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# Executive Summary

1. This report summarizes the findings of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) conducted during the August-September 2022 period for the UNDP project: “*Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure*” (hereby referred to as RMI-EDCR, the RMI-EDCR Project or the Project). This TE was prepared to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the completed Project by evaluating its design, process of implementation and achievements vis-à-vis its objectives, and any agreed changes during implementation of the RMI-EDCR Project. It also evaluates the Project’s relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, country ownership, gender equality, and cross cutting issues.
2. Key issues addressed on this TE include:
* that the TE is independent of RMI-EDCR Project management to ensure independent quality assurance;
* the application of UNDP norms and standards for evaluations;
* assessment of achievements of outputs, likelihood of the sustainability of outputs, and if the Project met the minimum M&E requirements; and
* reporting basic data of the evaluation and the Project, as well as provide lessons from the Project on broader applicability.
1. Key strategic issues addressed on this TE include:
* the effectiveness of training and procurement to monitor, measure, and disseminate weather, climate and geophysical early warning and disaster information as a part of risk-informed disaster communications by WSO and NDMO and other stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Transport and Communication, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and the public school system and communities of the outer and lagoon islands to receive and disseminate this information);
* the extent of the Project effectiveness in contributing to the Expected Outcome of the 2023-2027 MCPD. In particular, the effectiveness of communities and government institutions will be assessed to manage evacuation and humanitarian assistance in case of disasters from the impacts of climate variabilities;
* the extent of the Project in efforts to enhance capacities of all stakeholders in mainstreaming gender in disaster preparedness.
1. Data and information for this TE was sourced from:
* a review of Project documentation including quarterly progress reports to establish information pertaining to RMI’s perceptions of capacity building activities of the Project;
* interviewing selected stakeholders including the team members and technical advisors in attempts to triangulate information on key issues in capacity building. With the International Evaluator travelling to RMI during the period of 16-24 March 2024, information on the Evaluation was collected on field visits as well as face-to-face or Zoom interviews conducted by the International Evaluator. There were challenges, however, to the data collection including limitations to issuing questionnaires considering the geographic dispersion of various communities around RMI who have benefitted from the Project, and the few opportunities for the International Evaluator to engage stakeholders in detailed discussions on Project implementation (Para 14);
* Project evaluation was based on evaluability analysis consisting of formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) inputs.

**Project Summary Table**

| Project Details  |  | Project Milestones  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title  | Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of the Marshall Islands through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure (RMI-EDCR Project) | PIF Approval Date:  | n/a |
| Award ID:  | 00118500  | Project ID: | 00115304 |
| Country/Countries:  | Republic of the Marshall Islands | Date Project Manager hired:  | April 2019 |
| Region:  | PAC | Mid-Term Review Completion Date: | n/a |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Terminal Evaluation Completion date: | 26 April 2024 |
| Planned Operational Closure Date: | 31 March 2024 |
| Implementing Partner: | UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji |
| Responsible Parties: | RMI National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) (Activity 1.1/1.2/2.1)RMI Weather Service Office (NWSO) (Activity 1.3/1.4) Ministry of Works, Infrastructure and Utilities (MoWIU) (Activity 3.2) |
| Private sector involvement: | N/A |

| Financial Information |
| --- |
| **Project** | **At Approval (US$)** | **At TE to 13 March 2024 (US$)**  |
| [1] UNDP contribution: | **0** | **0** |
| [2] Government of Japan: | **7,400,000** | **5,793,275** |
| [3] Other multi-/bi-laterals: | **0** | **0** |
| [4] Private Sector: | **0** | **0** |
| [5] NGOs: | **0** | **0** |
| [7] Total Project funding: | **7,400,000** | **5,793,275** |

**Project Description**

1. The RMI experiences frequent natural hazards (tropical storms, typhoons, storm surges and droughts), which can result in human casualties, disrupt economic activity, lead to loss of livelihoods, divert fiscal resources, and undermine development priorities. Although not all disasters are caused by climate change, the country’s vulnerability to climate change will heighten disaster risks because extreme weather events are likely to increase in the future. Analysis undertaken under the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative indicates that RMI faces an average annual loss of more than 2% of GDP from typhoons, earthquakes, inundation and tsunamis. Typhoons occur at an average of 4 times per year. Additional challenges include related ecosystem degradation, coastal erosion and food and water insecurity. Rising sea level is the biggest threat in RMI as most of the atolls have an average highest elevation of 2 m.
2. The RMI-RMI-EDCR Project aims to improve the capacity for preparedness and mitigation of the RMI to geo-physical and climate related hazards and enhancing resilience to climate change impact, guided by the overarching Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (DRM NAP), The National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP), the Standard Hazard Mitigation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy Framework (NCCPF). The Project was supposed to respond to Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022: “By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened”. The updated version of this strategy is the Multi Country Programme Document (MCPD) 2023-2027: Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1: “By 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored”.
3. This cooperation with the Government of Japan (GoJ) has contributed to achieving the goals of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, elimination of threat to human security and protect gains of sustainable development and inclusive of the Sustainable Development Goals. The RMI-EDCR Project is also consistent with the overarching RMI Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (DRM NAP) of 2008-2018, the Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Management, the 2014 - 2018 National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP), and the Standard Hazard Mitigation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy Framework (NCCPF).
4. Concerted efforts have also been devoted to responding to urgent and unpredicted needs arising out of slow and sudden onset of natural hazards impacting livelihoods, economy, and persistent inequalities. Under Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), the implementing agency for the RMI-EDCR Project is the UNDP. The Project was to achieve Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022: “By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened”. This outcome was to be achieved through 2 expected outputs
* Output 1: Strengthened Disaster Communication and Climate and Inundation Monitoring Systems;
* Output 2: Enhanced National Disaster Responders readiness capacity & better resourced to minimise loss of lives and damages).

**Project Results**

1. Main highlights of the efforts as of December 2023 are portrayed on Table A.

**Table A: Comparison of Intended Project Outputs from the ProDoc to Actual Outputs**

| **Intended Outputs in Revised Results Framework of December 2022** **(see Appendix E)**  | **Actual Outcomes as of March 2024** |
| --- | --- |
| **Output 1:** Strengthened Disaster Communication and Climate and Inundation Monitoring Systems | **Actual Output 1**: Disaster communications and climate and inundation monitoring systems have been strengthened to an extent that 7 Chatty Beetles have been delivered to the RMI with only 2 deployed in outer Wotto and Lae Atolls, one wave rider buoy has been replaced in Majuro with another buoy still to be installed, and procurement of computer systems and equipment that provide improved disaster preparedness and response communication and ensures a more functional EOC that links communication media used by main MMI ministries. (Paras 51 to 58). |
| **Output 2:** Enhanced National Disaster Responders readiness capacity & better resourced to minimize loss of lives and damages | **Actual Output 2**: There has been enhanced National and island disaster preparedness capacity that is better resourced to minimize loss of lives and damages. This includes the completion of the Ebeye EOC that allows NDMO and line ministries to convene and respond to climate and inundation disasters, and the delivery of emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and Kwajalein Atoll Joint Utility Resources (KAJUR), and utility trucks for NDMO (Paras 60-74). |

**Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons**

1. The RMI-EDCR Project is relevant to its design with activities being appropriate towards the achievement of the Project objective and the Outputs, and relevant to strengthening DRM and climate resilience as identified in the RToC and RRF, addressing major gaps in DRM and climate resilience with other gaps being filled in by other donors (Para 41).
2. However, there were several inefficiencies on the Project including the absence of a budget for architectural and engineering services for the design for the EOCs. With the design implementation period for this Project being 12 months, a situation was setup where there was going to be failure from an implementation period perspective (Para 97). In addition, executing a “design-build” modality for the construction of the Ebeye EOC could have possibly resulted could have resulted in a lot of reduced time and effort by the PMU (Para 98).
3. Notwithstanding, the impact of the Project has clearly been additional confidence of GoRMI institutions in managing disaster preparedness and climate resilience solutions, notably, NDMO with the completion of the Ebeye EOC having more confidence to promote activities for improved preparedness of local governments (Para 115). The Project is also coherent, aligning well with key drivers identified in managing disaster risks in the Pacific, notably UNDP's MCPD 2023-2027 with the Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1 (Para 41). However, Project sustainability rating is moderately unlikely notably due to supplier problems of being unable to manufacture additional Chatty Beetles, and the lack of financing commitment by any donor for the Majuro EOC (Para 104).
4. Poor design of the RMI-EDCR Project caused Project implementation to be extended from one year to 5 years. Most of the Project activities involved the Ebeye EOC construction. The poor design was characterized by the Project not including funds for the services of an international engineering firm to prepare the design and tenders for the EOCs, reducing the available budget for EOC construction. This was exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic which raised the prices of construction materials and equipment, and narrowing the number of contractors willing to bid on the EOC construction work. This had the impact of the Project only being able to construct one EOC in Ebeye as opposed to the plan to build 2 EOCs (Para 124).
5. Other Project activities involved the procurement of Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys, and other equipment to improve and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for disaster preparedness using US$1.9 million in excess funds left over from the cancelled Majuro EOC construction. Procurement of the Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys was complicated by inability of UNDP and UH’s TASI program to come to an agreement on UNDP General Rules and Conditions resulting in separate agreements between Marshall Islands Weather Service Office (NWSO) and UNDP and NWSO and the TASI program. This caused delays until October 2023 and May 2021 for the Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys respectively. Despite the Project rating on efficiency being rated as moderately unsatisfactory due mainly to the majority of works not occurring until after 2020 caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Ebeye EOC was completed, and equipment was upgraded for critical infrastructure, all vastly improving disaster preparedness for the RMI (Paras 125-129). The RMI-EDCR Project ratings are provided in Table B.

**Table B: Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)  | Rating**[[1]](#footnote-2)** |
|  M&E design at entry | **5** |
|  M&E Plan Implementation | **5** |
|  Overall Quality of M&E | **5** |
| 2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution  |  |
|  Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight | **5** |
|  Quality of Implementing Partner Execution | **n/a** |
|  Overall quality of Implementation/Execution | **5** |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes  |  |
|  Relevance  | **2[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
|  Effectiveness | **5** |
|  Efficiency | **3** |
|  Overall Project Outcome Rating | **5** |
| 4. Sustainability  | Rating[[3]](#footnote-4) |
|  Financial sustainability | **3** |
|  Socio-political sustainability | **3** |
|  Institutional framework and governance sustainability | **3** |
|  Environmental sustainability | **3** |
|  Overall Likelihood of Sustainability | **3** |

1. *Recommendation 1 (to the Government of RMI): Continue with efforts to enhance capacity of the national emergency management (see Para 131)*.
2. *Recommendation 2 (to the Government of RMI and UNDP): Considerations should be made for a construction modality where sourcing of building materials and equipment come from one source (see Para 132)*.
3. *Recommendation 3 (to the Government of RMI): Implement and monitor sustainability plan for the Ebeye EOC building* (see Para 133).
4. *Recommendation 4 (to the Government of RMI): Setup a budget for the operation and maintenance of equipment procured (see Para 134).*
5. *Recommendation 5 (to the Government of RMI): Complete deployment of wave rider buoys and Chatty Beetles (see Para 135).*
6. *Recommendation 6 (to the UNDP): Seek partnership agreement between the UNDP and NOAA for the smooth implementation of activities to support NWSO (see Para 136).*
7. *Lesson #1: The hasty preparation of the EDCR design caused considerable delays and changes to the partial completion of the Project* (see Para 137).
8. *Lesson #2: A design-build approach could have possibly reduced Project delays on EOC construction (see Para 138).*
9. *Lesson #3: Lesson learned: Coordination with other UNDP projects and development partners was important for efficient project activity and increased synergy (see Para 139).*
10. *Lesson #4: Third party agreements make follow-up for UNDP difficult (see Para 140).*
11. *Lesson #5: For pandemic planning, ensure that a project has a contingency plan that outlines different activities that may be impacted in delivery time by flight restrictions, social distancing and disrupted supply chains (see Para 141).*
12. *Lesson #6: Projects that are focused on the procurement of equipment and services do not generate opportunities to address gender, specifically women’s empowerment (see Para 142).*

# introduction

1. The Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the Project entitled: “*Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure*” (hereby referred to as RMI-EDCR, the RMI-EDCR Project or the Project). was conducted for the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji as an impartial assessment of RMI-EDCR activities, mainly comprised of capacity building, technical assistance and investment facilitative activities.

## Evaluation Purpose

1. In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all UNDP supported projects are required to undergo a TE upon completion of implementation of a project to *provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the completed project by evaluating its design, process of implementation and achievements vis-à-vis its objectives, and any agreed changes during project implementation.* As such, the TE for the RMI-EDCR Project serves to:
* promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of accomplishments of the Project in the context of providing technical assistance to the Government of RMI (GoRMI) to achieve Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022: “By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened”;
* evaluate the Project’s outputs against the Results Framework (RF) in the Project Document signed on 31 March 2019;
* synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design, and implementation of future activities in this sector;
* provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the disaster management and climate change portfolio in RMI that require attention; and
* contribute to the UNDP Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of UNDP operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on the quality of monitoring and evaluation across the UNDP system.

## Approach and Scope

1. The TE approach is to ensure that the evaluation serves as an important learning and accountability tool, providing the GoRMI, UNDP, and its national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results and outcomes achieved by the Project. As such, the scope of this TE was to evaluate all activities funded by the Government of Japan (GoJ). The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the TE are contained in Appendix A. The UNDP Evaluation process is illustrated on Figure 1. Key issues addressed on this TE include:
* that the TE is independent of RMI-EDCR Project management to ensure independent quality assurance;
* the application of UNDP norms and standards for evaluations[[4]](#footnote-5);

**Figure 1: UNDP Evaluation Process**



* assessment of achievements of outputs and outcomes, likelihood of the sustainability of outcomes, and if the Project met the minimum M&E requirements; and
* reporting basic data of this TE and the Project to provide lessons from the Project on broader applicability. This would include an outlook and guidance in charting future directions by UNDP and their future support for a possible follow-up phase to the RMI-EDCR Project.
1. With this scope, the entire country of RMI and its population is covered under this TE. The following issues were identified for further discussion:
* the role of RMI-EDCR in adaptively managing the Project;
* the role of RMI-EDCR on conducting awareness raising workshops and training for the general population;
* the role of the various government agencies in RMI-EDCR initiatives;
* the financial position of the Project and what has been achieved;
* the work being done by RMI-EDCR to institutionalize monitoring and evaluation of an RMI-EDCR benchmarking system;
* an assessment of RMI-EDCR Project management, monitoring and evaluation and stakeholder outreach to be discussed with the Project Team (PT) in the RMI and Fiji.

## Methodology

1. The methodology of this TE assesses the Project’s performance from April 2019 to December 2022 in addressing the capacity gaps in managing RMI-EDCR affairs, through the lens of UNDP evaluation criteria of **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability**, **impact** and **cross-cutting issues** for 2 expected outputs that were achieved through activities contained within the RMI-EDCR Project:
* *Relevance* – the extent to which the outcome and outputs are suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time;
* *Coherence –* the alignment with UNDP's core documents, national priorities, and other related UNDP, UN, and development partner projects;
* *Effectiveness* – the extent to which an outcome and outputs were achieved or how likely it is to be achieved. This would include the effectiveness of the RMI-EDCR Project to assist implementation and facilitate capacity building (through technical assistance of the Project), and the quality of RMI-EDCR Project management (including M&E performance);
* *Efficiency* – the extent to which results were delivered with the least costly resources possible. This would include the pace of capacity building based on the baseline capacities of the institutions and potential beneficiaries;
* *Sustainability* - the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. This would include the sustained acceptance of RMI-EDCR methodologies for capacity building at the national level; and
* *Impact* – the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. This may include the extent of uptake by the national implementation team to the RMI-EDCR Project, and their resulting ability to confidently manage disaster preparedness and climate resilience solutions;
* *Cross cutting issues* – the contributions of the Project to gender equality, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion. This would include the use of disaggregated data and analysis methods that integrate gender considerations, and outreach to diverse stakeholder groups to empower women and strive towards gender balance both within the Project itself and further afield.
1. The TE is supposed to achieve the assessment of Project performance by:
* collecting credible, useful, and evidence-based information of the Project;
* interviewing selected stakeholders to triangulate information to bring up key issues in capacity building and investments to the RMI-EDCR Project team; and
* bringing up these key issues in strengthening capacity building within the RMI-EDCR team and its stakeholders.

The terminal evaluation of the Project is based on evaluability analysis consisting of formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) inputs. Considering the information to be provided into this TE (which is mainly whether or not the technical assistance of the Project was effective to the GoRMI and its stakeholders), the implication of the evaluation methodology is that it should be effective in the evaluation process, and should inform stakeholders and the RMI-EDCR Project team as it possibly transitions into a second phase.

1. This TE also evaluates the progress and quality of implementation against the indicators of the outcome and output in the RF as provided in Appendix F. The TE process was conducted in a spirit of collaboration with RMI-EDCR Project personnel with the intention of providing constructive inputs that can inform activities of a potential follow-up phase and future programming**.**

## Structure of the Evaluation

1. This evaluation report is presented with the following content:
* an overview of Project activities from commencement of operations in April 2019 to March 2024 activities of the RMI-EDCR Project;
* a review of all relevant sources of information including the Project Document, project progress reports, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation;
* discussions on the Project through a participatory and consultative approach to ensure close engagement with the PTs in RMI and Fiji, government counterparts, implementing partners, and other stakeholders. This includes interviews with stakeholders (with a target of at least 50% women) who have Project responsibilities;
* an assessment of results based on the Project outcome and outputs through relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency criteria;
* assessment of sustainability of Project outcomes;
* assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems;
* assessment of progress that affected Project outcomes and sustainability; and
* a summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.
1. Though the RMI-EDCR Project is not a GEF-financed project, the RMI-EDCR Terminal Evaluation report has been designed to meet UNDP-GEF’s “Guidelines for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF Financed Projects” of 2020[[5]](#footnote-6) in the absence of specific guidelines for UNDP projects financed by other sources. The TE also abides by UNDP guidelines “Evaluation during COVID-19” (updated to June 2021)[[6]](#footnote-7).

## Data Collection and Analysis

1. Different key Project personnel who were consulted about the Project included:
* The Project Team. This involved interviews with the Project Team in Fiji and RMI that included the UNDP Project Manager, the Procurement Associate, UNDP Country Project Coordinator, the UNDP Finance/Admin Officer, and UNDP Logistics and Procurement Officer. The purpose of contact with the Project Team were the issues of implementation and execution;
* Project partners. This involved the Second Secretary of the Embassy of Japan in RMI;
* Beneficiaries. This involved ministries and public agencies responsible for Project activities as elaborated on Para 30.

