Status and trends in native banded	Baseline to be established in Year 1	1. Consultancy to monitor native iguana populations has been advertised 2. Evaluation TOR of applicants in progress 3. Finalizing procurement	1. Native Iguana Survey consultant has been recruited in 2019. Native Iguana Survey is being conducted by Mr. Alivereti Naikatini. 2. The consultant has conducted 1 wet season survey in Qamea in 2019	Refer to PMU and reports by Alivereti Naikatini (surveys in 2019 & 2020)  Query: discussions amongst local Iguana experts notes	Stable populations of native banded iguana (Brachyloph	Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana			

iguana populations (Brachylophus bulabula) in areas occupied by GII		4. Surveys will be conducted by the 4th quarter 2019 and baseline will be established by next PIR	resulting in 4 native iguana being recorded. 3. Dry season survey was delayed in 2020 due to COVID 19 travel restrictions. However this work commenced July 2020 which resulted in 27 native iguanas being recorded.	that it would be difficult to demonstrate stable or improved Native Iguana population (due to GII eradication).	us bulabula) in areas occupied by GII on island(s) and eradication efforts ongoing	(Brachylophus bulabula) in areas previously (prior to eradication) occupied by GII on island(s)		es done, but baselines unclear and no reporting to targets.
3.4: Community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII, disaggregated by gender	Impacts not yet visible or reported  Limited awareness of potential impact of GII  No standardized assessment or understanding of community perceptions and awareness of damage or impacts from GII	1. Indicator included in the Community Outreach Consultancy 2. Consultancy procurement is being finalized 3. Activity will start in the next few months 4. Baseline levels of awareness will be known by next PIR.	1. Community Outreach Consultant has been recruited. This is done by Nature Fiji Mareqeti Viti. 2. Community Outreach work together with community perceptions work was delayed due to financial processes constraints. This was further delayed by COVID 19 travel restrictions in 2020. 3. Recent dialogues have established a start which is August 2020.	Discussions with IAS Project and some stakeholder note that GII impacts to crops not significant i.e. consuming coastal plants and some vegetables (in household gardens) & fruit trees (water melon). Earlier discussion with previous RTA were to focus on few selected IAS e.g. termites, there was discussion of taro beetle impacts to dalo (concern) as Taveuni supplies up to 80% of Fiji's export. Activity to be undertaken once the blacklist and while list is confirmed	Baselines established of community perceptions and awareness of GII impacts and monitoring protocols for evaluating changes in community perceptions designed and being monitored.  At least 30% of sampled local population (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of	No/reduced community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication) At least 50% of sampled local population (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of GII and need for biosecurity		

		Standard ized baseline will be establish ed in Year 1				GII and need for biosecurity				
Outcome 4: Strengthened awareness, knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation in regards to invasive alien species and biosecurity	4.1: Level of awareness of IAS and biosecurity among tour operator s, resort owners, importer s, tourists and shipping agents.	Coordinated outreach on biosecurity lacking  Limited awareness of impact of IAS among public  Baseline survey established in Year 1	1. Activity will start once recruitment of Communication Specialist is completed. Activities will involve creating awareness on site with domestic and international shipping agents, resort and hotel owners at the four-island area. 2. In the interim discussions have been on-going with hoteliers, resort owners, local communities and government agencies. 3. Issues with non-access to Laucala Island is on-going and will be resolved before the mid-term review.	1. A stakeholder workshop was conducted on Taveuni in November 2019 in which resort owners and operators were invited however did not attend. Based on earlier consultations, it is likely Resort owners (a) value the privacy of their guest and are not keen to have eradication efforts taking place whilst guest are in house (b) were busy during the timing of the stakeholder consultations as this coincided with peak seasons. The Project will continue discussions with resort owners and tour operators. 2. Due to COVID 19 restrictions outreach to these stakeholders could not be conducted from Jan-Jun 2020.	PMU has conducted discussion/awareness with Government agencies, communities, hoteliers (individual discussions).  Issues with recruitment of communications consultant.	At least 20% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity	At least 50% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity		MU	National Communication Consultant and Plan not in place. Baseline surveys not done.  No progress on support to clearinghouse and database. Consultants for these not recruited.
	4.2: Operational status of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information to collate and	Partial existence of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information at Department of	1. Indicator will progress on second visit of Chief Technical Advisor and progressed in late 2019 and early 2020. Activities for this indicator will involve assessing existing databases available for Fiji and addressing potential gaps during the development of the on-line clearinghouse for IAS.	1. Indicator will progress on second visit of Chief Technical Advisor and progressed in late 2020. Activities for this indicator will involve assessing existing databases available for Fiji and addressing potential gaps during the development of the on-line clearinghouse for IAS. 2. Indicator is still on track to meet midterm target as planned.	IAS Stakeholder discussions noted two existing portals/links e.g. USP/SPC. BAF launching new website which IAS project will be linked to. Continuation/sustainability after project as opposed to having clearing house mechanism	Enhancement of on-line clearinghouse fully scoped and improvements in progress	On-line clearinghouse completed and actively used by relevant agencies			



	make accessibl e IAS informati on to stakehol ders	Environ ment	2. Indicator is still on track to meet midterm target as planned	3. Due to COVID 19 travel restriction the CTA could not make visits to Fiji					
--	--	-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## ANNEX 7: Ratings Scales

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co- finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

## ANNEX 8: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

## Evaluators/Consultants:

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

## MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Jan Rijpma

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

Signed at (Place) on (Date)

The Hague, Netherlands  
23/04/2021

Signature:



Name of Consultant: Patrick Fong

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

Signed at (Place) on (Date)

Nauru, Fiji  
23/04/2021

Signature



## **ANNEX 12: MTR final report clearance form**

### **Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

#### **Commissioning Unit**

Name:

Signature:

Date:

#### **UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report

Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools