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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Component | Name of Co-financier | Co financing | IA own Financing | | Government | | Other\* | | Total Disbursement | | Remark |
| (Type/Source) | (mill US$) | | (mill US$) | | (mill US$) | | (mill US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| 1 | Lighthouse Foundation | Grants |  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.10 |  |
| 1 | Ministry for Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia | Grants |  |  | 0.050 | 0.050 |  |  | 0.050 | 0.05 |  |
| 1 | Ministry for Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia | In-kind |  |  | 0.200 | 0.200 |  |  | 0.200 | 0.20 |  |
| 1 | World Ocean Observatory | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.10 |  |
| 1 | Nausicaa and World Ocean Network | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.10 |  |
| 1 | UNESCO-IOC | Grants |  |  |  |  | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.01 |  |
| 1 | UNESCO-IOC | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.090 | 0.090 | 0.090 | 0.09 |  |
| 1 | EPOMEX | In-kind |  |  | 0.025 | 0.025 |  |  | 0.025 | 0.03 |  |
| 1 | Center for Marine Policy - University of Delaware | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.10 |  |
| 1 | The Nature Conservancy | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.050 | 0.050 | 0.050 | 0.050 |  |
| 1 | DFO Canada | Grants |  |  | 0.100 | 0.044 |  |  | 0.100 | 0.044 |  |
| 1 | DFO Canada | In-kind |  |  | 0.050 | 0.050 |  |  | 0.050 | 0.050 |  |
| 1 | FLAD, Portugal | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 |  |
| 1 | WIOMSA | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.025 | 0.025 | 0.025 | 0.025 |  |
| 1 | UNDP | In-kind | 0.087 | 0.087 |  |  |  |  | 0.087 | 0.087 |  |
| Additional Co-finance | Dept. for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), UK | Grants |  |  |  | 0.062 |  |  | - | 0.062 |  |
| (data from PIR 2011) | FAO | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.023 | - | 0.023 |  |
| 1 | FAO | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.005 | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | Center for Ocean Solutions/Stanford University | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.004 | - | 0.004 |  |
| 1 | Oceana | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.005 | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | UNEP | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.015 | - | 0.015 |  |
| 1 | European Environment Agency | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.003 | - | 0.003 |  |
| 1 | European Environment Agency | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.007 | - | 0.007 |  |
| 1 | French Marine Protected Areas Agency | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.070 | - | 0.070 |  |
| 1 | Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, France | Grants |  |  | - | 0.180 |  |  | - | 0.180 |  |
| 1 | Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea, France | Grants |  |  | - | 0.096 |  |  | - | 0.096 |  |
| 1 | Government of Republic of Korea | Grants |  |  | - | 0.149 |  |  | - | 0.149 |  |
|  | The Organizing Committee, Yeosu Expo (Korea) |  |  |  |  | 0.049 |  |  |  | 0.049 |  |
| 1 | Ocean Policy Research Foundation (OPRF), Japan | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.045 | - | 0.045 |  |
| 1 | Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.010 | - | 0.010 |  |
| 1 | Secretariat of environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), Mexico | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.003 | - | 0.003 |  |
| 1 | World Bank, Washington DC | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.010 | - | 0.010 |  |
| 1 | Government of South Africa | Grants |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  | - | 0.01 |  |
| 1 | GEF-UNDP Algulhas and Somali LME | Grants |  |  |  |  |  | 0.008 | - | 0.008 |  |
| 1 | World Meteorological Organiztion (WMO) | Grants |  |  |  |  |  | 0.002 | - | 0.002 |  |
| 1 | Plymouth Marine Laboratory, UK | Grants |  |  |  |  |  | 0.001 | - | 0.001 |  |
| 1 | State Oceanic Administration (SOA), People's Republic of China | Grants |  |  | - | 0.025 |  |  | - | 0.025 |  |
| 1 | GEF | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.025 | - | 0.025 |  |
| 1 | UNESCO-IOC | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.015 | - | 0.015 |  |
| 1 | International Maritime Organization (IMO) | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.005 | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | Forum do Mar, Brazil | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.005 | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | Pacific Islands Forum | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.010 | - | 0.010 |  |
| 1 | Republic of Seychelles | In-kind |  |  | - | 0.005 |  |  | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | Vietnam | In-kind |  |  | - | 0.005 |  |  | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | World Ocean Network | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.015 | - | 0.015 |  |
| 1 | Korean Ocean Research & Development Institute (KORDI) | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.025 | - | 0.025 |  |
| 1 | World Wildlife Fund (WWF) | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.005 | - | 0.005 |  |
| 1 | The Nature Conservancy (TNC) | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.002 | - | 0.002 |  |
| 1 | The Nature Conservancy (TNC) | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.003 | - | 0.003 |  |
| 1 | Caribbean LME Project (CLME) | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.010 | - | 0.010 |  |
| 1 | Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.003 | - | 0.003 |  |
| 1 | National Oceanic AND Atmospheric Adminishtration (NOAA) | Grants |  |  |  | 0.037 |  |  |  | 0.037 |  |
| 1 | Global Ocean Forum | In-kind |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0250 |  | 0.025 |  |
| 2 | UNDP | Grants & In-kind | 0.130 | 0.130 |  |  |  |  | 0.130 | 0.130 |  |
| 2 | Australian Government | Grants |  |  | 0.100 | 0.081 |  |  | 0.100 | 0.081 |  |
| 2 | ICPDR | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.110 | 0.110 |  |
| 2 | UNESCO | Grants |  |  |  |  | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.100 | 0.012 |  |
| 2 | UNITAR | Grants |  |  |  |  | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.085 | 0.085 |  |
| 2 | EC | Grants |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | - | 0.080 | - | The grant has not been realized |
| 2 | Red Cross/Red Crescent | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.012 | 0.012 |  |
| 2 | LMGM | In-kind |  |  |  |  | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.100 | 0.100 |  |
| Additional Co-finance | Project AWARE | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.002 | - | 0.002 |  |
| (data from PIR 2010-11) | SKM | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.006 | - | 0.006 |  |
| 2 | Quicksilver | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.006 | - | 0.006 |  |
| 2 | Cleaner Seas Alliance | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.002 | - | 0.002 |  |
| 2 | Terrain NRM | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.011 | - | 0.011 |  |
| 2 | James Cook U | Grants |  |  |  |  | - | 0.006 | - | 0.006 |  |
| 2 | SKM | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.002 | - | 0.002 |  |
| 2 | University Queensland | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.057 | - | 0.057 |  |
| 2 | James Cook U | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.004 | - | 0.004 |  |
| 2 | World Wildlife Fund Nature | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.011 | - | 0.011 |  |
| 2 | Reef and Rainforest Research Centre | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.011 | - | 0.011 |  |
| 2 | Project AWARE | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.011 | - | 0.011 |  |
| 2 | University of Wollongong | In-kind |  |  |  |  | - | 0.033 | - | 0.033 |  |
| 4 | UNDP | In-kind |  | 0.016 |  |  |  |  | - | 0.016 | Staff time from UNDP APRC contribute as Project coordinator |
|  |  | TOTALS | 0.217 | 0.233 | 0.525 | 1.067 | 1.092 | 1.443 | 1.834 | 2.743 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table** 6**:** **RETA 7307 -The financial picture (as of 30 June 2014)**

(all amounts in US dollars unless otherwise stated) (Annual expenditures were not available)

|  |
| --- |
| Title of TA Project**: Regional Cooperation on Knowledge Management, Policy, and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative** (RETA 7307). Approved 6 May 2009; Start of implementation 5 May 2010; Completion date: 31 December 2014, Total duration (since 5 May 2010 up to December 2014): 56 months |
| TA Amount and Sources of Funding: $2,468,000  Of which: ADB Regional Integration and Cooperation Fund (RCIF): $500,000  Other Sources : 1. GEF: $1,200,000  2. Government of Australia through AusAID: $168,000  3. Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Timor Leste: $600,000 (in-kind) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fund code | Fund Name | Original RETA amounts (US$) | Amounts disbursed  (US$) | Percentage disbursement | Amounts  not yet  committedc (US$) | Amounts disbursed as % of total RETA amounta |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (2)/Total (1) |
| 07 | Regional Cooperation & Integration Fund | 500,000 | 304,140 | 60.8 | 60,833 | 16.3 |
| 35 | Australian TA grant | 168,000 | 159,998 | 95.2 | 1 | 8.5b |
| 48 | GEF TA grant | 1,200,000 | 1,172,878 | 97.7 | 24,301 | 62.8 |
|  | Totala | 1,868,000 | 1,637,016 | 87.6b | 85,134 |  |