Appendix C presents a summary of persons consulted during the RMI-EDCR TE.

1. Data and information for this TE was sourced from:
* Project documentation including Project Board meeting minutes, annual progress reports (APRs) and quarterly progress reports (QPRs). This was important in establishing information pertaining to the Project’s perceptions on capacity building activities. This was done at the home base of the International Evaluator. A full listing of data and information sources is provided in Appendix D;
* follow-up interviews with respondents including the key stakeholders listed in Para 10 consisting of Project personnel, technical advisors, consultants, and equipment installers and suppliers. Discussions were undertaken by e-mail, Zoom calls and face-to-face interviews. A listing of activities for stakeholder contact for the TE is provided in Appendix B.

Though a questionnaire was prepared for stakeholders (as provided in Appendix E), the questionnaire was never issued to the stakeholders as it was anticipated that the Evaluator would meet all listed stakeholders provided in Paras 10 and 30 during his visit to RMI. While most of the stakeholders were interviewed, the Evaluator used the questionnaire as a guide for interviewing the stakeholders.

1. There were also attempts to collect data and information through a gender lens in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Given that most of the Project activities were related to procurement of equipment and services, most of the gender-related questions would be related to the impact of these services and equipment on the beneficiaries, male and female.

## Ethics

1. This Terminal Evaluation has been undertaken as an independent, impartial, and rigorous process, with personal and professional integrity and is conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations, and the UNDP M&E policies, specifically the August 2020 UNDP “Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects”.

## Limitations

1. There were limitations to this TE process, mainly due to the limited number of stakeholders met and the time constraints to completing the actual RMI-EDCR Terminal Evaluation before 31 March 2024. Challenges to the data collection included the time available for issuing the questionnaire considering the geographic dispersion of various communities around RMI who have benefitted from the Project. There were also few opportunities for the International Evaluator to engage stakeholders in detailed discussions on Project implementation. There was also a time limitation on conducting second interviews with some of the selected stakeholders in an effort to triangulate the quality of information received, and to provide assurance that the conclusions of the evaluation are robust. This was also limited gender-related questions on the TE given that all stakeholders were very focused on procurement of equipment and services, not on impacts of equipment and services. The International Evaluator to some extent mitigated this issue by being able to meet face-to-face with the most important stakeholders and conducting site visits to where equipment and materials were deployed that added an additional layer of validation and ground truthing.

# Project description and development context

## Project Start and Duration

1. The RMI-EDCR Project commenced on 31 March 2019. The Project was being implemented by the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji up to the time of writing of this report (as of March 2024). The Project closed as of 31 March 2024.

## Development Context

1. The RMI consists of 1,156 islands/islets and 29 atolls located in Micronesia, 24 of which are inhabited, with a population of around 42,309 (as of 2024), dispersed across 2 million km2 of ocean. The RMI experiences frequent natural hazards (tropical storms, typhoons, storm surges and droughts), which can result in human casualties, disrupt economic activity, lead to loss of livelihoods, divert fiscal resources, and undermine development priorities. Although not all disasters are caused by climate change, the country’s vulnerability to climate change will heighten disaster risks because extreme weather events are likely to increase in the future. Analysis undertaken under the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative indicates that RMI faces an average annual loss of more than 2% of GDP from typhoons, earthquakes, inundation and tsunamis. Typhoons occur at an average of 4 times per year. Additional challenges include related ecosystem degradation, coastal erosion and food and water insecurity. Rising sea level is the biggest threat in RMI as most of the atolls have an average highest elevation of 2 m.
2. Climate change projections by the IPCC suggest that RMI will face an even greater intensity of weather and climate-related hazard events in the coming years which is also expected to exacerbate the country’s vulnerability to natural hazards. Urgent action is required to mitigate the circumstances which make RMI one of the most physically vulnerable nations in the world.
3. In RMI, hardship is persistent, especially for disadvantaged groups in rural areas, fast-growing urban settlements, and outer islands. The smallness, remoteness, geographic dispersion, significant exposure to climate change and natural hazards, due to its elevation, and the narrow economic base magnify the effects of economic shocks. GDP growth is generally low and volatile. The situation is exacerbated when disaster strikes; hence, the critical need to strengthen disaster early warning and preparedness, and to mainstream disaster risk and climate change into development planning. There was a strong call for a disaster risk management project to address these challenges.
4. Collecting, analysing and communicating information is of utmost importance in these small, remote and geographically dispersed Atolls. The harsh environment calls for constant maintenance and replacement of high-quality and equipment. As travel is not always an option in these Atolls, island communities rely on HF radio communication for information on wave and weather reports, forecasts and warnings.
5. The National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) encourages and promotes activities for improved preparedness of local governments to respond to natural or human-induced disasters during “peace times”. This would include issuance of promotional materials, setting up disaster committees, and conducting drills. During “disasters” when local governments are unable to respond, NDMO leads in the coordination of relief efforts, bringing in all available government resources including the Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure & Utilities (MoWIU) and the Marshall Islands Weather Service Office (NWSO), to do the assessments, and execute the evacuations and movement of people as is necessary.
6. In dealing with drought response, which is the most common hazard in much of RMI, NDMO utilises most or all available standby and operational equipment such as hand-held radios and outer island kits. However, some of this communication equipment was damaged during deployment in the 2016 drought that hit the country hard. Repair and replacement costs have not been provided due to time and other constraints and total disaster effects are thus likely higher than reported. Data management also remains a key gap across all sectors but has been assessed and can be addressed through implementation of the BAM (Bok Am Melele)[[7]](#footnote-8), the NDMO Information Management Strategy.
7. Whilst GoRMI has planned for disaster relief materials, there has been the lack of a warehouse, no dedicated operational space for humanitarian clusters to meet during disasters, and poor communication for coordination that hampers NDMO responses and recovery efforts. In addition, topographic data and GIS layers relevant to disaster risk management (such as elevation, critical buildings, vulnerability and hazards) were unavailable prior to this Project for disaster risk reduction or response purposes. Data gathering for assessments related to disaster risk management (DRM) has been insufficient prior to the Project to enable sound decision-making. Moreover, baseline datasets were limited for age and gender disaggregated datasets at atoll and island level across sectors. There were only limited visualisation options available in RMI, both in terms of hardware and software.
8. The NWSO is tasked with providing weather forecasts, early warnings on hazardous weather, likely inundation forecasts and other weather-related products as well as tsunamis or other sea swell inundation to the government and the public. This is done through:
* delivery of scientific assessment and analytical services;
* undertaking of manual surface aviation, synoptic and upper-air observations, transmitting data to the Global Telecommunication System/Integrated World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Information System;
* receipt of data from outer island focal points (such as mayors, disaster committees);
* receipt and interpretation of daily data from partner scientific agencies, notably US Department of Commerce’s National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA);
* advice to the NDMO and Chief Secretary on key threats to inform and for consideration of further action (such as activation of a National Disaster Committee (NDC) or other actions);
* equipment for the collection of information and the communication systems. This is an area in need of upgrades and replacements to function according to WMO, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), NOAA and other international standards.

## Problems that the RMI-EDCR Project sought to address

1. The RMI-EDCR Project sought to address are:
* the occurrence of frequent natural hazards (such as tropical storms, typhoons, storm surges and droughts), which can result in human casualties, disruption to economic activity, loss of livelihoods, diversion of fiscal resources, and the undermining of development priorities;
* the country’s vulnerability to climate change that heightens disaster risks because extreme weather events are likely to increase in the future;
* challenges related to ecosystem degradation, coastal erosion and food and water insecurity.

## Development Objective of RMI-EDCR Project

1. In response to the aforementioned problems, the RMI-EDCR Project aimed to effectively address the consequences of, and responses to, geo-physical and climate-related hazards to protect lives, sustain livelihoods, preserve the environment and safeguard the economy. The Project sought to improve the capacity for preparedness and mitigation of the RMI to geo-physical and climate related hazards and enhancing resilience to climate change impact, guided by the overarching RMI Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (DRM NAP) of 2008-2018, the Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Management of 2014 – 2018 (JNAP), the National Disaster Management Office Strategic Plan 2017 – 2019 (NDMP), and the Standard Hazard Mitigation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy Framework (NCCPF).
2. With no dedicated financing available for immediate disaster response, and early recovery and reconstruction, there was a shortfall of emergency funding from the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) insurance program and USAID under the Compact of Free Association (supporting JNAP Goal 3). Moreover, much of the funding needs were always being met by the United States under the Compact Agreement tied solely for development purposes. With the end of the Compact Agreement in 2024, there was a need for UNDP to seek multilateral development assistance on behalf of RMI for DRM and climate change adaptation (CCA). This Project was approved by GoJ in March 2019 with Project funding of US$7,400,000. A remote Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting was undertaken to get final comments and inputs from the GoRMI and UNDP units with a final Project Document (ProDoc) signed by GoRMI in May 2019.

## Description of the Project’s Theory of Change

1. A Theory of Change (ToC) was provided for this Project as shown on Figure 2. However, the ToC diagram is not entirely reflective of the RMI-EDCR Project. This is further discussed in Para 42.

**Figure 2: Theory of Change**



## Expected Results

1. Concerted efforts have also been devoted to responding to urgent and unpredicted needs arising out of slow and sudden onset of natural hazards impacting livelihoods, economy, and persistent inequalities. Under Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), the implementing agency for the RMI-EDCR Project is the UNDP. The Project was to achieve Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022: “By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened”. This Outcome was to be achieved through 2 expected outputs:
* Output 1: Strengthened Disaster Communication and Climate and Inundation Monitoring Systems;
* Output 2: Enhanced National Disaster Responders readiness capacity & better resourced to minimise loss of lives and damages.

## Total Resources for RMI-EDCR Project

1. The total resources allocated to this Project at the time of the original ProDoc signature is provided in Table 1. The actual budget for the Project as per received funds is US$ 7,400,000.

**Table 1: Total Resources for RMI-EDCR Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Resources from Government of Japan (US$)** |
| Output 1 | $1,202,332 |
| Output 2 | $5,211,052 |
| Staff in Country and in Pac Office Suva | $356,667 |
| Evaluation | $ 14,667 |
| Audit | $ 3,000 |
| Monitoring | $ 63,134 |
| General Management Support (8%) | $548,148 |
| Total | **$7,400,000** |

## Key Partners involved with the RMI-EDCR Project

1. Key partners on the RMI-EDCR Project are provided on Table 2. More details on these stakeholders are provided in Sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.2.

## Context of other ongoing and previous evaluations

1. There are no other ongoing or previous evaluations of the RMI-EDCR Project.

**Table 2: Listing of Key Partners of the RMI-EDCR Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Partner** | **Mandate** |
| RMI Office of the Chief Secretary to the President (OCS) | As head of the Public Service and the chief administrative and advisory officer of the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, OCS is responsible to the Cabinet for the general direction of the work of all Departments and offices of government.  |
| Marshall Islands National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) | Responsible for coordinating dissemination of disaster warnings and disaster relief and coordination |
| Marshall Islands Weather Service Office (NWSO) | Administers the programs and facilities of the National Weather Service (under NOAA) as a part of a large network covering the expanse of the Pacific |
|  National Telecommunication Authority (NTA) | Responsible for the majority of communication on the Marshall Islands including phone, telex services, radio, television, and internet  |
| Ministry of Works, Infrastructure and Utilities (MoWIU) | Responsible for planning, design, construction and maintenance of all public works on the Marshall Islands |
| Majuro Water & Sewer Company (MWSC)  | Responsible as a GoRMI entity for managing water and sewer infrastructure and services in the capital city of Majuro |
| Kwajalein Atoll Joint Utilities Resources (KAJUR) | Responsible for providing the community of Ebeye, including Gugeegue and smaller island communities connected to Ebeye by the causeway with electricity, water and sanitation services. |
| Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority (KADA)  | Responsible for providing improvement projects on Kwajalein Atoll in housing, infrastructure and health services. |
| Embassy of Japan | Responsible for the donation of funds to the RMI-EDCR Project |
| Communities of the outer and lagoon islands  | Project beneficiaries |

# Findings

## Project Design and Formulation

1. From January to March 2019, the RMI-EDCR Project was prepared by UNDP through the RESPAC Project team[[8]](#footnote-9), and in consultation with selected stakeholders including RMI Office of the Chief Secretary to the President. The actual Project design, however, was reportedly hastily prepared during a 2-week period in February 2019 that included a one-year implementation period, a seemingly impossible period to execute such an undertaking. The Project design also did not include funds for the services of an international engineering firm to prepare the design and tenders for the EOCs. The Project design was also a result of considerable lobbying by the GoRMI to include both Majuro and Ebeye for EOC construction with the construction of the Ebeye EOC subject to funding availability. The Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs approved the Project design during the 1st half of March 2019. After the early April 2019 e-LPAC was undertaken to get the final comments from the GoRMI and UNDP, the ProDoc was signed by GoRMI during May 2019. The hasty preparation of the ProDoc resulted in shortfalls in the Project design and planned activities which are covered in Paras 61-67.
2. The ProDoc mentioned that gender analysis was yet to be undertaken but planned as an activity during Project implementation. The ProDoc did not include a gender analysis at a national level nor did it identify any concrete efforts related to specific needs of women and men or acknowledging their different roles. However, it did mention that “gender equality and social inclusion interventions need to be an integral part of the solution, in order to reduce vulnerability of minority or socially excluded groups such as women and girls, persons with disability and ethnic minorities”. These tasks were assumingly left to a technical specialist who would support training of Project and governments staff in these areas with an emphasis on gender and social protection.

## Project Implementation

1. The following is a compilation of significant events during implementation of the RMI-EDCR Project in chronological order:
* Project approved 31 March 2019;
* Project staff were recruited during the 3rd quarter of 2019;
* an engineering design company started in October 2019;
* the COVID-19 pandemic delayed:
	+ the installation of wave rider buoys. An LOA was completed between the NWSO and the University of Hawai’i (UH) and between UNDP and NWSO in October 2020, and the first buoy replaced a wave rider buoy needing calibration in October 2021;
	+ design work on EOCs to the October 2020-April 2021 period noting that the design needs to reflect the NTA server building;
* an international engineer was hired by MoWIU in late 2020 as per signed LoA responsible for supervision of construction and design. This person initially worked remotely due to the travel restrictions to the RMI;
* in April 2021, bids for EOC construction offered price at US$7.2 million and US$8.6 million for Majuro and Ebeye EOCs respectively, higher than the estimated cost;
* HACT assessment of MoWIU in May 2021 for the NTA data center works;
* a new full-time engineer for UNDP was recruited on 15 April 2021;
* in January 2022, UH’s Pacific Islands Ocean Observing System (PacIOOS) delivered best management practices through several capacity development trainings including acoustic release and transducer operation;
* value engineering process for the EOCs was completed in April 2022;
* a second wave rider buoy was received by NWSO in April 2022;
* 2nd round of EOC construction procurement notice was closed in mid-May 2022 with only 1 bid received[[9]](#footnote-10);
* bathymetry survey was conducted in June 2022 near Majuro for a wave rider buoy;
* cabinet approved construction of only the Ebeye EOC in July 2022;
* Ebeye EOC construction started in November 2022;
* ICT equipment procurement proceeded for Ebeye EOC and Majuro NDMO in May 2023;
* HACT micro-assessment was conducted for NWSO in June 2023;
* NWSO received 7 chatty beetles in October 2023;
* in December 2023, NWSO dispatched a mission to Wotto and Lae to supply chatty beetles with solar system to charge the equipment;
* substantial completion of the Ebeye EOC in March 2024.
1. From 2019-2024, a Project Team consisted of 3 staff in RMI: Country Coordinator, Administrative Finance Officer, Procurement Officer, and 7 staff at UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji: Project Manager, Procurement Specialist, Operations and Implementation Specialist, Procurement and Travel Services Analyst, Project Assistant, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Finance Officer. Figure 3 provides an illustration of the Project organization.
2. Overall, the RMI-EDCR Project management arrangements and strategies were well-conceived and efficient in delivering the Project under difficulties caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the short implementation period as designed in the ProDoc. The major focus of the Project during the first 6 months was on recruitment of Project Team staff and preparatory work for major procurement. The first Project Board meeting was held in August 2019. No substantial results were achieved in 2019. Since the original Project document stated that the Project was supposed to be completed in March 2020, there were numerous Project extensions requested and approved by the Government of Japan until 31 March 2024. This issue caused numerous problems for the Project Team.

### Actual Stakeholder Participation Partnership Arrangements

1. The Project worked closely with many stakeholders towards the outcome of improving the country’s resilience to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters and strengthening environmental protection. Stakeholders included the OCS, NDMO, MoWIU, NWSO, KAJUR, KADA, NOAA, and the NTA, many of whom were included on the Technical Advisory Committee. The Project has also established a partnership with the UH for the installation of wave rider buoys as the University has provided support to the NWSO via NOAA. Overall efforts by the RMI-EDCR team to forge effective partnership arrangements with various stakeholders have been ***satisfactory***.

**Figure 3: RMI-EDCR Project Organization Structure**
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	+ 1. **Performance of Implementing Agency**
1. The performance of UNDP (the Implementing Agency) can be characterized as follows:
* UNDP was the main driver behind the Project, involved in engaging stakeholders and consultants in Project activities and in providing management arrangements that follow global UNDP POPP guidelines. Their involvement helped drive the Project towards its completion despite all the delays;
* UNDP sustained its cooperation with government, suppliers and contractors throughout implementation of RMI-EDCR. This produced important collaborative synergies with GoRMI that led to informed discussions during Project Board meetings and other meetings between UNDP and GoRMI related to Project-specific activities. Evidence of this can be traced back to Project Board meeting minutes and BTORs filed by the UNDP staff;
* The overall performance of UNDP on the RMI-EDCR Project can be assessed as being **satisfactory**.

## Relevance

1. The RMI-EDCR Project is **relevant** to the development priorities of RMI, namely:
* the RMI Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (DRM NAP) 2008-2018;
* the 2014-2018 Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Management (JNAP), a detailed strategy for holistically and co-operatively addressing risk in the RMI;
* The National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) of 1997; and
* the Standard Hazard Mitigation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy Framework (NCCPF) of January 2011;
* the Multi Country Programme Document (MCPD) 2023-2027 that includes RMI that stipulates:
	+ a Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1: By 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored;
	+ a Related Strategic Plan Outcome: Resilience built to respond to systemic uncertainty and risk;
	+ an Output 1.2: Governance systems are risk-informed to manage and finance disasters and shocks.
* the UN Pacific Strategy Outcome 1 where by 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impact of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened with specific intervention on Output 1.1 of the sub-regional programme document on “Scale up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented in the Pacific”.
1. The Project is also relevant to its design with activities being appropriate towards the achievement of the Project objective and the Outputs, and relevant to strengthening DRM and climate resilience, as identified in the RToC and RRF. The Project did address major gaps in DRM and climate resilience (through Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys, a functional and equipped EOC in Ebeye, and other back-up generator and other equipment), with other gaps being filled in by other donors (such as weather stations in all 24 atolls funded by GCF). Design and implementation of the Ebeye EOC integrated cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights and climate resilience, reflecting the rights of all females and males. A large gap does remain in DRM and climate resilience by not constructing the Majuro EOC, something the design did not exclude.

## Coherence

1. Most Project activities fit the Project objective, with coherence between what the Project is doing and what it is attempting to achieve to address the needs and priorities of Majuro and Kwajalein Atolls and surrounding atoll communities for both men and women. The ToC for the RMI-EDCR Project on Figure 2, however, is not reflective of all activities. While the activities related to “enhanced community disaster resilience through improved water and food resources management, livelihood diversification and integrated disaster and social inclusion awareness training” was implemented in other Micronesian countries, this was not done in the RMI. A revised ToC (RToC) corrects this deficiency as provided on Figure 4, eliminating many of the “solution pathways” of the ToC, and conforming to a Revised Results Framework (RRF) of the RMI-EDCR Project up to December 2022 and shown in Appendix F.
2. Otherwise, the Project is coherent, aligning well with key drivers identified in managing disaster risks in the Pacific, notably:
* UNDP's MCPD 2023-2027 with the Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1: “By 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored”;
* UN Pacific Strategy Outcome 1 where by 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impact of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened with specific intervention on Output 1.1 of the sub-regional programme document on “scale-up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented in the Pacific”;
* RMI’s DRM NAP for 2008-2018, JNAP for 2014-2018, NDMP of 1997, and the NCCPF of January 2011.
1. Other relevant projects incorporated lessons into the RMI-EDCR Project design and implementation, adding to the Project’s coherence:
* the UNDP-GEF Ridge to Reef RMI inception report of 2018[[10]](#footnote-11) highlighted various related lessons learned and potential areas of interventions in building capacities of national and local stakeholders towards integrated approaches through appropriate training with a paramount focus on conservation, sustainable livelihoods and community-based adaptation. This would include strengthened community-based management structures to enable communities to take ownership and leadership in integrated resource management plans and disaster risk management;
* the Drought Post Disaster Needs Assessment Report (2017)[[11]](#footnote-12) provided a wealth of information with respect to enhanced resilience for the GoRMI as well as island communities.

##  Effectiveness

### Analysis of Results Framework for RMI-EDCR Project

1. As mentioned in Para 42, an RToC for the RMI-EDCR Project better reflects what was done on the Project (Figure 4). The Project was designed based on an RRF that includes intended outputs with indicators that generally meet SMART criteria with “output targets” for each Project output. The RRF underwent many changes during implementation including:
* Output 1 wording changed to “strengthened gender sensitive disaster communication and climate and tsunami monitoring systems“;
* Indicator 1.1 was changed in August 2019 and again in December 2022 to be “# of islands with upgraded (i.e. redundancy, marine grade, energy efficient, gender sensitive) climate and tsunami early warning system installed and operational”;
* Indicator 1.2 was also changed in August 2019 and again in December 2022 to be “# of men and women with access to early warning information through the upgraded disaster gender sensitive communications, climate and tsunami early warning systems”;
* Indicator 1.4 was cancelled in November 2019;
* Output 2 wording changed to “enhanced gender sensitive national and state disaster preparedness capacity”;
* Indicator 2.1 was cancelled in 2019 in favor of “scale (%) of upgrading of the National Emergency Operational Centre with appropriate infrastructure and equipment to facilitate information management and effective coordination”;
* Indicator 2.2: “# staff and members of the Emergency Operational Centre and Disaster Management Team have improved their capacities in information management and coordination” was added to the RF in December 2022;
* Indicator 2.3: “# men and women benefitted from the improved disaster preparedness in water sector” was also added in December 2022;
* no assumptions or risks mentioned in the RMI-EDCR RRF.

These RRF indicators and their targets are listed as shown in Appendix F. The RRF setup was sufficient to monitor and evaluate the latest Project’s activities.

### Planned Stakeholder Participation

1. Though the RMI-EDCR ProDoc did not detail planned stakeholder participation, the ProDoc did imply that stakeholder participation will be realized through empowering line ministries and local governments to foster strong working relationships with key stakeholders, and to enhance resilience to climate change and disasters in ways that contribute to RMI’s sustainable development.
2. This is precisely what occurred. The capacities of government stakeholders for DRM were enhanced through the Project, assisting in the guidance and adoption of the DRM NAP, JNAP, NDMP, and NCCPF. This subsequently involved stakeholders such as OCS, NDMO, NWSO, NTA, MoWIU, MWSC, KAJUR, KADA, the Red Cross and communities of the outer and lagoon islands.

**Figure 4: RToC for the RMI-EDCR Project**



### Linkages between the RMI-EDCR Project and other interventions in the sector

1. Linkages with the RMI-EDCR Project included:
* the ACWA project (Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector in the Marshall Islands) where UNDP was to place water storage tanks in public areas and private residences;
* a US$25 million GCF project entitled Pacific Resilience Project Phase 2, to install and maintain the sustainability of wave rider buoys and installation of weather and climate equipment on 24 atolls. With currently only 7 data points for climate in RMI, this project is expected to increase capacities to improve the accuracy of weather forecasting in the RMI and setting up a short-term climate outlook for droughts;
* UNDP-GEF RMI Ridge-to-Reef Project (see Para 44).

### Project Results

1. This section provides an overview of the overall results of the RMI-EDCR Project and an assessment of the actual achievements of the RMI-EDCR Project. For Table 2, RMI-EDCR “progress of activities against planned activities” is color-coded according to the following color-coding scheme. Table 3 shows the “summary of targets achieved against the output indicators” of the RMI-EDCR RRF where progress of the output indicators is also color-coded according to the color-coding scheme:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green: Completed, indicator shows successful achievements | Yellow: Indicator shows expected completion by the EOP | Red: Indicator shows poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by Project closure |

###

***Progress of planned activities towards intended outcomes***

1. With the overall objective of the RMI-EDCR Project being “by 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored”, the work by the RMI-EDCR Project has assisted the Marshallese and ecosystems in the Pacific to become more resilient to the impacts of climate change, variability and disasters, but not to strengthen environmental protection. Overall, the largest risk to the Marshallese people is inundation, and much of the Project investments were made to address this risk. Overall, the work to address this risk is rated as **moderately satisfactory**.

***Progress towards Output 1: Strengthened gender sensitive Disaster Communication and Climate and Tsunami Monitoring Systems***

1. Most of the funds on this Output were utilized to provide enhanced products to improve data collection services of the NWSO. Chatty beetles are a means of reliable communication by text messaging to warn of hazards for 24 hours during the day. The improvements of chatty beetles over UHF/VHF phones are their resistance to the corrosive salty spray environment, their use of less energy, less costly to operate, maintaining the confidentiality of the messaging, and being operational over a 24-hour period. With no air conditioning on remote islands, chatty beetles have a protective casing that protects the equipment from the corrosive environment and can last up to 72 hours with power from solar panels. A chatty beetle resembles a mini-satellite phone without the audio that can also transmit their messages through computer with most communities having internet access through Starlink services for those who can afford the services. The approximate cost of a Chatty Beetle is around US$5,000.

**Table 2:** **RMI-EDCR progress of activities against planned activities**

| **Project Strategy** | **Planned Activities** | **Summary of Progress** | **Evaluation Comments** | **Rating[[12]](#footnote-13)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1:** Strengthened gender sensitive disaster communication and climate and tsunami monitoring systems | 1.1 Install inundation and tsunami and multi-hazard warning redundancy and climate data conduit through Chatty Beetles in 9 locations with 3 spares | NWSO received 7 chatty beetles from TASI in October 2023 where only 2 Chatty beetles have been deployed to Wotto and Lae Atolls in December 2023.  | See Paras 51 and 53 | 5 |
| 1.2 Provide 2 Wave-Riders that will support wave modelling and Realtime inundation forecasting and warning for coastal communities and long-term oceanographic measurements in strategic and vulnerable locations | 2 wave rider buoys which were received by WSO in May 2021. One buoy was shipped was received by WSO in October 2021. Another other spare buoy was shipped to RMI in April 2022 and is yet to be deployed. | See Paras 52, 54-55 | 5 |
| 1.3 Link the Northern Meteorological Offices with HF radio as per Pacific Island Communication and Infrastructure (PICI) Panel Workplan 2019 | Cancelled since WSO has already connected with the outer Northern Pacific Island countries. | See Para 56 | n/a |
| 1.4 Provide appropriate and improved disaster preparedness and response communication and other equipment to GOB/EOC to ensure a fully equipped and functional Centre linking to the main communication media used in RMI by the main Ministries for baseline disaster data collection and transmission to NDMO and line Ministries and vice versa for dissemination of warnings, with software and training | Procurement of computers, monitors, displays, network switches, servers, firewalls, security and operating system software programs, printers, screens, scanner, drones, Personal Locator Beacons (PLB), tablets and phones with training on the use of drones. | See Para 57 | 5 |
| **Output 2:** Enhanced gender sensitive national and state disaster preparedness capacity | 2.1 Construct NDMO centre (including NEOC and a disaster warehouse) facility in Majuro that meets disaster preparedness, international and functional standards | Cancelled due to significant cost increases in Majuro EOC construction cost after the COVID-19 pandemic | See Para 68 | 1 |
| 2.2 Support construction of one GOB/EOC in Ebeye including feasibility option, design and technical file preparation, and finalize construction subject to availability of funds and Government of Japan approval | Ebeye EOC was completed on 31 March 2024 | See Paras 69-72 | 5 |
| 2.3 Supply and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness | Procurement of furniture and fixtures for EOCs, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for the MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR, and utility trucks. | See Para 73 | 5 |

**Table 3: Status of RMI-EDCR Results Framework**

| **Project Strategy** | **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Status of Target Achieved** | **Evaluation Comments** | **Rating[[13]](#footnote-14)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1:** Strengthened gender sensitive Disaster Communication and Climate and Tsunami Monitoring Systems | **1.1** # of islands with upgraded (i.e. redundancy, marine grade, energy efficient, gender sensitive) climate and tsunami early warning system installed and operational | 0 | 9 | 2 (Chatty beetles installed in Wotto and Lae) | See Paras 51-58 | 5 |
| **1.2** # of men and women with access to early warning information through the upgraded gender sensitive disaster communications, climate and tsunami early warning systems | 0 | 54,705 Projection 2019 (from Census 2011) | 221 people (113 men and 108 women) (Chatty beetle installed in Wotto and Lae) | 5 |
| **Output 2:** Enhanced gender sensitive National and State Disaster Preparedness capacity | 2.1 Scale (%) of upgrading of the National Emergency Operational Centre with appropriate infrastructure and equipment to facilitate information management and effective coordination | 0 | 100% | 100% construction work completed | See Para 69  | 5 |
| 2.2 # staff and members of the Emergency Operational Centre and Disaster Management Team have improved their capacities in information management and coordination (equipment and gender sensitive guidelines) | 0 | 20 (women=8) | 172 (74 women) | See Para 70 | 5 |
| 2.3 # men and women benefitted from the improved disaster preparedness in water sector [newly added in Dec 2022] | 0 | 32,398(16,417 men and 15,981 women) In Majuro: 11,289 men and 11,269 womenIn Kwajalein: 5,128 men and 4,712 women | 31,066 (15,768 men and 15,298 women) [[14]](#footnote-15)Majuro: 11,430 men and 11,255 womenKwajalein: 4,338 men and 4,073 women |  | 5 |

1. Wave rider buoys monitor wave height, wave direction, water temperature, ocean currents and ocean hazards from weather-related events to give tailored advisories on where inundation will occur in Kwajalein and Majuro atolls as well as other islands provided that bathymetry exists for the other islands. Tsunamis are monitored by tsunami buoys which were not included on this Project. The issue with wave rider buoys is having a ~500 m depth and location to install the buoy. The approximate cost of a wave rider buoy is around US$100,000 plus US$15,000 for installation and US$50,000 to $200,000 for bathymetric surveys depending on how successful the surveys are in findings at suitable location.
2. *Activity 1.1 (Install inundation and tsunami and multi-hazard warning redundancy and climate data conduit through Chatty Beetles in 9 locations with 3 spares)* involved:
* NWSO having a conference call with USAID representatives at the US Embassy in RMI on 7 April 2021, to discuss ways to continue to provide awareness on the many effective uses of Chatty Beetles as a warning tool and for weather and climate communication. USAID was the primary source of funding and working partner for existing Chatty Beetle arrangements in the RMl;
* UNDP approaching the UH’s TASI program to provide support to RMI’s NWSO for Chatty Beetle text-based alerts and messaging in remote locations where communication options are limited. Due to the inability of UH to come to an agreement with UNDP, the Project made the decision to access Chatty Beetles from the TASI Program through NWSO. As such, UNDP made an agreement with NWSO in July 2022 to transfer funds to NWSO for the procurement of 14 Chatty Beetles;
* UNDP conducting a HACT assessment on NWSO in June 2023 to ensure capacities and operational frameworks within NWSO are sufficiently strengthened for management and accountability of the Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys, with the ultimate objective of gradually shifting to NWSO systems and supporting a closer alignment of funds that were transferred to service national priorities in DRM. The HACT assessment gave UNDP a green light to sign off on the agreement between UNDP and NWSO for procurement and installation of 14 Chatty Beetles;
* Project activity related to Chatty Beetles that included procurement and shipping of the Beetles to RMI by TASI, as well as transport and travel within the RMI. While there were 6 chatty beetles already in operation in RMI, NWSO only received 7 Chatty Beetles and solar panels from TASI in October 2023 due to the inability of the American company to supply more chatty beetles[[15]](#footnote-16);
* 6 Chatty Beetles already in use in RMI that were sent to NOAA in October 2023 by NWSO for repair and maintenance. With NWSO only receiving 7 chatty beetles, NWSO dispatched a mission to supply Chatty Beetles to Wotto and Lae Atolls in December 2023. The Mission imparted best management practices of the Chatty Beetles including closure of the Chatty Beetle casing to shield out the salt spray from the equipment thus providing the optimum service life. This meant the opening of the Chatty Beetle casing only for communications. The remaining Chatty Beetles are to be installed in the outer islands at the earliest possible time, likely in 4 atolls in Ratak Chain and 3 atolls in Ralik Chain. Timing will depend on what flights are available for ease of maintenance and logistics. There was no gender disaggregation of the communities attending the best management practices of the Chatty Beetles.
1. *Activity 1.2 (Provide 3 Wave-Riders that will support wave modelling and real time inundation forecasting and warning for coastal communities and long-term oceanographic measurements in strategic and vulnerable locations)* involved:
* the Project making the decision, similar to Activity 1.1, to access wave rider buoys from the TASI Program through NWSO. An LoA was signed between UNDP and NWSO in April 2020 to provide support for the procurement and installation of wave-rider buoys from PacIOOS with support from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for RMI;
* PacIOOS initiating the procurement of 2 wave rider buoys which were received by NWSO in May 2021 (2 buoys instead of 3 were procured due to the budget constraints). One buoy was shipped to RMI after testing and received by NWSO in October 2021. The other spare buoy was shipped to RMI in April 2022;
* best management practices for wave rider buoys that were developed by the PacIOOS in August 2021. Based on the MoA between UNDP and PacIOOS, qualified staff under PacIOOS trained NWSO contractors and staff in 2022 on the installation and maintenance of the buoys[[16]](#footnote-17);
* UH conducting several capacity development trainings including acoustic release and transducer operation in January 2022, operation of the portable acoustic command system (PACS) deck unit equipment in April 2022, and a training introduction to Garmin chart plotter transducer equipment and survey methodology in May 2022;
* PacIOOS and NWSO conducting bathymetry surveys after they obtained required equipment through cooperation with Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority (MIMRA) in June 2022. While survey data collected was processed and analyzed by PacIOOS, the result did provide a suitable location to moor the wave buoy east of Majuro. Due to the absence of bathymetry in Jaluit Atoll, PacIOOS has suggested alternative locations for the second buoy south of Kwajalein;
* the Project deploying a replacement wave rider buoy in east of Majuro in August 2022 with PACIOOS taking in the existing wave rider buoy for calibration. The existing site of this wave rider buoy was at a 500 m depth and clear from shipping lanes. The Project paid for installation of the buoy including bathymetric analysis of Majuro. However, this buoy has limited exposure to northern swells;
* plans for the deployment of the second buoy on Kwajalein to take place after U.S. Army Garrison Kwajalein Atoll (USAGKA) clearance. The depth of the location of the second buoy, although deeper than 500 m, is still feasible but a challenge. The buoy location site near Kwajalein will improve monitoring of northern swells, notwithstanding the strict protocols required by the US Military. With the Project closing as of 31 March 2024, the bathymetric analysis to site the second buoy is going to be funded from sources outside the Project;
* in 2024, the Project was considering procuring another wave rider buoy based on the cancellation of the Majuro EOC. However, due to the length of time required for purchase, PacIOOS informed the Project and UNDP that the purchase was not going to be possible before the Project completion date of 31 March 2024.
1. NWSO added to the wave rider buoy discussion on the recent finding on tsunami modeling that has posed a new risk for RMI as mentioned earlier. Due to an Australian study that was conducted in the early 2000s, RMI thought that there was no risk tsunami for Marshall Islands. However, with sea level rise now accelerating and with the new models put together, there is a change to a higher risk profile for RMI. A team from the International Tsunami Information Center (ITIC) came to RMI in 2023 to inform the GoRMI of the new risk profile and changing priorities of the wave rider buoys in the RMI, especially for the southern islands such as Namdrik and Ebon and western islands such as Ujae, Lae, Wotto and Lib.
2. *Activity 1.3 (Link the Northern Meteorological Offices with HF radio as per Pacific Island Communication and Infrastructure (PICI) Panel Workplan 2019)* was cancelled by the Project Board at the November 2019 meeting since NWSO has already connected with the outer Northern Pacific Island countries. The funds allocated to this activity were re-allocated to EOC construction in late 2019.
3. *Activity 1.4 (Provide appropriate and improved disaster preparedness and response communication and other equipment to GOB/EOC to ensure a fully equipped and functional Centre linking to the main communication media used in RMI by the main Ministries for baseline disaster data collection and transmission to NDMO and line Ministries and vice versa for dissemination of warnings, with software and training)* involved:
* the PB deciding in November 2019 to cancel the activity of supplying the HF/VHF radios which was to be provided by the World Bank. However, the Project did communicate with the World Bank on radios to be installed in the newly constructed Ebeye EOC;
* in July 2022, starting procurement of computers, monitors, displays, network switches, servers, firewalls, security and operating system software programs, printers, screens, scanner, drones, Personal Locator Beacons (PLB), tablets and phones. Aerial and submersible drones were delivered to the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC in October 2023 in addition to four smaller drones received in November 2023. Smaller items such as PLBs, tablets, computers, and mobile phones arrived in December 2023;
* trainings were conducted by the drone suppliers from 3-10 October 2023, attended by 5 men and 1 woman from NDMO, Office of Chief Secretary, KADA and Marshall Islands Police Department (MIPD). The drones are expected to enable responder to rapidly assess and monitor real-time of disaster areas and capture high-resolution images by reducing exposure to danger for responders.
1. In terms of this output described as “strengthened gender sensitive Disaster Communication and Climate and Tsunami Monitoring Systems”, there was no evidence of the Project undertaking any gender analysis with regards to the procurement of equipment in this Output or the provision of training related to Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys and drone operations. There is also no evidence of any effort to promote gender sensitive capacity development through training strategies, curriculum, and instruction nor was there any evidence of efforts to mainstream gender or to enhance the gender sensitiveness of the equipment. Again, the GoRMI had its own gender equality initiatives for recruiting women in specific positions though this recruitment does not appear to make any progress on this Output. This is further discussed in Paras **Error! Reference source not found.**-107.
2. The overall work by the Project in Output 1 to strengthen disaster communication and climate monitoring systems can be rated as **satisfactory.** This is primarily due to the equipment procured and installed, and training activities being implemented. It should be noted that tsunami monitoring systems were not upgraded.