Notes: a In-kind contributions of participating governments ($600,000 equivalent) are not included in the total. Neither is the additional financing by the Australian Government totalling Aus$72,000 that was channelled to, and accounted for, by WorldFish Center.

b Rounding off errors involved

c Amounts committed are not listed separately since they can be derived as (1)-(2)-(4). As of 30 June 2014, the amounts uncommitted constituted a reserve for expected expenses associated with printing and distribution of RETA 7307 knowledge products during the remaining months of 2014.

**Table of M&E Activities and indicative budget**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of M&E activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Budget US$**  *Excluding project team staff time* | **Note** |
| Inception Workshop (IW) | * Project Coordination Unit (PCU) * UNDP-RCB * UNDP GEF | $50,000 | Budget under outcome 4 Project management cost. Aprox. $12,000 has been spent on travel/misc of part-time project manager and project coordinator to join the Inception workshop, remaining budget reallocated to com 2 |
| Inception Report | * Project Team * UNDP CO | None |  |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators | PCU will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members | To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost $10,000 | Log frame was reviewed/revised by project team, no hiring of specific studies and institutions, budget reallocated to com 2 |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis) | Oversight by Project GEF Regional Technical Advisor and PCU  Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs | To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost $40,000 | No hiring of specific studies and institutions, budget reallocated to com 2 |
| APR and PIR | * Project Team * UNDP-RCB * UNDP-GEF | None |  |
| TPR and TPR report | * Government Counterparts * UNDP CO * Project team * UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit | None |  |
| Steering Committee Meetings | * Project Coordinator * UNDP-RCB | None |  |
| Periodic status reports | Project team | $5,000 | The report was not required, budget reallocated to com 2 |
| Technical reports | * Project team * Hired consultants as needed | $15,000 | The report was not required, budget reallocated to com 2 |
| Mid-term External Evaluation | * Project team * UNDP-RCB * UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit * External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | $20,000 | Distributed among com 1,2 and 4 |
| Final External Evaluation | * Project team, * UNDP-RCB * UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit * External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | $30,000 | Distributed among com 1,2 and 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Terminal Report | * Project team * UNDP-RCB * External Consultant | None |  |
|  | TOTAL | $170,000 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component One: Support for ICO as Described in Project Document Budget Notes** | | | | | | |
| Activity/Expenditure | Int’l Consultants | Contractual Services | Travel | Publica- tions | Totals | % |
| 1.1 Strategic planning support for Global Oceans Agenda | $52,800 | $79,200 | $20,000 | $64,000 | $383,000 | 40% |
| $167,000 |
| 1.2 Advice and organization support for Global Ocean Policy Day | $19,800 | $25,300 | $49,500 |  | $144,100 | 15% |
| 1.3 Policy Analysis for marine areas beyond national jurisdiction | $13,200 | $16,500 | $19,800 |  | $49,500 | 5% |
| 1.4 Develop Ocean Leadership training program | $23,100 | $64,900 | $165,000 |  | $253,000 | 27% |
| 1.5 Public Education and Outreach: Youth Forum, DVC, Youtube, etc. |  | $119,900 |  |  | $119,900 | 13% |
| Totals | $108,900 | $305,800 | $421,300 | $64,000 | **$949,5002** | **100%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component One: Support for ICO as Described in UNOPS Contract** | | | | | | |
| Activity/Expenditure | Int’l Consultants | Contractual Services | Travel | Publica- tions | Totals | % |
| 1.1 Strategic planning support for Global Oceans Agenda | $ 42,000 | $ 78,400 | 177,333 | $ 59,733 | $357,466 | 42.6% |
| 1.2 Advice and organization support for Global Ocean Policy Day | $ 18,000 | $ 25,293 | $ 45,000 |  | $  88,293 | 10.5% |
| 1.3 Policy Analysis for marine areas beyond national jurisdiction | $ 12,000 | $ 15,270 | $  18,480 |  | $ 46,200 | 5.5% |
| 1.4 Develop Ocean Leadership training program | $  21,000 | $ 61,133 | $ 154,000 |  | $ 236,133 | 28.1% |
| 1.5 Public Education and Outreach: Youth Forum, DVC, Youtube, etc. |  | $ 111,907 |  |  | $ 111,907 | 13.3% |
| Totals | $  93,000 | $ 292,453 | $394,813 | $ 59,733 | **$ 839,999** | **100%** |