***Progress towards Output 2: Enhanced gender sensitive National and State Disaster Preparedness capacity***

1. EOCs were to be constructed in Majuro and Ebeye to serve as command centers enabling the convening of national disaster committees for national disasters. EOCs would allow the GoRMI to convene meetings in one secure place in the event of a disaster, and to securely communicate with other communities about mitigative measures. The EOCs were to be built to withstand any climatic event and be equipped with data, maps, reliable communications that enhance the capacities of the national government personnel to be able to quickly respond and coordinate emergencies caused by natural disasters. This would include droughts, flooding events, and disease. EOCs were also to provide back-up supplies of water and power during disasters.
2. EOC activities common to both Activities 2.1 and 2.2 experienced problems with the design of the RMI-EDCR Project. The Project was hastily prepared resulting in a one-year implementation period and funds not being included in the Project budget for the services of an international engineering firm to prepare the design and tenders for the EOCs (Para 33). An Australian architectural and engineering firm, JSC, was hired by UNDP in October 2019 to collect required information to discuss possible options for EOC construction. This resulted in the re-allocation of the Project budget, leaving less funds for EOC construction in Majuro and Ebeye. This had implications on the Project budget which was now heavily invested in the construction of the EOCs in Majuro and Ebeye, leaving little to no allocation in October 2019 for soft activities and equipment purchases.
3. After the resolution of land tenure issues for both Majuro and Ebeye in January 2020, there were attempts by the Project Board in 2020 to re-visit the scope of the EOC design and construction work without deteriorating quality in an effort to reduce costs to make it more possible to complete both EOCs. With a LoA with MoWIU signed in July 2020 to allow for UNDP supervision of EOC design and construction work, there were very few qualified bids for the EOC design work.
4. In July 2020, the process for a design contractor was started once approval was attained and a kick-off meeting was held to clarify some requirements and any other information needed on the work. Due to UNDP procurement rules based on the expected budget, the Project needed to advertise the tender internationally with local companies also able to participate. To accelerate progress once the tender for design company was finalized, work was to proceed forward for a procurement process for EOC construction such as conducting pre-qualification to ensure time can be saved instead of waiting for design to be completed. In the end, the Australian architectural and engineering firm, JSC, was again awarded EOC design work in August 2020 after the Project launched tenders twice for this work.
5. Adjustments were made for delays in the procurement of JSC’s architectural and engineering services for the design of the EOCs in Majuro and Ebeye. However, due to restrictions in travel, JSC was not able to travel to RMI starting in October 2020 with the company forced to conduct design work remotely. In this regard, there was a risk of compromising the quality of the design work; however, the LoA signed between MoWIU and UNDP somewhat mitigated this issue. JSC completed its tender design work of the EOCs by March 2021. Furthermore, JSC set another condition for its final design work in the costing of the EOCs could only be done through MoWIU. This challenged the Project team with maintaining the quality of the work in the design phase.
6. The first construction tender was held in May 2021 with bidders for construction of Majuro and Ebeye EOCs offering prices that were much higher than the estimated cost[[17]](#footnote-18). Raw materials, shipping and labour costs had all increased due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This caused the PB to reconsider all options of how to use the budgeted amount for the EOCs. This included seeking clarification from bidders on how prices were determined, and seeking approval from UNDP Procurement to proceed with contract negotiations. Eventually, the UNDP Project team cancelled the tender in December 2021, and proceeded with discussions with the lowest price bidder, re-assessing market rates and comparing with the lowest price, and requesting the design company, JCA, to undertake additional services to conduct value engineering to reduce scope and update the drawing and estimates. By March 2022, this resulted in the Majuro EOC being less than US$4 million (a reduction of US$1.1 million) and the Ebeye EOC being less than US$2 million (a reduction of US$1.3 million) based on estimates by the MoWIU Engineer. However, the cost of both EOCs was still an issue for the PB.
7. With the completion of value engineering by JSC in April 2022, another tender for the construction of the EOCs was issued in May 2022 after much analysis by UNDP, MoWIU and NDMO of local construction companies, and re-assessing market rate. This tender resulted in the same cost overruns despite a local RMI company doing the work[[18]](#footnote-19). OCS and the UNDP then had discussions on whether or not the GoRMI could cost share. The GoRMI was then requested to take a decision on constructing a Majuro EOC, allocating more funds towards constructing 2 EOCs or only constructing an Ebeye EOC. In July 2022, the RMI Cabinet endorsed as per CM/108-22 document to construct only the Ebeye EOC at a cost of US$1.967 million as this was the only option within the available budget; GoRMI was not able to share the cost of constructing an EOC in Majuro at the high cost of US$4.497 million[[19]](#footnote-20).
8. With the insufficiency of the available budget to construct the 2 EOCs in Majuro and Ebeye, the Project is still pursuing additional funds as of today, to complete the construction of the 2 EOC facilities. A request to the GoJ in 2021 for additional funds was not successful, and there have been ongoing discussions with the US Embassy on the possibility of additional funds to construct the EOC in Majuro.
9. *Activity 2.1: Construct NDMO centre (including NEOC and a disaster warehouse) facility in Majuro that meets disaster preparedness, international and functional standards [EOC Majuro and NTA data center]* involved:
* the recruitment of a structural engineer hired by the UNDP in 2019 to collect required information to discuss possible options for EOC construction;
* lease agreement of the EOC sites being received in December 2019;
* the Project discontinuing this activity to construct the NEOC in Majuro in July 2022, due to significant cost increases in construction cost after the COVID-19 pandemic, based on the cabinet endorsement as per CM/108-22 document;
* the PB deciding in November 2019 to allocate US$110,000 for the construction of a back-up NTA data information center[[20]](#footnote-21) with the remaining to be cost shared by the NTA. In May 2023, the Project Manager suggested the PB decide on whether the Project should move forward with the NTA data center activity which is limited to only detailed design. Furthermore, detailed design of the NTA data center does not enhance national capacity for disaster preparedness. The PB's decision to provide US$110,000 was done to secure the extra NTA money to secure construction of the back-up NTA data information center which has not been done to date. In May and June 2022 during the cancellation of construction of the EOC in Majuro, budget of cost-sharing the construction of NTA data center was removed from the Project based on results of Project board meetings.
1. *Activity 2.2 (Support construction of one GOB/EOC in Ebeye including feasibility option, design and technical file preparation, and finalize construction subject to availability of funds and Government of Japan approval)* involved:
* the Project securing a lease agreement for the EOC with the Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority (KADA) in January 2020;
* KADA demolishing the Old Kwajalein Atoll Local Government building in March 2021 to construct the Ebeye EOC. A final report confirmed there was no asbestos in the old building;
* design and tender works by JCA of Australia for the Ebeye EOC (and Majuro EOC) that concluded in October 2021;
* award of the work to construct the Ebeye EOC building to Pacific International Inc. RMI (PII) in August 2022 with construction commencing in February 2023;
* PII starting structural work on the Ebeye EOC building in May 2023 with masonry walls, reinforced concrete, and roofing completed in November 2023. Door frames, dry wall framing, insulation of walls, insulation below roof and concrete ceilings, ceiling framing, pipes for stormwater drainage (connected to the city stormwater drainage) as well as installation of the water tank, water treatment plant and backup generator, and fuel storage tank were complete as of 31 March 2024. The reasons for the long lead-up to construction have been issues with procurement of materials, some of which are sourced from many countries including roofing plates from Korea which took time to arrive in RMI;
* dealing with delays in receipt of building materials and equipment. The UNDP Structural Engineer, KADA Engineer and MoWIU stated that material delays were mainly caused by sourcing materials and equipment from different countries that do not come in order of priority need; and manufacturers and suppliers who do not supply certain products to RMI due to lack of skills to install and maintain the specified product;
* 100% of the work has been completed as of 31 March 2024. A handover ceremony was held on 30 March 2024.
1. The Ebeye EOC building is to be hosted by the OCS and NDMO staff based in Ebeye and to be utilized by relevant groups, offices, and official visitors for efficient coordination of emergency responses in Kwajalein and neighbouring atolls. The keys to the EOC are to be held by the Chief Secretary as well as the landowners, traditional leaders, and mayor as representatives of the Kwajalein leadership. Estimated beneficiaries include 129 officials (66 men and 63 women) from OCS, Heads of Departments, Kwajalein Emergency Operation Center and Clusters, officials from Majuro including senators, and Minister in Assistant to the President, Project Steering Committee of the KAJUR, and Women’s Group and Kwajalein Disaster Focal Points as well as 32 men and 11 women that includes National Disaster Committee members and Cluster focal points[[21]](#footnote-22).
2. The Ebeye EOC has been setup to service 7 other atoll communities in partnership with local governments of those communities including the Kwajalein Airforce Base. Communication with these atoll communities is through Star Link internet through NTA. GoRMI are still seeking human resources to service all southern atoll communities.
3. There is to be a joint maintenance agreement between Kwajalein Atoll Local Government (KALGOV) and KADA. However, training for the operations of the Ebeye EOC was not done or programmed on the Project. Capacity assessments and preparation of SOPs still need to be done. While the World Bank are doing some of IT training, there are still no dedicated IT persons in Ebeye (as well as Majuro). UNDP has a ToR for the operations training to be submitted to NDMO and others to further support NDMO in terms of the management of EOC including an NWSO soft component required from Australian Weather Service.
4. *Activity 2.3 (Supply and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness)* involved:
* the Project requested a new activity with the US$1.9 million left over from the cancellation of Activity 2.1 involving the construction of the EOC in Majuro, for the supply and upgrade of critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness. This was approved by the GoJ in December 2022;
* procurement of furniture and fixtures for Majuro and Ebeye EOCs, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for the Majuro Water and Sewer Company (MWSC)[[22]](#footnote-23), water trucks for MWSC and Kwajalein Atoll Joint Utility Resources (KAJUR), and utility trucks for NDMO[[23]](#footnote-24);
* delivery of furniture and a pick-up truck for the Ebeye EOC in November 2023;
* the delivery and installation of MWSC backup generators in January 2024;
* delivery of MWSC water trucks in Majuro and Ebeye in March 2024. It was noted on the Ebeye water truck that some of the metal parts including bolts were not made of stainless steel. With the trucks having been in the corrosive salt spray environment for 2 months, the rusting process is advancing quickly;
* training being offered in the near future for the back-up generator from the supplier to MWSC and the electricity company of RMI.
1. In terms of this output described as “enhanced gender sensitive National and State Disaster Preparedness capacity”, there was no evidence of the Project undertaking any gender analysis with regards to the procurement of equipment or services in this Output. There also is no evidence of any efforts to promote gender sensitive capacity development through training strategies, curriculum, and instruction or to enhance the gender sensitiveness of the EOC systems. However, the GoRMI had its own gender equality initiatives for recruiting women in specific positions that includes a female as the Deputy Chief Secretary of OCS. Additionally, PII, the contractor for the Ebeye EOC, employed a woman for the important position of site engineer. This is further discussed in Paras 106-107.
2. In conclusion, the work by the Project in Output 2 to “enhance national and state disaster preparedness capacity that is better resourced to minimize loss of lives and damages” is rated as **satisfactory** based on available resources to complete the Ebeye EOC, and procure equipment and products to assist in emergency response and preparedness.

***Overall effectiveness rating***

1. Overall, the effectiveness of the RMI-EDCR Project has been ***satisfactory***, in consideration of overcoming the difficulties in getting direct results of building materials and equipment imported into RMI during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the end, the continuous support of UNDP and its partners to import these materials and equipment prevailed, though there were delays in delivery forcing the Project to obtain numerous extensions but partially achieving the outcome of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022: “By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened”. Partial achievement pertains to the “people and ecosystems in the Pacific being more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters” but not “environmental protection is strengthened”.
2. The updated outcome of this strategy is the Pacific Office’s MCPD 2023-2027: Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1: “By 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored”. One could also say that there was also partial achievement pertaining to the “people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts” but not “ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored”.
3. In the context of the Project’s specific gender results and its contributions, the Project can claim that the Project’s activities benefit people in all communities including women, children and disadvantaged groups. The additional equipment of chatty beetles, wave rider buoys, drones, PLBs, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC as well as the Ebeye EOC and water trucks and IT equipment for the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC, all serve to ensure appropriate and improved disaster preparedness and response communication and other equipment were provided to ensure for NDMO and line Ministries fully equipped and functional communication media from the NEOC in Majuro and the Ebeye EOC. Furthermore, additional equipment and the Ebeye EOC upgrades critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness for the entire population.
4. In conclusion:
* Output 1 has been partially achieved with strengthened disaster communication and climate monitoring systems, not tsunami monitoring systems, however, without gender sensitivities; and
* Output 2 has been partially achieved with enhanced national and regional disaster preparedness capacities that are better resourced to minimize loss of lives and damages, not including an NEOC in Majuro. The fully equipped Ebeye EOC as well as back-up generators for water and sewage pumps, water trucks, and computer and communications equipment for Majuro and Ebeye is a contribution to everyone (male and female) on Kwajalein and Majuro Atolls and surrounding atoll communities. This Output has been delivered without gender sensitivities.

## Efficiency

### Adaptive Management

1. Adaptive management is discussed in UNDP evaluations to gauge performance of Project personnel to adapt to changing regulatory and environmental conditions and unexpected situations encountered during the course of implementation, both common occurrences that afflict the majority of UNDP projects. Without adaptive management, donor investments into UNDP projects would not be effective in achieving their intended outcomes, outputs and targets.
2. Much of the adaptive management by the RMI-EDCR Project came from decisions from the Project Board, which appear to have functioned very well, allowing for adaptive management decisions to be made. However, due to the design flaw of an implementation period of one year (Para 33), several adaptive management decisions had to be made by the Project Board. This is covered in the following Paras.
3. The first adaptive management measure was cancelling Activity 1.3 in November 2019 due to the World Bank’s PREP II project activity of the supply and installation of HF/VHF radios for RMI, and diverting the funds to Activities 2.1 and 2.2. This also led to a request for a Project extension on 1 November 2019 to extend the Project from March 2020 to March 2021.
4. Secondly, the Project had to involve NWSO to act as a Responsible Party in February 2020 for the procurement and installation under Activity 1.1 or deployment of Chatty Beetles in partnership with Telecommunications and Social Informatics Program (TASI) under the University of Hawaii (UH) as mentioned in Para 53, 2nd bullet. UNDP was unable to have a direct contract with UH due to their not accepting UNDP General Terms and Conditions. NWSO had a similar arrangement with an Australian Government funded project. This led to an adjustment of the Project budget in February 2020 to accommodate the purchase of 2 wave rider buoys instead of 3.
5. Thirdly, adjustments had to be made to the Project schedule from March 2020 to March 2022 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This generated a number of adaptive management measures including:
* adjusting for delays in the delivery of chatty beetles and wave rider buoys (Paras 53-54). An LoA was signed between UNDP and NWSO in April 2020 to provide support for the procurement and installation of wave-rider buoys from PacIOOS with support from NOAA. An added measure to make the Project more efficient in accessing wave rider buoys from the TASI Program through NWSO as well as continued support for North Pacific countries in the area of meteorology, could be a blanket agreement between the NOAA and UNDP;
* adjusting for delays in the procurement of architectural and engineering services to the October 2020-April 2021 period for the design of the EOCs in Majuro and Ebeye (Para 64);
* a resulting request for another Project extension on 27 October 2020 to extend the Project from March 2021 to March 2022;
1. Fourthly, adaptive management measures had to be taken for the 1st construction tender of May 2021 where bidders for the construction of Majuro and Ebeye EOCs offered prices that were higher than the estimated cost (Para 65). This generated a request for value engineering on the EOC bids and for another Project tender held in May 2022; Cabinet made the decision to construct only the Ebeye EOC and to pursue additional funding for the Majuro EOC (Paras 66-67). This also generated another Project extension request on 15 December 2021 to extend the Project from March 2022 to March 2023.
2. Fifthly, an agreement was reached in December 2022 with the GoJ for additional procurement from savings of not constructing the Majuro EOC. This included furniture and fixtures, storage containers for the Majuro and Ebeye EOCs, a utility truck for the Ebeye EOC, back-up generators for Majuro Water and Sewer Company (MWSC), and water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR (Para 73).
3. A final adaptive management measure was managing delays in the Ebeye EOC construction related to the unavailability of specified materials. With materials and equipment sourced from several different countries, there were vendors who were reluctant to supply small quantities of materials. Furthermore, materials and equipment sourced from several countries do not come in order of priority need, and manufacturers and suppliers do not supply certain products to RMI due to lack of skills to install and maintain the specified product. Constant adaptive management was required as these issues were beyond the control of the contractor, constantly moving the timeline of completion.
4. In conclusion, UNDP’s efforts to adaptively manage this Project were sincere and ***satisfactory*** in consideration of the numerous difficulties to ensure enhanced community resilience in the RMI to disasters and climate change.
	* 1. **Project Finance**
5. The total GoJ budget allocation for the RMI-EDCR Project was originally US$7,400,000 that was to be disbursed over a one-year period, managed by a UNDP-PMU under the direction of the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji. Table 4 depicts disbursement levels up to 13 March 2024, 2 weeks prior to the actual terminal date of the Project of 31 March 2024, and Table 5 depicts disbursement levels according to ATLAS codes, revealing the following:
* there were numerous changes in expenditures of the Project. However, expenditures were not monitored to the Activity level. As such, expenditures were only monitored to the Output level;
* Output 1 expenditures were underspent by US$409,395 due to the purchase of 7 Chatty Beetles instead of a design quantity of 12 Chatty Beetles (14 Chatty Beetles were actually ordered with receipt of only 7);
* Output 2 was underspent by US$1.3 million due to the cancellation of the Majuro EOC construction. However, a significant portion of the Output 2 expenditure was the design work of the EOCs in addition to the construction of the Ebeye EOC;
* if the management activities are added to the General Management Support (8%), management costs of the RNI-EDCR Project were overspent by an amount of US$107,153 in large part due to all the changes in activities and the need to justify successive Project extensions from March 2020 to March 2024;
* there is still an unexplained US$1.6 million remaining in the GoJ budget. This is likely due to planned expenditures that could not be procured or completed by the Project’s Terminal date of 31 March 2024.
1. The Project has also demonstrated that appropriate financial controls are in place, notably through:
* Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs) and Project Budget Balance Report which shows the expenditure and commitments in the current year up to date (both as generated under Quantum);
* manual monitoring of Project activities and expenditures against budget lines to attain an in-depth understanding of the financial progress and the pending commitments.

**Table 4: Government of Japan Project Budget and Expenditures for the RMI-RMI-EDCR Project (in USD as of 13 March 2024)**

| **Outputs** | **Resource Allocation (from ProDoc)** | **2019[[24]](#footnote-25)** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024[[25]](#footnote-26)** | **Total disbursed** | **Total Remaining** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1: Strengthened Disaster Communication and Climate and Inundation Monitoring Systems**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1.1: Install inundation and tsunami and multi-hazard warning redundancy and climate data conduit through Chatty Beetles in 9 locations with 3 spares | 42,000 | 46,736 | 238,388 | 53,331 | 9,928 | 421,328 | 23,227  | 792,938 | 409,395 |
| Activity 1.2: Provide 3 Wave-Riders to that will support wave modelling and Realtime inundation forecasting and warning for coastal communities  | 275,000 |
| Activity 1.3: Link the Northern Meteorological Offices with HF radio as per Pacific Island Communication and Infrastructure (PICI) Panel Workplan 2019 | 5,000 |
| Activity 1.4: Provide appropriate and improved disaster preparedness and response communication and other equipment to GOB/EOC to ensure …... | 880,333 |
| **Output 2: Enhanced National and State Disaster Responders readiness capacity & better resourced to minimise loss of lives and damages**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 2.1: Construct the GOB/EOC in Majuro that meets disaster preparedness, international and functional standards | 3,500,000 | 90,878 | 315,753 | 333,618 | 132,266 | 2,130,984 |  903,070 | 3,906,569 | 1,304,483 |
| Activity 2.2: Support construction of one GOB/EOC in Ebeye including feasibility option…... and finalize construction subject to availability of funds…. | 1,711,052 |
| Activity 2.3: Supply and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness | 0 |
| Management activities | 438,468 | 387,301 | 306,733 | 209,660 | 41,283 | 95,508 | 53,283 | 1,093,768 | -655,300 |
| General management support (8%) | 548,147 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 0 | 548,147 |
| Total (Actual) | **7,400,000** | **524,915** | **860,874** | **596,609** | **183,477** | **2,647,820** | **979,580** | **5,793,275** | **1,606,725** |

**Table 5: Expenditures by ATLAS Code**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ATLAS Code** | **Expenditure Description** | **Spent to 13 March 2024 (US$)** |
| 61000  | International Staff Salary  | 197,659  |
| 71200  | International Consultants  | 112,303  |
| 71300  | Local Consultants  | 30,972  |
| 71400  | Contractual Services - Individuals  | 417,100  |
| 71500  | UN Volunteers  | 160,457  |
| 71600  | Travel  | 290,558  |
| 71800  | Contractual Services-Individual Impl. Partner  | 0  |
| 72200  | Equipment and Furniture  | 924,268  |
| 72300  | Materials & Goods  | 123,858  |
| 72400  | Communications and Audio Visual Equipment  | 35,490  |
| 72600  | Micro Capital Grants – Credit   | 0  |
| 73200  | Premises Alterations  | 0  |
| 73400  | Rental and maintenance of other office equipment  | 2,027  |
| 74200  | Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs  | 1,273  |
| 74500  | Miscellaneous Expenses  | 17,640  |
| 74700  | Contingency  | 243,478  |
| 76100  | Realized loss  | 85.74  |
| 75100  | Facilities and Administration  | 459,823  |
| 75700  | Training, Workshops and Conference  | 37,049  |
| 72100a  | Contractual Services - Companies / Nat  | 2,335,086 |
| 72100b  | Contractual Services - Companies / Int  | 0  |
| 72800  | Information Technology Equipment  | 0  |
| 64397  | Services to projects -CO staff  | 75,803  |
| 77300  | International Staff - TA  | 308,755  |
| 72500  | Supplies  | 36,374  |
| 73100  | Rental & Maintenance-Premises  | 69,829  |
| 74100  | Professional Services   | 7,210  |
| **Total**  |   | **$5,887,096**  |

1. Notwithstanding delays in procurement and execution of works until after 2021, the cost efficiencies of the RMI-EDCR Project has been **satisfactory** in consideration of the excellent results achieved in the facilitation of disaster and climate resilience initiatives taken, the capacity building of the stakeholders involved, and the lower costs associated with UNDP works.

### Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design at Entry and Implementation

1. The Project Document does provide for an M&E design in Section VII (pg 17 in the ProDoc) that is tied to the RF in terms of timing of the achievement of targets. The design follows UNDP’s programming policies and procedures of M&E designs, and details the monitoring plan (from tracking Project results to Project quality assurances to Project review) and the evaluation plan of the Project. However, there was no budget for monitoring activities implying that the M&E activities would be done under management activities of the RMI-EDCR Project. In addition, monthly reports were to be provided to the GoJ and GoRMI. As such, the M&E design is rated as***satisfactory.***
2. In terms of M&E plan implementation, the Evaluator had access to annual progress reports for 2019 to 2023, quarterly progress reports (Q4 2019 to Q3 2023), and minutes to the Project Board meetings, which were all informative in terms of the progress made on various initiatives and actions taken by the Project. Minutes to the Project Board meetings were especially informative, providing insights into the adaptive management decisions being made throughout the course of Project implementation including changes being made to the RF and RRF. All progress reports provided details and reports on the targets to be achieved. As such, M&E plan implementation is rated as***satisfactory***.
3. Ratings according to the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation system[[26]](#footnote-27) are as follows:
* *M&E design at entry – 5;*
* *M&E plan implementation – 5;*
* *Overall quality of M&E – 5.*

### Social and Environmental Safeguards

1. An SESP was available for this Project on pg. 38 of the ProDoc. Specifically, the SESP responds to the community needs for health and food security through better climate services in these sectors. The Project was also to contribute to building national and regional gender mainstreaming capacities to analyze and integrate gender-sensitive data into disaster recovery capacity building, policy, and planning, and to promote gender sensitive capacity development and training strategy, curriculum, and instruction, as well as female participation in the geo-sciences. Finally, increased capacity of regional and national meteorological services was to produce and disseminate user-relevant information on climate risks, a key to informed decision-making and environmental sustainability. The Project was to address environment development linkages, and address adaptation and environmental dimension of recovery.
2. None of these issues were addressed since the PMU and the Project Board had focused their efforts on procurement of equipment and services for the Project. The Project was unable to address the impacts of that procurement.

### Overall efficiency rating

1. The majority of works of the RMI-EDCR Project did not occur until after 2020, mainly due to delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, there were other inefficiencies that caused delays. One of these inefficiencies was the absence of a budget for architectural and engineering services for the design for the EOCs. The budget re-allocation for the A&E work resulted in less funds for EOC construction in Majuro and Ebeye, as well as little to no allocation for soft activities and equipment purchases, as early as October 2019. Secondly, the design implementation period for this Project was 12 months, setting up a situation where there is going to be failure from an implementation period perspective. A strong Project management structure and an adequate M&E system (through Project Board meetings) ensured good quality assurance at Project output levels. Overall staffing of Project plans, coordination and implementation was satisfactory between UNDP and members of the Project Board. However, the Project spent significant efforts to justify Project extensions from March 2020 to March 2024.
2. There were also inefficiencies with respect to the approach of EOC works where the A&E works were separated from the construction work. By executing a “design-build” modality, the Project could have saved a lot of time and effort in the construction of the Ebeye EOC. Through design-build:
* the tendering of construction work would have been delegated to the design-build contractor;
* materials would have likely been sourced from convenient locations so as not to disrupt the flow of construction works of the design-build firm;
* involvement of UNDP and its partners in supervising the works would have been minimal with all detailed work assigned to the design-build contractor; and
* the overall outcome would have likely been a shorter construction period for the Ebeye EOC.
1. There were also efficiency issues with the Chatty Beetle and wave rider procurements due to UH not accepting UNDP’s General Rules and Conditions, having to formulate new agreements between UNDP and NWSO as well as NWSO and TASI, and performing a HACT assessment on NWSO. The HACT assessments took longer since UNDP wanted to use a preferred vendor, KPMG, instead of a local Ernst and Young consultant. This caused a wait of 4 weeks to have KPMG fly into RMI for the assignment instead of deploying a local Ernst & Young consultant.
2. Overall, the RMI-EDCR Project provided value for money. However, the resources were not deployed efficiently, leading to an overall efficiency rating of the Project as ***moderately unsatisfactory***.

## Overall Project Outcome

1. The RMI-EDCR Project has been able to:
* strengthen disaster communication and climate monitoring systems by equipping outer islands with Chatty Beetles for reliable communications with EOCs;
* enhance disaster preparedness at the national level through the provision of wave rider buoys to NWSO that will provide improved warnings to extreme inundation events;
* improve disaster preparedness on the main islands of Majuro and Ebeye through the provision of drones, PLBs, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC, water trucks for the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC;
* build capacities of NDMO and line Ministries for improved disaster preparedness through the setup of IT equipment and response communication equipment at the NEOC in Majuro and the Ebeye EOC. The Ebeye EOC ensures NDMO and line Ministries provides a secure place to convene even after an inundation or typhoon disaster; and
* provide communication to all stakeholders through UNDP press releases, UNDP Facebook and Twitter accounts, and the Island Times web and print media.
1. Despite the Project not delivering gender sensitive communication systems and disaster preparedness capacity, delivery of intended Project outputs and activities has been ***satisfactory***.

## Sustainability of Project Outcomes

1. In assessing sustainability of the RMI-EDCR Project, the Evaluator asked “how likely will the Project outcomes be sustained beyond Project termination?” Sustainability of RMI-EDCR’s outcomes was evaluated in the dimensions of financial resources, socio-political risks, institutional framework and governance, and environmental factors, using a simple ranking scheme:
* *4 = Likely (L):* negligible risks to sustainability;
* *3 = Moderately Likely (ML):* moderate risks to sustainability;
* *2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU):* significant risks to sustainability; and
* *1 = Unlikely (U):* severe risks to sustainability; and
* *U/A = unable to assess*.

The overall rating given is equivalent to the lowest sustainability ranking score of the 4 dimensions*.* Details of sustainability ratings for RMI-EDCR Project are provided on Table 6.

1. *The overall RMI-EDCR Project sustainability rating is moderately unlikely (MU).* This is primarily due to:

the manufacture and supply of more Chatty Beetles currently being a problem due to the supplier being unable to manufacture additional Chatty Beetles;

lack of financing commitment by any donor for the Majuro EOC and enhancing capacity of the national emergency management.

## Country Ownership

1. Country ownership of the RMI-EDCR Project to improve its capacity for preparedness and mitigation to geo-physical and climate related hazards and enhancing resilience to climate change impact is demonstrated through its own commitment DRM NAP of 2008-2018, the 2014 – 2018 (JNAP), the 2017 – 2019 NDMP, and the NCCPF mentioned in Para 40.

## Gender equality and women’s empowerment

1. Gender equality and the empowerment of women has not been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the Project due to much of Project efforts over procurement of equipment and services to construct the Ebeye EOC and improve disaster communication and climate monitoring systems. Procurement of Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys and equipment and material purchases for the NEOC in Majuro and EOC in Ebeye and the construction of the Ebeye EOC, were designed to enhance protection of entire communities, male and female. For the communities of Wotto and Lae Atolls that received Chatty Beetles, beneficiaries were gender disaggregated with no further analysis of gender. For the upgrading of NDMO equipment and construction of the Ebeye EOC and improved disaster preparedness in water sector, beneficiaries were also gender disaggregated but with no further analysis of gender. This included the entire communities of Majuro Atoll and Kwajalein Atoll (Ebeye Island).

| **Table 6: Assessment of Sustainability of RMI-EDCR Outputs** |
| --- |
| **Actual Outputs** **(as of March 2024)** | **Assessment of Sustainability** | **Dimensions of Sustainability** |
| **Actual Output 1**: Disaster communications and climate and inundation monitoring systems have been strengthened to an extent that 7 Chatty Beetles have been delivered to the RMI with only 2 deployed in outer Wotto and Lae Atolls, one wave rider buoy has been replaced in Majuro with another buoy still to be installed, and procurement of computer systems and equipment that provide improved disaster preparedness and response communication and ensures a more functional EOC that links communication media used by main MMI ministries.  | * *Financial Resources:* Financing for more Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys does not appear to be an issue. There is currently a GCF project financing weather stations on all 24 outer islands of the RMI. However, there are currently no O&M budgets for all equipment procured including back-up generators for water and sewage pumps, drones, water trucks, utility trucks, and communication equipment;
* *Socio-Political Risks*: A total of 14 Chatty Beetles was ordered with the receipt of only 7. Manufacture and supply of more Chatty Beetles is currently a problem due to the supplier being unable to manufacture additional Chatty Beetles. Though this activity did not contribute to greater gender equality amongst beneficiary communities, the use of Chatty Beetles and other communications equipment will be used by communities for DRM and climate resilience;
* *Institutional Framework and Governance:* GoRMI have been extremely supportive of the DRM work done by the Project on Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys, computer systems and equipment that provide improved disaster preparedness and response communication. They are prepared to take on additional work to further enhance communications and data collection for DRM and climate resilience;
* *Environmental Factors:* No environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of Output.

***Overall Rating*** | 3244**2** |
| **Actual Output 2:** There has been enhanced National and island disaster preparedness capacity that is better resourced to minimize loss of lives and damages. This includes the completion of the Ebeye EOC that allows NDMO and line ministries to convene and respond to climate and inundation disasters, and the delivery of emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR, and utility trucks for NDMO. | * *Financial Resources:* With insufficient financing for both the Majuro and Ebeye EOCs, there have been ongoing discussions with GoJ and the US Embassy to fund the Majuro EOC. There currently is no commitment by any donor for the Majuro EOC and efforts to improve and enhance the capacity of the national government (Majuro NEOC) to respond to natural disaster and inundation emergencies;
* *Socio-Political Risks*: No socio-political risks foreseen with the Ebeye EOC, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR, and utility trucks for NDMO. The only risk will be the rusting of the trucks due to certain components not being stainless steel, and the salty corrosive environment of Ebeye Island. Though this output did not contribute to greater gender equality amongst beneficiary communities, the EOC and emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps, water trucks, and utility trucks will be used by Majuro and Kwajalein Atoll communities for during inundation and extreme climate events;
* *Institutional Framework and Governance:* GoRMI has been very supportive of the Ebeye EOC construction and completion. This will enhance GoRMI’s ability to cope with inundation and climate extreme events in Kwajalein Atoll. They are prepared to take on additional work for the Majuro NEOC. However, the sustainability plan for the Ebeye EOC building developed by MoWIU needs to be implemented;
* *Environmental Factors:* No environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of Output.

***Overall Rating*** | 2334**2** |
|  | ***Overall Rating of Project Sustainability:*** | **2** |

1. Though this was mentioned in the Project’s SESP, there was no evidence of reporting on Project contributions to building national and regional gender mainstreaming capacities to analyze and integrate gender-sensitive data into disaster recovery capacity building, policy, and planning. There also is no evidence of any effort to promote gender sensitive capacity development and training strategies, curriculum, and instruction as well as increasing female participation in the geo-sciences.
2. Though indicators of the outputs were informed by gender equality, there is no evidence of the Project making any specific efforts on gender equality; rather, the GoRMI had its own gender equality initiatives by recruiting women in specific positions and regarding them as equals including the Deputy Chief Secretary for the Ebeye OCS. Additionally, PII, the contractor for the Ebeye EOC employed a woman for the important position of site engineer. There was no specialist recruited to manage gender issues on this Project, counter to what was mentioned in Para 34.

## Cross cutting issues

1. For cross-cutting issues, the Project has made contributions to SDG 1 (No poverty), SDG 2 (No hunger), SGD 5 (Gender Equality), SDG 6 (Clean water and sanitation), and SDG 13 (Climate Action). To a large extent, men and women who are poor, physically challenged, youth and belonging to other disadvantaged and marginalized groups, all benefit from the Project work in RMI implemented by UNDP.
2. The Project design was responsive to gender equality and social inclusion to reduce vulnerability of minority or socially excluded groups such as women and girls, persons with disability and ethnic minorities. However, the target of 40% women’s participation in Project activities was questioned during the 1st Board meeting where 50% was suggested but was not accepted due to the indicator being derived as a progressive percentage from a baseline. The gender targets set on this Project were also higher than in other countries considering the actual level of women’s participation. There is no evidence of gender targets being met on this Project.
3. Opinions of disaster management and climate resilience appeared to be strong in the RMI. As a baseline, the RMI government staff and relevant stakeholders, notably NDMO, appeared to have mainstreamed DRM issues. The EOC infrastructure and equipment is for the benefit all Marshallese especially for those in Majuro and Ebeye as well as the remote island communities. In addition, there was communication with all stakeholders on platforms such as UNDP in the Pacific press releases, Facebook and Twitter accounts, and the Marshall Islands Journal web and print media that was informative on the launching of the Project, Project status, groundbreaking of the Ebeye EOC, drone training, and the hand-over ceremony for the back-up generators. With stronger communications on various platforms, the opinions of DRM are trending positively.