2 The total GEF contribution was US$ 900,000. The total budget note figure was US$ 949,500.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component Two: Support for GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning as described budget notes** | | | |
| *Budget Line* | *Budget by Activity* | *Totals* | *%* |
| Learning Costs | Learning Exchange Program ($50,100)  CTI Leadership Training WOC Manado, 2009 ($16,500) Experience notes:  Global Oceans, IWC5 and CTI regional ($1,650) | $68,250 | 17% |
| ALD Employee Costs | IWC5 Coordinator($60,000) KM Specialist (52 weeks):  Cross Fertilization of IW:LEARN and CTI; manage M&E ($88,400) | $148,400 | 37% |
| Travel | IW:LEARN/KM attend IWC5 IW:LEARN attend WOC 2009 | $10,000 | 3% |
| Contractual Services | IWC5:  Convention Center ($66,850); multi-media/KM ($30,000); Event Coordinator ($7,500); Pre-conference workshops ($50,000); Site Visit ($11,000) | $165,350 | 41% |
| Communications | IW: LEARN Support | $4,000 | 1% |
| Supplies | IW:LEARN: Workspace in Bratislava | $4,000 | 1% |
| **Total** | | **$400,000** | **100%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Component* | Budget (Prodoc) | *Expenditure (UNDP expenditure report )* | *Estimated expenditure (based on work plan)* | *Justification* |
| Com#1 | 900,000 | 1,032,034.54 | * GOF contract $ 839,000 * UNOPS Fee 67,000 * MTE consultant $5,800 | According to the annual work plan, all activities (accept MTE) were undertaken by GOF under fixed amount contract. Additional expenses shown in the report are the matter of recording the cost which linked into wrong component. It supposed to charge against com#2. |
| Com#2 | 473,357 | 558,369.73 |  | Additional expenses incurred by:   * Three months contract extension of IW-Learn project manager ($30,000) to continue work on remaining activities which has been delayed. * Additional activities e.g IW Leadership Training * Actual cost of many activities during project implementation are increased or higher than estimated budget in prodoc e.g travel, conference charge etc |
| Come#4 | 200,000 | -31,033.75 | - Salary for part time Project manager $30,000/Coordinator $6,000  - MTE consultant $5,800  - Travel (attended IWC5, ADB inception workshop $10,000 | According to the annual work plan, estimated expenses for this component should be around $65,000-80,000. The expenses shown in the report are deficit. This is the matter of recording the cost which linked into wrong component. The correction have been made during MTE but still didn’t reflect the realistic cost. |
| **Total** | 1,573,357 | **1,559,370.52** |  |  |