## Catalytic/Replication Effect

1. The catalytic and replication effects are mainly found in institutional stakeholders wanting additional funding for the NEOC in Majuro and additional back-up generators for water and sewage systems, and additional solar PV systems for schools and government buildings to serve as emergency backup power. To a large extent, the disaster and climate resilience infrastructure and equipment of the Majuro EOC is a long-term fix for DRM and CCA, minimizing catalytic and replication effects.

## Progress to impact

1. Before the RMI-EDCR Project, there was a clear vision on how to deal disasters and extreme climate events but with a paucity of funds to implement. The impact of the Project on RMI’s resilience to extreme climate and inundation events has been:
* an enhanced system to strengthen communications of 7 more remote island communities consisting of Chatty Beetles to provide secure and confidential communication with NDMO. Chatty Beetles have been deployed to Wotto and Lae Atoll communities thus far;
* a more robust system of monitoring wave inundation and other extreme events through wave rider buoys that will monitor northern and southern swells. A wave rider buoy was replaced at Majuro and another wave rider buoy has been supplied and will be installed near Kwajalein to monitor northern swells;
* GoRMI having a place to convene during disaster events at the Ebeye EOC complete with emergency back-up power and water supply;
* GoRMI having upgraded critical infrastructure and equipment at its NEOC in Majuro and EOC in Ebeye for emergency response and preparedness. This includes furniture and fixtures for Majuro and Ebeye EOCs, emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR, and utility trucks for NDMO;
* improved communication between stakeholders and GoRMI on all developments related to the enhancement of national and state disaster preparedness and community disaster and climate resilience.
1. Despite the successes of the Project, the impact of the RMI-EDCR Project was nearly sidelined by the COVID-19 pandemic. Though the risks related to the COVID-19 pandemic affected the progress of the Project, notably pricing change of equipment and services and delays related to the importation of equipment and services, the Project managed to deliver most of the intended outputs overcoming the aforementioned challenges.
2. The impact of the Project has clearly been more confidence of GoRMI institutions in managing disaster preparedness and climate resilience solutions. This includes the OCS, NDMO, NWSO, MoWIU, MWSC, KAJUR, KADA and communities of some of the outer and lagoon islands, who have demonstrated Project involvement and are all aligned to existing priorities of the national government (DRM NAP of 2008-2018, JNAP 2014 – 2018, the 2017 – 2019 NDMP, and the NCCPF). Notably, NDMO with the Ebeye EOC has more confidence to promote activities for improved preparedness of local governments (i.e. issuance of promotional materials, setting up disaster committees, and conducting drills) to respond to natural or human-induced disasters during “peace times” and during “disasters” when local governments are unable to respond and NDMO leads in the coordination of all relief efforts.
3. However, Project activities did not impact the gender sensitivities of the installed systems. Project management activities were mostly focused on adaptive management measures to ensure delivery of the intended outputs. Strong compliance to the gender policies of the GoRMI for recruiting women in specific positions mitigated this Project shortcoming.

# findings, main conclusions, recommendations and lessons

## Findings

1. The EDCR Project design was reportedly hastily prepared during a 2-week period in February 2019 that included a one-year implementation period, and did not include funds for the services of an international engineering firm to prepare the design and tenders for the EOCs (Para 33). Implementation of the Project proceeded with:
* the procurement of only 7 chatty beetles out of which only 2 were dispatched to Wotto and Lae Atolls in December 2023 (Para 51);
* procurement of 2 wave rider buoys, one of which was deployed east of Majuro in August 2022, and the second buoy to be deployed on Kwajalein after USAGKA clearance (Para 54);
* computers equipment, aerial and submersible drones, Personal Locator Beacons (PLB), and phones were starting delivered to the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC in October-December 2023 (Para 57);
* the Ebeye EOC was constructed at a cost of US$1.967 million. Work started on the Ebeye EOC building in May 2023 with several delays in receiving building materials and equipment. The EOC was completed on 30 March 2024 with a handover ceremony (Paras 66-67 and 69-70);
* due to the high cost of US$4.497 million of constructing an EOC in Majuro, the surplus funds were used for the supply and upgrade of critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness procurement of furniture and fixtures for Majuro and Ebeye EOCs, including emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps for the MWSC, water trucks for MWSC and KAJUR, and utility trucks (Para 73);
* no evidence of the Project undertaking any gender analysis or any efforts to promote gender sensitive capacity development of the EOC systems. However, the GoRMI had its own gender equality initiatives for recruiting women in specific positions that included a female as the Deputy Chief Secretary of OCS (Para 74).
1. *Relevance*: The RMI-EDCR Project is relevant to its design with activities being appropriate towards the achievement of the Project objective and the Outputs, and relevant to strengthening DRM and climate resilience as identified in the RToC and RRF, addressing major gaps in DRM and climate resilience with other gaps being filled in by other donors (Para 33). The design also did not include a gender analysis at a national level nor did it identify any concrete efforts related to specific needs of women and men or acknowledging their different roles (Para 34).
2. *Effectiveness in Project implementation*: The effectiveness of the RMI-EDCR Project has been satisfactory in overcoming implementation difficulties complicated by the COVID-19 pandemic but with continuous support of UNDP and its partners to get imports of building materials and equipment for the Ebeye EOC into RMI during the pandemic (Para 76). In the end, the Project partially achieved the outcome of the Pacific Office’s MCPD 2023-2027: Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1: “By 2027, people, communities and institutions are more empowered and resilient to face diverse shocks and stresses, especially related to climate variability impacts and ecosystems and biodiversity are better protected, managed and restored” (Para 77).
3. *Efficiency in Project implementation*: There were several inefficiencies on the Project including the absence of a budget for architectural and engineering services for the design for the EOCs. With the design implementation period for this Project being 12 months, a situation was setup where there was going to be failure from an implementation period perspective (Para 97). In addition, executing a “design-build” modality for the construction of the Ebeye EOC could have possibly resulted could have resulted in a lot of reduced time and effort by the PMU (Para 98). Finally, the Project was unable to expend US$1.6 million due to planned expenditures that could not be procured or completed by the Project’s Terminal date of 31 March 2024.
4. *Impact*: The Project had an impact on RMI’s resilience to extreme climate and inundation events through a series of interventions detailed in Para 127. This has translated into a clear impact of additional confidence of GoRMI institutions in managing disaster preparedness and climate resilience solutions. This is notable with NDMO having more confidence to promote activities for improved preparedness of local governments with the completion of the Ebeye EOC (Para 115). However, Project activities did not impact the gender sensitivities of the installed systems as most Project management activities were focused on adaptive management measures to ensure delivery of the intended outputs (Para 116).
5. *Coherence*: An RToC corrects the deficiency of some of the “solution pathways” that were not implemented by this Project, and conforming to a Revised Results Framework (RRF) of the Project up to December 2022 and shown in Appendix F. However, the Project is coherent in an overall manner, aligning well with key drivers identified in managing disaster risks in the Pacific, notably UNDP's MCPD 2023-2027 with the Cooperation Framework Outcome involving UNDP #1 (Para 43).
6. *Sustainability*: The RMI-EDCR Project sustainability rating is moderately unlikely, notably due to supplier problems of being unable to manufacture additional Chatty Beetles, and the lack of financing commitment by any donor for the Majuro EOC and enhancing capacity of the national emergency management (Para 104).

## Conclusions

1. Poor design of the RMI-EDCR Project caused Project implementation to be extended from one year to 5 years where most of the Project activities involved the Ebeye EOC construction. The poor design was characterized by the Project not including funds for the services of an international engineering firm to prepare the design and tenders for the EOCs, reducing the available budget for EOC construction. This was exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic which raised the prices of construction materials and equipment, and narrowing the number of contractors willing to bid on the EOC construction work. This had the impact of the Project only being able to construct one EOC in Ebeye as opposed to the plan to build 2 EOCs.
2. Other Project activities involved the procurement of Chatty Beetles, wave rider buoys, and other equipment to improve and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for disaster preparedness using US$1.9 million in excess funds left over from the cancelled Majuro EOC construction. Procurement of the Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys was complicated by inability of UNDP and UH’s TASI program to come to an agreement on UNDP General Rules and Conditions resulting in separate agreements between NWSO and UNDP and NWSO and the TASI program. This caused delays until October 2023 and May 2021 for the Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys respectively. Deployment of the 6 additional Chatty Beetles and wave rider buoys is needed to accommodate a higher flood risk profile for RMI (Paras 53-55).
3. Despite the Project rating on efficiency being rated as moderately unsatisfactory due mainly to the majority of works not occurring until after 2020 caused by the COVID-19 pandemic (Paras 97-100), the Ebeye EOC was completed, and equipment was upgraded for critical infrastructure, all vastly improving disaster preparedness for the RMI. With all the adaptive management that took place on the Project (Paras 80-88), the rating of the Project for effectiveness was raised to satisfactory.
4. The RMI-EDCR Project had an impact on RMI’s resilience to extreme climate and inundation events through an enhanced system to strengthen communications of 7 more remote island communities, a more robust system of monitoring wave inundation and other extreme events through wave rider buoys to monitor northern and southern swells, GoRMI having the Ebeye EOC as a place to convene during disaster events, and GoRMI having upgraded critical infrastructure and equipment at its NEOC in Majuro and EOC in Ebeye for emergency response and preparedness. The impact of the RMI-EDCR Project has clearly increased the confidence of GoRMI institutions in managing disaster preparedness and climate resilience solutions (Paras 113-115). However, there needs to be a continued search for funds for a Majuro NEOC and the EOC facility at Ebeye to further improve and sustain the capacity of the national government to respond to natural disaster and inundation emergencies (Table 6, Actual Output 2). A listing of the major items procured during the Project is provided on Table 7.
5. Gender equality and the empowerment of women has not been adequately addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the Project due to the Project being mainly concerned over procurement of equipment and services to construct the Ebeye EOC. Though the Project did not make any impacts on gender equality, it was observed that GoRMI had its own gender equality initiatives by recruiting women in specific positions and regarding them as equals including the Deputy Chief Secretary for the Ebeye OCS. Additionally, PII, the contractor for the Ebeye EOC employed a woman for the important position of site engineer (Paras 106-107). There is a perception that further efforts to address gender equality and the empowerment of women on any future projects in RMI are not likely to gain any traction due to GoRMI’s strong gender policies.
6. The overall RMI-EDCR Project sustainability was rated as moderately unlikely (MU) mainly due to the supplier being unable to manufacture additional Chatty Beetles, and lack of financing commitment by any donor for the Majuro EOC. To a large extent, the disaster and climate resilience infrastructure and equipment of the Majuro EOC is a long-term fix for DRM and CCA, minimizing catalytic and replication effects (Paras 104 and 112, Table 6). To this point, the RMI-EDCR Project has only partially achieved its intended objective of “effectively addressing the consequences of, and responses to, geo-physical and climate-related hazards to protect lives, sustain livelihoods”, and “improving the capacity for preparedness and mitigation of the RMI to geo-physical and climate related hazards and enhancing resilience to climate change impact”, but not to “preserve the environment and safeguard the economy”.

**Table 7: Major items procured during the RMI-EDCR Project**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Procurement Item** | **Quantity** | **Remarks** |
| Chatty Beetles | 7 | From Activity 1.1. Delivered to NWSO in October 2023. There still needs to be 6 more Chatty Beetles procured for other islands and atolls |
| Wave rider buoys | 2 | From Activity 1.2. Delivered October 2021 and October 2022. Project was considering procuring a 3rd wave rider buoy. However, there was insufficient time to purchase before the Project completion date of 31 March 2024 |
| Computer equipment including computers, monitors, network switches, servers, firewalls, security and operating system software programs, printers | 1 | From Activity 1.4. Computer equipment delivered to the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC from July 2022 to December 2023  |
| Aerial and submersible drones | 6 | From Activity 1.4. Delivered to the Majuro NEOC and Ebeye EOC in October 2023.  |
| Ebeye EOC including water tank, water treatment plant, backup generator, fuel storage tank, air conditioners and building materials. | 1 | From Activity 2.2. Delivered to KALGOV and KADA on 31 March 2024 |
| Emergency back-up generators for water and sewage pumps | 2 | From Activity 2.3. Delivered to MWSC in January 2024 |
| Furniture for Ebeye EOC | 1 | From Activity 2.3. Delivered to Ebeye EOC in November 2023 |
| Water trucks | 2 | From Activity 2.3. Delivery of MWSC in Majuro and Ebeye in March 2024 |
| Pick-up truck | 1 | From Activity 2.3. Delivered to Ebeye EOC in November 2023 |

## Recommendations

1. With long-term infrastructure and equipment being supplied by the Project, a few recommendations are made on the basis of the lessons learned during implementation of the RMI-EDCR Project, and in the spirit of improving ongoing future delivery of other projects in RMI.

|  | **Recommendation** | **Entity Responsible** | **Time Frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 1:** |  |  |
|  | *Continue with efforts to enhance capacity of the national emergency management*. This should involve:* a continued search for funds for a Majuro NEOC to improve the capacity of the national government to respond to natural disaster and inundation emergencies. This should be tied to emergency operations and coordination of all the leads with the Red Cross, NWSO, and IOM clusters;
* an emphasis on building and sustaining capacity to operate EOC facilities at Ebeye and Majuro to further improve the emergency communication network, enhance the capacity of emergency management to collect and analyze information during emergency responses, raise community awareness and participation, and collaborate with ongoing initiatives with other government institutions and development partners (Para 127).
 | Government of RMI  | Immediate |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 2:** |  |  |
|  | *Considerations should be made for a “design-build” modality where sourcing of building materials and equipment come from one source*. Despite the COVID-19 pandemic significantly increasing the cost of goods and services globally, consideration needs to be given to a design-build modality for the Majuro EOC (see Para 120). The Pohnpei EOC was built at a lower cost than Ebeye EOC through a design-build modality. Rather than having separate contracts for designing the EOC and constructing the EOC, one contractor overseeing the design and construction of the EOC should be given serious consideration for the following reasons:* the standards to be deployed on an EOC would have been decided by the design-build team, probably under the standards of the country where the EOC is being designed;
* the design firm would then be responsible for constructing the EOC within specifications. It would do so to its own convenience, sourcing materials from convenient locations so as not to disrupt the supply of building materials and equipment for the EOC. The DCS Majuro said that local RMI construction firms were used to sourcing materials from the United States given their proximity and business ties to Hawaii;
* completion of the EOC would fall under the responsibility of the design-build contractor, minimizing the time spent by UNDP inspecting and supervising its construction to completion;
* hiring a RMI firm to design-build the EOC would have further advantages of the firm understanding the complexities of working in RMI and the associated difficulties in shipping of building materials and equipment;
* the net result of a design-build modality would certainly have been more efficient delivery of the EOC, and the possibility of an overall lower cost to design and build.
 | Government of RMI and UNDP  | Medium Term |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 3:** |  |  |
|  | *Implement and monitor sustainability plan for the Ebeye EOC building*. MoWIU has developed a sustainability plan for EOC buildings prior to the construction work. This plan needs to be implemented and closely monitored by OCS, MoWIU and KADA (Table 6, Actual Output 2).  | Government of RMI  | Immediate |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 4:** |  |  |
|  | *Setup a budget for the operation and maintenance of equipment procured.* To optimize the sustainability of the Majuro NEOC, Ebeye EOC and associated equipment, MWSC and KAJUR need to secure budgets for the operation and maintenance of back-up generators for water and sewage pumps, drones, water trucks, utility trucks, and computer and communication equipment (Table 6, Actual Output 1). | Government of RMI  | Immediate |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 5:** |  |  |
|  | *Complete deployment of wave rider buoys and Chatty Beetles*. Although the Project supplied 2 wave rider buoys to NWSO in 2022, NWSO did not complete deployment of a second buoy. Since NWSO continuously works with PacIOOS to complete buoy deployment to obtain real-time data of ocean conditions, NWSO needs to continue to work with TASI to complete wave rider buoy installation near Kwajalein Atoll (Para 54, 7th and 8th bullets) to accommodate the higher flood risk profile of RMI (Para 55). NWSO also needs to deliver 5 Chatty Beetles to the remaining 5 atolls, and find another Chatty Beetle supplier for the other 7 atolls (Para 53, 5th bullet).  | Government of RMI  | Short Term |
| 1.
 | **Recommendation 6:** |  |  |
|  | *Seek partnership agreement between the UNDP and NOAA for the smooth implementation of activities to support NWSO*. The NSWO is part of the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) under the Compacts of Free Association for RMI, which has an agreement with the UH. UH under its TASI program has the technical capacity to deploy wave rider buoys and is responsible for monitoring ocean data. The activity of deploying wave rider buoys took time to initiate as the Project was not able to conclude an agreement directly with the UH due to legal issues from both parties. The Project concluded an LoA with NWSO instead who channelled the funds to UH. It is recommended to explore a blanket agreement with the NOAA if the UNDP continues supporting North Pacific countries in the area of meteorology (Para 84, 1st bullet).  | UNDP | Medium Term |

## Lessons learned

1. *Lesson #1:* *The hasty preparation of the EDCR design caused considerable delays and changes to the partial completion of the Project*. The hasty Project preparation caused the original ProDoc to include two civil works projects, the Majuro EOC and Ebeye EOC without a detailed design phase, tender phase, conducting tender process or confirmation of land usage available at the time of the Project initiation. As such, it was unrealistic to complete the activities within a one-year period, considering the time required for detailed design, tender phase (including documentation with market research and conducting tender process), confirmation of land usage, shipping of materials and equipment and actual construction. However, knowing this Project was funded by GoJ using their supplementary budget, Project duration was set as one year due to the nature of that fund. Regardless, identification of Project inputs could have been more realistic during the formulation stage to overcome the management difficulties of a one-year Project duration.
2. *Lesson #2: A design-build approach could have possibly reduced Project delays on EOC construction*. It is definitely strange that firms such as Przym Consulting out of Hawaii who have numerous project in RMI, did not bid on the design of the EOCs. Instead, an Australian firm, JSC, was selected for the work. While the international standard was promoted by UNDP for the EOC building construction, the Project agreed with the Australian firm to use Australian standards for the EOC designs. However, UNDP had to select a construction contractor to build the EOC where sourcing of most of the building materials and products had to come from various countries to comply with Australian standards. This issue had been made more complex with the COVID-19 pandemic which caused the prices of several services and products to increase from several countries. In addition, several delays in EOC construction resulted since the materials and equipment were not delivered in any order of priority, but delivered according to the supplier schedules for delivery.
3. *Lesson #3: Lesson learned: The structure and conduct of UNDP management of DRM projects in RMI, FSM and Palau was important for strong coordination with other UNDP projects and development partners to optimize efficiency of RMI-EDCR Project activity and increased synergy*. In addition to the RMI-EDCR Project, UNDP has implemented similar projects to enhance disaster and climate resilience in the Republic of Palau and the Federated States of Micronesia. The same Project Management Unit serviced the 3 EDCR projects. Lessons learned were shared amongst these countries for efficient implementation including close collaboration with other development partners. This Project’s close coordination with the World Bank and IOM was beneficial to the PMU and the GoRMI to increase synergy in the area of DRM and emergency communications. In addition, the Project Board with all key GoRMI and GoJ stakeholders played a key role in the adaptive management of the RMI-EDCR Project. The Project Board discussed at length and in detail, the steps necessary to optimize Project performance in overcoming the challenges and delays in implementing the Ebeye EOC construction and procurement delays in the Chatty Beetles and other DRM equipment. Without frequent Project Board meetings with GoRMI and GoJ stakeholders and UNDP, the Project would have suffered from further delays in procurement and implementation. Leaving this work to a design-building company would have saved UNDP and the RMI Ministry of Works, Infrastructure & Utilities a lot of coordination work.
4. *Lesson #4: Third party agreements make follow-up for UNDP difficult*. An example of this was UNDP making an agreement with NWSO to access procurement of Chatty Beetles from the UH’s TASI program. UNDP’s requests for follow-up on various issues related to Chatty Beetle equipment was difficult since UH was not responding to these requests, deferring to NWSO.
5. *Lesson #5: For pandemic planning, ensure that a project has a contingency plan that outlines different activities that may be impacted in delivery time by flight restrictions, social distancing and disrupted supply chains*. The Project did progress on procurement and evaluations during the pandemic, and maximized the use of virtual meetings. The Project also sought support from counterparts and additional costs to permit some essential persons to enter into RMI. During the pandemic, the Project also adjusted the procurement strategy of civil works by targeting the local market (considering that the borders were closed, preventing experts from entering RMI), and encouraging local companies to participate in tenders by adjusting the scope of work or evaluation criteria of the detailed design or construction activities.
6. *Lesson #6: Projects that are focused on the procurement of equipment and services do not generate opportunities to address gender, specifically women’s empowerment*. This was the case with the EDCR Project which spent all of their time procuring services to construct the EOC and installing specialized equipment, with no time to measure impacts of the work done. As such, there was little to no scope on the Project to advance women’s empowerment and measure gender impacts of these activities.