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Evaluation Question** | **Indicator** | **Source** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |
| **Objective**:  Improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra- regional adaptive learning processes. | Has there been improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra- regional adaptive learning processes. | Effective, efficient management systems drawn from targeted learning from the GEF international waters (IW) program applied in the Coral Triangle and other areas by 2010. | Attendance at WOC in 2009  Hits on IW:LEARN website  CTI Regional Plan of Action and country action plans  CTI monitoring and evaluation system. | Review MTE Report  Document review  See Impact section |
| *The Project Logical framework does not give indicators for the Component Outcomes but does give detailed indicators for the expected outputs (given in Table 1). The Indicators listed here have been added by the evaluation team.)* | | | | |
| **Component 1**  To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues. | Have there been increased critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building in advancing the ocean agenda?  Has there been increased involvement of SIDS & SIDS agenda in ocean policy discussions?  Has there been movement of new ocean issues on to the ocean policy agenda? | Examples ofincreased critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building in advancing the ocean agenda.  Examplesofincreased involvement of SIDS & SIDS agenda in ocean policy discussions.  Examples of new ocean issues (climate change, areas beyond national jurisdiction) incorporated into ocean agenda. | Documents of ocean meetings (WOC 2009, GOC 2010, Rio+20) and other related meetings (UNFCCC, CBD, BBNJ), & GOF documentation. | * Document review * Interviews with Component 1 staff & relevant stakeholders |
| **Component 2**:  Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems. **Expected learning outcomes** include increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes | Has there beenimproved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems in GEF–IW projects due to transboundary cooperation? | Examples of Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems in GEF–IW projects. | IW:LEARN website & documents  GEF-IW project documents | Document review  Interviews with IW:LEARN staff, GEF-IW staff, & GEF Project leaders. |
| Component 3: Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra- regional adaptive learning processes. | Has strategy formulation and implementation of CT6 countries’ plans of action noticeably benefitted from the Component’s focus on regional learning processes? | Consultations and other activities that have facilitated access by policy makers and implementers to new or improved information and methodology of sustainable mgmt. of marine and coastal resources  Examples of updates, re-formulations or modifications of strategic documents or plans of action that reflect inter- or intra-regional adaptive learning | IW:LEARN website & documents  Statements and presentations by CTI Regional and National Coordination bodies  The CTKN knowledge network website and other CTI-related websites  ADB RETA 7307 Completion Report and other RETA 7307 documentation  Regional and national plans of action | Document review  Targeted questionnaire and follow-up person-to-person discussions/triangulation (Phone/Skype, personal contacts) with key actors under Component 3 |
| **Component 4**  **Project Coordination and Management**  Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI. | Have the project components been effectively managed?  Has there been effective coordination between the project components? | Effective use of UNDP & GEF operating procedures.  Examples of coordination between components. | UNDP Project Reviews (APR), MTE & other project documents  UNDP, UNOPS & Component staff | Document Review  Skype & in person interviews |
|  | **Efficiency** |  |  |  |
| Components 1, 2,3,& 4 | Has the funding been cost effective? | Degree of funding resulting in additional leverage.  Adherence to budget. | Financial reports  PMU, UNOPS & Component leaders | Review of financial reports  Interviews (Skype) with PMU,UNOPS & component leaders |
|  | **Sustainability** |  |  |  |
| Components 1, 2,& 3 | Are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | Degree to which risks may impact on achievement of greater project impact.  Initiatives & projects that have continued project results | Project documents  PMU, UNOPS & Component leaders  Recent project summaries & proposals | Document review  Interviews (Skype) with PMU,UNOPS & component leaders  Review IW: LEARN & other websites |
|  | **Impact** |  |  |  |
| Components 1, 2,& 3 | What are the most significant outcomes in terms of increased ocean policy, increased learning & information sharing, & improved marine ecosystem management? | Examples of significant outcomes in terms of increased ocean policy, increased learning & information sharing, & improved marine ecosystem management? | PMU, UNOPS, other stakeholders & Component leaders  Project & related documents | Interviews with PMU, UNOPS, key stakeholders, & component leaders  Document review |

Component 1 Questionnaire and analysis

Component 2 Questionnaires and analysis

Component 3 Evaluation Questionnaire

Component 3 Analysis of questionnaire responses

**Component 1 Questionnaire and analysis**

We know that you are very busy but hope you will be able to take about 15 minutes to complete this questionnaire that will assist in the Terminal Evaluation of the **GEF IW: LEARN/CTI:**

Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia-Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes Project.

All responses are confidential and when reported they will be aggregated and not ascribed to any individual or organisation. Answer the questions as best you can and leave questions blank that are not relevant to you or your organisation.

We are looking specifically at Component 1 that was coordinated by the Global Forum (GOF),through the secretariat–International Coastal and Ocean Organization (ICO). The objectives of this Component were to:

*foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, & partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals & the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, & SIDS, & in response to new ocean issues.*

As you will know the activities have involved a large number of meetings and fora often in partnership with various other organisations to plan, and strategize in order to advance the ocean agenda and issues.

The meetings have included:

* World Ocean Conference, 2009 Manado, Indonesia
* Global Oceans Conference, 2010, Paris
* Ocean Days @ Rio+20 2012 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
* Ocean days and side meetings at CBD COP Nagoya, Japan
* Ocean days and side meetings around climate change meetings including UNFCCC COP, Copenhagen, Denmark; Cancun, Mexico; Durban South Africa.
* Various UN meetings related to Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), and
* Various activities to increase government capacity in the lead up to Rio+20.