# Appendix A - Mission Terms of Reference for RMI-EDCR Project terminal Evaluation

**Duty station:** Home based with travel to RMI for field mission

**Type and duration:** International Consultant (30 working days, from January to March 2024)

1. **Background and context**

The Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure (EDCR RMI) project was launched in March 2019, for an initial period of 12 months, funded by the Japan Government Supplementary Budget and extended a completion date until March 2024. The project is implemented by UNDP Pacific Office as Direct Implementation, with the aim to enhance disaster and climate resilience in RMI through improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure.

The EDCR RMI project aims to improve the capacity for preparedness and mitigation of the RMI to man-made, geophysical, climate-related hazards and climate change impact. The project will respond to Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022: By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific, will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability, and disasters, and environmental protection is strengthened. The cooperation with the Government of Japan will contribute to achieving the goals of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, elimination of the threat to human security, and protect gains of sustainable development. It is in line with the Japan Country Assistance Policy for the RMI and its priority areas: 1) overcoming vulnerability and 2) environment, and climate change. This project is consistent with overarching RMI Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (DRM NAP) 2008-2019, the Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Management 2014-2018, the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP), and the Standard Hazard Mitigation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy Framework (NCCPF).

The overall project goal is to effectively address the consequences of, and responses to, geophysical and climate-related hazards to protect lives, sustain livelihoods, preserve the environment, and safeguard the economy. The outcome will be achieved through two expected outputs:

Output 1: Strengthened gender-sensitive Disaster Communication and Climate Monitoring Systems

Output 2: Enhanced gender-sensitive National and State Disaster Responders readiness capacity

**Key achievements of the project (as of October 2023):**

* Strengthened pre- and post-disaster data collection capabilities by supplying aerial and submersible drones to EOC Majuro and Ebeye in October 2023. This leads to improved situational awareness, better-informed decision-making, and more targeted resource allocation for disaster response and recovery efforts. The trainings were attended by 5 men and 1 women from National Disaster Management Office (NDMO), Office of Chief Secretary, Kwajalein Atoll Development Agency (KADA) and Marshall Islands Police Department (MIPD). Other ICT equipment are under procurement.

Construction of Emergency Operation Center (EOC) in Ebeye is under construction which is expected to provide an important role as a central command and control facility to coordinate

* Ebeye and neighbouring atolls. Approximately 50% of the work was completed.
* The request for changing the project activities was submitted and approved in December 2022 to supply and upgrade critical infrastructure and equipment for emergency response and preparedness instead of constructing EOC in Majuro. Equipment such as furniture, pick-up truck, back-up generators and water trucks to be supplied in Majuro and Ebeye are under procurement.

**Impact of Covid-19 in project implementation:**

COVID-19 has severely impacted to the project implementation since the key counterparts such as the Office of Chief Secretary (OCS), National Disaster Management Office (NDMO), National Weather Service Office (NWSO) and the University of Hawai’i (UH) have been fully engaged to COVID-19 response. Implementation of the main activities, construction of Emergency Operation Centers (EOCs) was affected due to the delay in the implementation of A&E design and deployment of Engineers due to restriction of travel. Prolonged travel restriction affected significantly where the project adjusted to obtain required resources locally instead of seeking from abroad. The cost of planned procurement also required adjustment due to the significant increase of cost and supply chain disruption caused a serious delay in the implementation schedule and resulted in the cancellation of one of the constructions

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT INFORMATION**  |
| **Project/outcome title**  | **Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience (EDCR) in the Republic of RMI through improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure**  |
| **Project ID**  | **00115304**  |
| **Corporate outcome and output**  | **UNPS Outcome 1: Climate Change, Disaster Resilience, and Environment Protection**  |
| **Country**  | **Republic of the Marshall Islands**  |
| **Region**  | **Asia and the Pacific**  |
| **Date project document signed**  | **7 June 2019**  |
| **Project dates**  | **Start**  | **Planned end**  |
| **18/03/2019**  | **31/03/2024**  |
| **Project budget**  | **USD 7,400,000**  |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation**  | **USD 3,510,270**  |
| **Funding source**  | **Government of Japan**  |
| **Implementing party1**  | **UNDP (DIM)**  |

**Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives**

The project will expire on 31 March 2024 and the evaluation will assess the relevance and effectiveness of the UNDP’s implementation obligation during the project’s life and provide specific recommendations for the future course of actions. The terminal evaluation is scheduled in the first quarter of 2024 as planned in the UNDP 2023 Evaluation Plan.

The overall purpose of this terminal evaluation is to assess the project results achieved and lessons learned from the gender project and provide specific recommendations for future course of actions, and will be conducted with great emphasis on: accounting for results (i.e., to what extent have the intended results been achieved); impact and sustainability; review progress towards the project’s objectives and outcomes; assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes; identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation; and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature. The evaluation would also assess: the project’s sustainability and impact of COVID-19 on project’s implementation, and project’s contribution to gender equality and women’s empowerment).

The evaluation will be used for learning and accountability, and to contribute to the UNDP and Government of Japan decision-making regarding further engagement on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scope of the Evaluation: Unit of analysis** (full project/programme/ parts of the project/programme; etc.)  | Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience (EDCR) in the RMI through improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure  |
| **Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation**  | April 2019 to December 2023  |
| **Geographical coverage of the evaluation**  | Republic of the Marshall Islands  |

The final evaluation will cover the full scope of the EDCR project and its geographical coverage in RMI.

The evaluation will focus on relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the intervention. In addition, the evaluation will assess how the intervention sought to mainstream gender and social inclusion issues and application of the human rights -based approaches in disaster preparedness and infrastructure.

Mainly, the evaluation should cover at least the following areas.

* **Relevance of the project:** Assess the appropriateness of the project *design* particularly project’s objectives, Theory of Change, Results and Resource Frameworks as it relates to the achievement of project objectives, its linkages with the government’s national strategic plans, and problems it intends to address;
* **Effectiveness and efficiency in project implementation:** Assess the project’s direct and indirect accomplishments (results) including specific gender results and its contributions towards the achievement of the anticipated outcomes, including any constraints on its *effectiveness*, and any unintended outcomes;
* **Impact of the project:** Assess the quality of direct and indirect results such as mainstreaming of gender equality and social inclusion aspects in policies and strategies, structures, preparedness activities, capacity enhanced to the target group, partnership and engagement enhanced, the functional efficiency of the target institutions increased. Assess the specific impact of the project on gender equality both direct and indirect results;
* **Coherence of the project:** alignment with UNDP's core documents (e.g., UNDP SRPD/CPD), national priorities (e.g RMI’s national development plan), and other related UNDP, UN, and Development Partner projects;
* **Sustainability of the project interventions:** assess the positive impacts for sustainability and replication to other countries;
* Assess the management and implementation arrangement of the project and distribution of responsibilities within the given structure, including financial and human resource management, monitoring and oversight as well as the *risks* and risk management strategies in terms of their contribution to the delivery of project results in accordance with the project’s log frame and Results and Resources Framework (RRF);
* Identify and examine **key external factors** beyond the project’s control that have contributed to the program’s successes and failures;
* Document **specific lessons learnt** in the design, implementation, management and monitoring of the project, gender mainstreaming that will add value to similar projects in the future;
* Assesses the impact of the project on **gender equality** and include recommendations on gender equality and women’s empowerment cutting across effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and lessons learnt on gender equality and women’s empowerment.
1. **Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The final evaluation will adopt the six revised evaluation criteria by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) - Relevance, Effectiveness, Coherence, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Moreover, additional cross-cutting criteria such as Human Rights, Gender Equality and leaving no one behind, and climate change action will also be included.

The evaluation will address the following main evaluation questions:

1. To what extent has the EDCR project achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives? What factors contributed to or hindered the project’s performance and sustainability of the results?
2. To what extent was the EDCR project relevant and effective in relation to the contribution of foreseen strategies and theories of change to achieve a disaster risks management and climate resilient impact?
3. To what extent the EDCR contributed in mainstreaming gender in disaster preparedness and infrastructures as well as mechanisms including capacity enhancement?
4. The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the consultant and agreed with UNDP and stakeholders prior to commencing the evaluation.

**Project *evaluation* sample guiding questions:**

**Relevance/ Coherence**

* The degree to which the objectives are (and continue to be) relevant vis-à-vis the disaster risks management and climate resilience, i.e. whether they address the key drivers of weak disaster risks management identified in the Theory of Change analysis;
* Whether important disaster risks management gaps exist, or opportunities are being missed?
* Did the activities and strategies fit the objectives, i.e., is there internal coherence between what the programme is doing and what it is trying to achieve?
* To what extent were the interventions relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries?
* To what extent have gender, human rights and other cross cutting issues considerations been integrated into the project design and implementation?
* To what extent did the EDCR RMI Project complement work with different entities, and have a strategic coherence of approach?
* To assess the alignment and contribution of the project interventions in CPD, UNSDCF and SP

**Effectiveness**

* To what extent were the project outputs achieved or not achieved (Disaggregate by gender, youth and vulnerable groups?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project activities?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?
* To what extent have the results at the project outcome and outputs levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
* To what extent has the project improved the capacities of national gender machinery to advocate for resource mobilization, gender equality and women’s empowerment, women leadership, institutional and policy strengthening etc.
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**Efficiency**

* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent was the project management structure, M&E system as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results? Was quality assurance at project output levels sufficient in truly reflecting expected results? If not, what were the contributing factors and how can it be improved?
* How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the project (including between the two implementing agencies and with stakeholders? Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* How efficient and successful was the project’s implementation approach, including procurement and other activities?
* Overall, did the EDCR RMI project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?

**Sustainability and Impact**

* Are there any financial, social or political, and legal risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs affecting women, men and vulnerable groups?
* Assess preliminary indications of the degree to which the Project results are likely to be sustainable beyond the Project’s lifetime (both at the community and government level), and provide recommendations for strengthening sustainability.
* Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy?
* How prepared the government and other stakeholders are to take on EDCR in RMI??
* How has the project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity?
* Assess the degree of involvement of national partners, and aligning to existing priorities of the local government in targeted areas, looking into how sustainable these tools of measurement are
* Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy:
* How prepared the government and other stakeholders are to take on EDCR in RMI?
* How has the project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity?
* Assess the degree of involvement of national partners, and aligning to existing priorities of the local government in targeted areas, looking into how sustainable these tools of measurement are;

**Sample evaluation questions on cross-cutting issues**

**Human rights**

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

**Gender equality**

To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?

To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men, youth or vulnerable groups?

Are there any lessons learnt related to gender equality?

**Disability**

Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?

What positive impact/transformative change the project has on persons with disabilities?

**Climate Change Action**

To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs, possibly affecting project beneficiaries (men and women) in a negative way

Were there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?

**4. Approach and methodology**

The suggested evaluation approach and methods are indicative only. The specific design, methods and tools for the evaluation should be finalized and proposed by the consultant in the inception report, following consultations with the programme unit and review of the project related documents and reports. The method and tools should be appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The method and tools should be context-sensitive and adequately address the issues of human rights, gender equality and climate change action. The final evaluation should build upon review of the available project documents, field visits, interviews and meetings, surveys and questionnaire if deemed appropriate which would provide an opportunity for more in-depth analysis and understanding of the project. The consultant is expected to frame the evaluation using relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability criteria.

The evaluation employs a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments, and the evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and male and female direct beneficiaries. The consultant must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

Thus, the consultant is expected to work closely with the UNDP Country Office during evaluation process. The following data collection methods could be used, or the evaluator may propose the other data collection method in the inception report.

Document review - a review of all relevant documentation, inter alia:

* Project document (contribution agreement);
* Theory of change and results framework;
* Programme and project quality assurance reports;
* Annual workplans;
* Activity designs;
* Consolidated quarterly and annual reports;
* Results-oriented monitoring report;
* Highlights of project board meetings;
* Technical/financial monitoring reports.

Interviews and meetings with key stakeholders (men and women) such as key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations country team (UNCT) members and implementing partners:

* Semi-structured interviews, based on questions designed for different stakeholders based on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
* Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
* All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

Surveys and questionnaires including male and female participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels. Online questionnaires can be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.

Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.

Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the consultant will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

Gender and human rights lens. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders, and the evaluators.

# Evaluation products (deliverables)

The outputs expected from the consultant is in the following detailed timeline and schedule for completion of the evaluation products, with detail of the length of specific products (number of pages). These products could include:

* Evaluation inception report– A brief narrative of the evaluation methods used and the limitations. Describe the different data collection methods used. A detailed evaluation/matrix or framework (Matrix representation of evaluation criteria, question types and sources of data, data collection technique, including data limitations). The evaluation matrix could be annexed or included under the methodology section. This will also be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
* Evaluation knowledge management product – A narrative through evidence from lessons learnt and key finding to support future programming for UNDP to be produced. A two to three pages on knowledge management product to be part of the deliverable.
* Evaluation debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
* Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length). A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary & annexes is suggested.
* Evaluation report audit trail. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period, as outlined in these guidelines. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* Final evaluation report.
* Presentations to stakeholders and/ or evaluation reference group (if required).
* Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant to maximise use.

Final payment is dependent on the approval of the report by the UNDP. It is understood that if needed multiple drafts may be required until the final approval.

# Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation should be conducted by an independent international evaluator.

* Roles and responsibilities: Responsible for overall lead and conduction of the final evaluation. S/he should be responsible for the overall quality and timely submission of the evaluation report and briefing to the UNDP, and for ensuring a gender equality and social inclusion perspective is incorporated throughout the evaluation work and report.
* Required qualifications: At least a master’s degree in Public Policy, International Development, Development Economics/Planning, Economic, Public Administration, Disaster Management and in any other related university degree;
* Technical knowledge and experience: At least 7 years of experience in conducting/ managing evaluations, with programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation in disaster risk management and Climate resilience and Pacific/regional experience. Possess gender expertise/competencies in the evaluation including experience of disability inclusion. Also has technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development, familiarity with the political, economic, social and gender situation in Pacific – RMI in specific would be an asset. Knowledge of, and experience in, applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. Data analysis and interpretation skills. Knowledge of the relevant national context, policies, and stakeholders.
* Language skills required: Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.

The Evaluator/individual consultant should provide clear methodology, updated resumes, work samples, references shared to support claims of knowledge, skills, and experience.

Evaluator’ independence is compulsory. Individual consultant involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation will not be qualified.2

# Evaluation ethics

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant 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 consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and must sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment”.

# Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this final evaluation resides with the UNDP Pacific Office, Fiji. The UNDP Pacific Office will ensure the logistic arrangements within the country for the consultant. The selected consultant will report to the MPO and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) which will comprise of government representatives, at least one donor representatives and UNDP representatives. The Evaluation Manager will provide technical guidance on evaluation and ensure an independent evaluation process, and that the policy is followed. The project manager and the project team will provide required information, furnish documents for review to the consultant and provide logistical support. They will also be responsible for the final evaluation's logistic arrangements, setting up stakeholder interviews, arranging consultations, coordination with the Government, etc.

After signing the contract, UNDP will brief the consultant upon commencing the assignment on the final evaluation's objectives, purpose, and expected outputs. Key project documents will be shared with the consultant. The team should review the relevant documents and share the draft inception report before the commencement of the field mission or data collection. The team should revise the methodology, data collection tools and review questions. The final methodology and instruments should be proposed in the inception report, including the evaluation schedule and evaluation matrix that guides the final evaluation's overall implementation. The inception report submitted by the consultant should be approved by ERG prior to the commencement of the evaluation process.

The final evaluation will remain fully independent. A mission wrap-up meeting will be organized during which comments from ERG members, participants and stakeholders will be noted for incorporation in the final report. The draft report will be reviewed by the ERG, concern stakeholders and provide their comments.

The international consultant will maintain all communication through the Evaluation Manager/ERG. The Evaluation Manager/ERG should clear each step of the evaluation.

The consultant will be responsible for updating the ERG team on the progress of the evaluation on a fortnightly basis and deliverables must be approved as satisfactory by the ERG.

# Time frame for the evaluation process

The envisaged timeframe of the consultancy is a total of 47 persons days (30 working days) spread over January - March 2023. This includes desk reviews, primary data collection, field work, and report writing. The consultant should provide division of works among the team members in the inception report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Task** | **Time frame** | **Estimated number of days** | **Payment** |
| 1 | **Evaluation Inception Report** Secondary research/desk review and development of gender- sensitive evaluation methodology & approach and detailed workplan - needs to be presented to &approved by ERG before starting the field work componentEvaluation tools/questionnairesdesign and finalization. (Home-Based) | Within 10 days of signing the contract  | 5  | **20 percent** of the contract amount upon approval of the inception report |
| 2& 3 | **Administration of the Evaluation** (data collection in the field) as per agreed sample strategy with ERG, if required (Home-Based) **Data entry, cleaning and** **Tabulation** **Data analysis and presentation of** initial report of findings including case studies/success stories. (Home-Based)  | Within 30 days of signing the contract (right after the approval of inception report)  | 13  | **40 percent** of the contract amount upon approval of the data collection mission  |
| 4 | Evaluation de-briefing meeting to ERG and submission of Draft Evaluation Report to ERG and UNDP for review  | Within 40 days of signing the contract  | 7  | None  |
| 5 | Submission of **final report** after incorporation of feedback from ERG (Home-Based)  | Within 60 days of signing the contract  | 5  | **40 percent** of the contract amount upon approval of the final report  |

# Appendix B - Mission Itinerary (for march 2024)

| **#** | **Activity** | **Stakeholder involved** | **Place** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***17 March 2024 (Sunday)*** |
|  | Arrival in Majuro |  |  |
| ***18 March 2024 (Monday)*** |
| 1 | De-brief meeting with Pacific Office in Fiji | UNDP | Zoom |
| 2 | Discussion with Ms. Yoko Ebisawa | UNDP | Zoom |
| 3 | Meeting with Mr. Melvin Dacillo, Chief Engineer | MoWIU | Majuro |
| ***19 March 2024 (Tuesday)*** |
|  | Travel to Ebeye with Melvin Dacillo and Vinay Singh |  |  |
| ***20 March 2024 (Wednesday)*** |
| 4 | Site visit to Ebeye EOC |  |  |
| 5 | Meeting with Ms. Abacca Anjan Maddison (DCS), Mr. Anjojo Kabua (KADA), Mr. Ariston Santiago (KADA), Mr. Wesley Lemari (NDMO), Mr. Joseph Pedro (Kwajalein Atoll Joint Utilities Resources), Ms. Ivy Mantilla (PII), Mr. Melvin Dacillo and Mr. Vinay Singh | OCS, NDMO, KADA and PII | Ebeye |
|  | Travel back to Majuro |  |  |
| ***21 March 2024 (Thursday)*** |
| 7 | Meeting with Mr. Isadore Robert | NDMO, Majuro | Majuro |
| 8 | Meeting with Mr. Reginald White | NWSO | Majuro |
| ***22 March 2024 (Friday)*** |
|  | Working on TE report |  |  |
| ***23 March 2024 (Saturday)*** |
| 9 | Meeting with Mr. Catalino Kijiner, DCS | OCS | Majuro |
| ***24 March 2024 (Sunday)*** |
| 10 | Meeting with Mrs. Teresa White | UNDP | Majuro |
|  | Departure from Majuro |  |  |

Total number of meetings conducted: 10

# Appendix C - List of Persons contacted

This is a listing of persons contacted in the RMI-RMI-EDCR Project (unless otherwise noted) during the Terminal Evaluation Period only. The Evaluators regret any omissions to this list.

1. Ms. Yoko Ebisawa, Project Manager, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
2. Ms. Adelle Khan, Programme Associate, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
3. Ms. Marilyn Omondi, Programme Analyst, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
4. Ms. Merewalesi Laveti, Monitoring, Evaluation and Country Coordination, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
5. Ms. Emmilia Tuiwawa, Development and Effectiveness Analyst, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
6. Mr. Kiye Mwakawago, Programme Advisor, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
7. Mr. Vinay Singh, UNDP RMI-EDCR/TCAP Finance Officer, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji;
8. Ms. Teresa A. Bing White, UNDP RMI-EDCR Finance & Administrative Officer, UNDP RMI In-Country Project Team;
9. Mr. Catalino Kijiner, Deputy Chief Secretary, OCS, Majuro;
10. Ms. Abacca Anjan Maddison, Deputy Chief Secretary, OCS, Ebeye;
11. Mr. Isidore Robert, Director, National Disaster Management Office, Majuro;
12. Mr. Melvin Dacillo, Chief Engineer, Ministry of Works, Infrastructure & Utilities;
13. Mr. Reginald White, Director/Meteorologist-in-Charge, National Weather Service Office;
14. Mr. Anjojo Kabua, Director, Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority;
15. Mr. Ariston Santiago, Engineer, Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority;
16. Mr. Wesley Lemari, National Disaster Management Office, Ebeye;
17. Mr. Joseph Pedro, Kwajalein Atoll Joint Utilities Resources, General Manager;
18. Ms. Ivy Mantilla, Staff Engineer, Pacific International Inc., Ebeye.

#

# Appendix D - List of documents reviewed

1. UNDP Project Document for ““Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of Palau through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure” (RMI-EDCR Project) (Project #: 00115303);
2. Annual Work Plans for November 2019, March 2020, July 2020, November 2020, August 2021 and December 2021;
3. Monthly Progress Reports for 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 (up to June 2022);
4. Quarterly Progress Report for 2020, 2021 and 2022;
5. Annual Progress Reports for 2019, 2020 and 2021;
6. BTOR reports from August 2019 to June 2022;
7. Project Board meeting minutes from August 2019 to March 2022;
8. UN’s Subregional programme document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (2018-2022);
9. UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation of Sustainable Land Management Project for the Republic of Palau, October 2012;
10. RMI-EDCR Training Workshop Report on “Protection, Gender and Social Inclusion in Disaster Risk Management,” 2021.

# Appendix E – general questionnaire provided to stakeholders

**Stakeholder Questions and Discussion for the PMU and Government agencies**

* + - 1. How well has the project aligned with government and agency priorities?
			2. To what extent has RMI-EDCR’s selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
			3. Has the RMI-EDCR Project been influential in influencing national policies on disaster management and climate change?
			4. What evidence is there that the Project has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity and institutional strengthening?
			5. Has the RMI-EDCR Project been effective in helping improve disaster management and climate change planning?
			6. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outputs, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outputs?
			7. What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about during project implementation?
			8. What were the contributing factors and impediments that enhanced or impeded project performance?
			9. To what extent did the Project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women, and/or a human-rights based approach?
			10. To what extent are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outputs?
			11. To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
			12. Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)?
			13. Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that the Project has in place help to ensure that activities and outputs were managed efficiently and effectively?
			14. Were alternative approaches considered in designing the programme?
			15. What is the likelihood that the Project interventions are sustainable?
			16. What mechanisms have been set in place by the Project to support the Government of Palau to sustain the results made through these interventions?
			17. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
			18. What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?
			19. How has the Project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the Project closure date?
			20. What has happened because of the Project?
			21. What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
			22. Were there contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)?
			23. Were there any unintended impacts of the Project (both positive and negative)? If so, assess their overall scope and implications.
			24. Identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long term impact.
			25. Assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of resources, decision‐making power, division of labor, etc.

**Stakeholder Questions and Discussion for Beneficiaries**

Has there been any capacity development of key beneficiaries?

Has the RMI-EDCR Project been influential in influencing national policies on disaster management and climate change adaptation?

What evidence is there that the Project has contributed towards an improvement in disaster management and climate change adaptation?

Has the RMI-EDCR Project been effective in helping improve disaster management and climate change planning?

How would you rate the training conducted by the Project? Was it effective in transferring knowledge on disaster management and climate change?

How have you used the knowledge transferred by the Project?

What were the contributing factors and impediments that enhanced or impeded Project performance?

To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality, and the empowerment of women?

How many people have benefited?

Can you identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards the long-term impact of improving the capacity for preparedness and mitigation of Palau’s resilience to different types of related hazards and enhancing resilience to climate change impacts?

To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?

What has happened because of the project?

# Appendix F – revised results framework for RMI-EDCR Project (up to december 2022) with edits in red font

|  |
| --- |
| **Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD or GPD):** Outcome 1 of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022: By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened. Indicative Output(s) with gender marker: Output 3.2. Preparedness systems in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards (geo-physical and climate related) and man-made crisis at all levels of government and community. Gender Marker: GEN2 (Gender equality as a significant objective) |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme [or Global/Regional] Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:** RBAP Regional Programme Document- Outcome 3. Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risks of natural disasters, including from climate change  |
| **Intended SDG the project will support:** Goal 1: No poverty, Goal 2: zero hunger, Goal 5: gender equality, Goal 6: clean water and sanitation, Goal 13: climate action.  |
| **Regional priority:** Pacific people, societies, economies, cultures and natural environments are resilient to changing conditions and extreme events resulting from climate change, climate variability and geological processes, to enhance the well-being of the people and to promote their sustainable development (Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP)  |
| **Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan:** Output 3.2. Preparedness systems in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards (geo-physical and climate related) and man-made crisis at all levels of government and community.  |
| **Project title and Atlas Project Number:** **“Enhancing Disaster and Climate Resilience in the Republic of the Marshall Islands through Improved Disaster Preparedness and Infrastructure (RMI-EDCR Project)”**  |

| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS**  | **OUTPUT INDICATORS**  | **DATA SOURCE**  | **BASELINE**  | **TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)** | **DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value**  | **Year**  | **Q1** **2020**  | **Q2 2020**  | **Q3** **2020**  | **Q4** **2020**  | **Q1 2021**  | **FINAL** |
| **Output 1** Strengthened gender sensitive Disaster Communication and Climate and Tsunami Monitoring Systems  GEN 2   | 1.1  ~~% of disaster communication, climate and storm surge early warning systems upgraded & operational~~ – cancelled in ~~# of States with upgraded (i.e. redundancy, marine grade, energy efficient, gender sensitive) climate and tsunami early warning system installed and operational~~ – cancelled in 2019 # of islands with upgraded (i.e. redundancy, marine grade, energy efficient, gender sensitive) climate and tsunami early warning system installed and operational | *Quarterly progress Reports*   | 0 | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  | ~~16~~9 | *Procurement and installation report**Guidance note including gender sensitive information* |
| * 1. ~~% of government departments expressing satisfaction with the upgraded disaster communications, climate and inundation and tsunami early warning systems~~ – cancelled in 2019 # of men and women with access to early warning information through the upgraded disaster gender sensitive communications, climate and tsunami early warning systems
 | *Quarterly progress Reports*   | 0 | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  | 54,705 Projection2019 (from Census2011) | *Early warning coverage report* |
| 1.4 ~~# of HF/VHF radios supplied-~~ cancelled in November 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2** Enhanced National gender sensitive and State Disaster Preparedness capacity  GEN 2  | 2.1   ~~% of national and state disaster responders’ agencies representatives show an increase in knowledge on disaster response (disaggregated by gender)~~ - cancelled in 2019 Scale (%) of upgrading of the National Emergency Operational Centre with appropriate infrastructure and equipment to facilitate information management and effective coordination  | *Quarterly progress Reports*   | 0 | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 (women=8) | *EOC report**Topographic map**Training reports* |
| 2.2   # staff and members of the Emergency Operational Centre and Disaster Management Team have improved their capacities in information management and coordination (equipment and gender sensitive guidelines) -  | *Quarterly progress Reports*   | 0 | 2019 | 10% tender doc. |  | 25% procurement processed | 75%Construction in process | 100% Building finalized | 100% | *EOC report* |
| 2.3   # men and women benefitted from the improved disaster preparedness in water sector [newly added in Dec 2022] | *Quarterly progress Reports*  | 0 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | *EOC report* |

# APPENDIX G – evaluation matrix

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Data Sources/Methods | Methods for Data Analysis |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project relevance: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? |
| * To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, UNDP Strategic Plan, country programme outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent was the project in line with the SDG 7 (affordable & clean energy) & SDG 13 (climate action)?
* To what extent have project management and implementation partner contributed towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent are methodologies, plans, outcomes and lessons learned in this project relevant to other similar projects that may be designed for other countries/ regions the UNDP operates in?
* To what extent were perspectives of men and women who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during project design processes?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
 | - Alignment with National developmental policies and plans- Alignment with global development and environmental agenda - Alignment with needs of the target communities especially women and vulnerable groups | * Review of documents including secondary sources
* Key informant interviews
* Focus group discussion
 | Qualitative methods- Triangulation- Validations- Interpretations- Abstractions |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? |
| * Are the project objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent did the project contribute to the national development priorities, UNDP Strategic Plan, country programme outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent did the project contribute to the SDG 7 (affordable & clean energy) & SDG 13 (climate action) and SGD 5 (Gender Equality)?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
* What factors contributed towards the project effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
 | - Objective, Outcome level indicators from the project results and resources framework  | * Review of documents
* Key informant interviews
* Focus group discussion
 | Qualitative methods- Triangulation- Validations- Interpretations- AbstractionsQuantitative methods- Progress and trend analysis |
| Efficiency: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far?  |
| * To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
* To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
 | - Changes made in the resource framework or project design, if any- Level of stakeholder involvement and coordination mechanisms- Availability of work plans and M&E system- Availability and effectiveness of communication mechanisms - Efficient and timely use of financial resources  | * Review of documents including financial statements
* Key informant interviews
* Focus group discussion
 | Qualitative methods- Triangulation- ValidationsQuantitative methods- Progress and trend analysis |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
| * Are there any risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs going forward?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operated pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* What factors contributed towards the project sustainability?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability in order to support female and male project beneficiaries as well as marginalized groups?
 | - Financial, Social, Institutional and Environmental risks to sustainability of interventions and benefits | * Review of documents
* Key informant interviews
* Focus group discussion
 | Qualitative methods- Triangulation- Validations- Interpretations- Abstractions |
| Cross-cutting issues: To what extent are cross-cutting issues contributing to long-term project results? |
| * To what extent has the project promoted and contributed towards the other SDG’s (excluding 5, 7 & 13)?
* To what extent did the project and its outcomes contribute to women’s empowerment and gender balance both within the Project itself and further afield?
 | - Achievement of SDG objectives- Level of women’s recruitment in RMI-EDCR and other government institutions and private entities | * Review of documents
* Key informant interviews
* Focus group discussion
 | Qualitative methods- Triangulation- Validations- Interpretations- Abstractions |

# APPENDIX H – audit trail (based responses to comments received on draft te report)

**Provided as a separate file.**

# APPENDIX I - evaluation consultant agreement form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[27]](#footnote-28)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_Roland Wong\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Signed at *Surrey, BC, Canada* on *16 July 2024*

1. Evaluation rating indices: 6=*Highly Satisfactory (HS)*: The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives; 5=*Satisfactory (S)*: The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives; 4=*Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*: The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives; 3=*Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):* The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives; 2=*Unsatisfactory (U)* The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives; 1=*Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):* The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Relevance ratings: 1=Not relevant; 2=Relevant [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *4 = Likely (L):* negligible risks to sustainability;

 *3 = Moderately Likely (ML):* moderate risks to sustainability;

 *2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU):* significant risks to sustainability;

 *1 = Unlikely (U):* severe risks to sustainability; and

 *U/A = unable to assess*. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. This TE was conducted to closely adhere to GEF guidelines for evaluations. The Table of Contents of this report reflects these GEF guidelines that were accepted by UNDP in the Evaluator’s Inception Report from 18 March 2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Available at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Available at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/covid19/update/June2021/UNDP%20DE%20Guidance%20Planning%20and%20Implementation%20during%20COVID19%203%20June%202021.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Meaning is "to get information" where people can access disaster related information, most likely from a website. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Refers to the Project “Disaster Resilience for Pacific Small Island Developing States”. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. 6 companies did not offer a bid due to shortage of manpower, no possibility of importing skilled workers due to Covid-19 related travel restrictions, current ongoing projects, and remote geographic location. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. <https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/MHL/Inception%20Report%20for%20RMI%20R2R%20Project.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. <https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/default/files/publication/pda-2017-marshall-islands.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Ibid 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Ibid 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. The figures were estimated from the Census Data deducted by estimated beneficiaries by ACWA project which provides communities where there is no access of MWSC and KAJUR. Economic Policy, Planning and Statistics Office. 2023. “Republic of the Marshall Islands 2021 Census Report Volume 1: Basic Tables and Administrative Report”, ACWA project. 2023. “Water Investment Plan RMI V15Oct2023” [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Two spare Chatty Beetles were proposed. However, spare chatty beetles were deemed to be not important since there is a communications package attached to the Chatty Beetle that should be used for communications and the fact that chatty beetles can be easily repaired by NWSO. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. There were 3 subsequent trainings in January, April and May 2022. These were on Acoustic release and Transducer Operation in January, Operation of the Portable Acoustic command system and deck unit equipment in April and a brief training in Garmin Chart Plotting/Transducer and survey methodology in May 2022. Previous buoy installations and interactions between NOAA-PacIOOS and NWSO only involved the buoy expert coming to install the equipment without involving NWSO. This changed with the UNDP contract which stipulated that PacIOOS had to send the expert to train NWSO staff. There was no gender disaggregation of the NWSO staff attending the trainings. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. There was a construction tender issued and closed in April 2021 that resulted in submitted bids beyond the budget. Based on the Project Board’s decision in May 2021, the tender was cancelled as none of the bidders met the required criteria. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. There were difficulties in attracting international companies to work in RMI during the post-COVID period. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Cabinet could have taken the decision to do only the Ebeye EOC back as early as August 2021, However, the Cabinet held off on that decision until July 2022 in the hopes of getting funds from somewhere to do both EOCs. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Consisting of a server that stores data and information on weather and persons for all islands in RMI in a safe and secure place. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Information obtained From Mr. Isidore Robert, Director of NDMO on 15 March 2024 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. A hand-over ceremony for the back-up generators took place in February 2024. The installation will be completed by MWSC soon after the Project termination. The cost of installing back-up generators comes from GoRMI. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. All trucks were sourced from Türkiye which took 4 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. From 1 April 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Up to 13 March 2024 [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. 6 = HS or Highly Satisfactory: There were no shortcomings;

 5 = S or Satisfactory: There were minor shortcomings,

 4 = MS or Moderately Satisfactory: There were moderate shortcomings;

 3 = MU or Moderately Unsatisfactory: There were significant shortcomings;

 2 = U or Unsatisfactory: There were major shortcomings;

 1 = HU or Highly Unsatisfactory;

 U/A = Unable to assess;

 N/A = Not applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-28)