**11 Responded out of 22 contacted** *Number of responses in parenthesis*

1. What organisation did you represent (answer more than one if relevant)?

* National Government (1)
* SIDS
* NGO (4)
* University & research Inst. (4)

Intergovernmental organisation (2)

Regional Organisation

Private Sector

Local Government (1)

1. List the meetings/activities that you were involved in;

* World Ocean Conference, 2009 Manado, Indonesia (8)
* Global Oceans Conference, 2010, Paris (10)
* Ocean Days @ Rio+20 2012 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (5)
* Ocean days and side meetings at CBD COP Nagoya, Japan (3)
* Ocean days and side meetings around climate change meetings including (8)

UNFCCC COP, Copenhagen, Denmark; Cancun, Mexico; Durban South Africa. (6)

* Various UN meetings related to Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas (6)

Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), and

* Various activities to increase government capacity in the lead up to Rio+20. (3)

1. How relevant have the meetings/activities been towards advancing the goals of sustainable use and development of the ocean? (Rate using a scale of 1-5 where 1 is not relevant and 5 is highly relevant) \_**4.9 (n=10)**

***Quotes****: The series of meetings and activities have provided a structured process for engaging and building the capacity, knowledge and commitment of diverse partners (intergovernmental orgs, govts, NGOs, academia, etc) to separately and severally advocate for advancing a collective ocean/coasts/islands agenda.*

1. Please give examples where appropriate of how the meetings activities have increased:

* 1. critical thinking
* Discuss high priority issues
* Multiple perspectives & multiple ideas
* Cutting edge issues
* Big picture, holistic & integrative
* Various actors from heads of state and high level policy makers to NGOs & communities

***Quotes****: The Ocean Forum has become a unique space for presenting, analyzing, and discussing all the relevant ocean, coasts and island topics. Most of any other meetings focus on a single topic missing the big picture and therefore conducting to partial outcomes. The holistic and integrated approach provided at each one of the Ocean Forum meetings drives parties and participants to critical thinking that result in insightful conclusions and propositions.*

* 1. Creative learning
* Objective & strategy of meetings is to create an atmosphere of learning leading to capacity building
* Increased knowledge of policies
* Science input useful for policy makers
* Learning about other experiences
* Diversity of participants
  1. Partnerships
* GOF itself is a dynamic partnership
* All meetings plan for and facilitate partnerships
* GOF facilitates various organisations to take lead e.g. Indonesia (Manado mtg), Korea (green economy), Mexico & South Africa (climate change), Seychelles (climate change)
* High diversity of participants facilitates alliances, collaboration & coordination

***Quotes***: *The GOF de facto provides the only truly multistakeholder forum on oceans and complements and value adds to former mechanisms for ocean science and policy under the UN.*

*Since it's birth, the Ocean Forum has become a permanent participant of the most relevant International meetings that creat opportunities for interactions for an increasing number of participants from different levels of government; academia; NGOs; private sector, UN Agencies; and Funding institutions. When this meetings take place, participants always find the proper environment that ultimately results in alliances, coordination, collaboration, as well as partnership opportunities.*

1. At the meetings and activities has there been:

* 1. increased involvement of SIDS ? Yes (**9**)
  2. Increased involvement of SIDS issues in ocean policy discussions? Yes (**9**)
  3. Give examples or comments
* There has been participation and involvement but difficult to measure whether there has been increased participation
* SIDS leaders have been involved as session chairs
* SIDS issues especially related to climate change---vulnerability, coastal disasters, climate refugees,
* Increased involvement of AOSIS
* Some countries i.e. Seychelles have played central role in multistake holder dialogues on climate change
* Korea will fund capacity building among SIDS

**Quotes:**

*GOF has been instrumental in influencing the global discourse and nudging forward an increasingly coherent and comprehensive future-oriented climate smart, green-economy/blue-society, low-to-zero-carbon renewable energy transforming healthy ecosystem-service productive agenda on ocean issues,*

*There was active involvement of SIDS in the various meetings, within and outside the framework of the UNFCCC and CBD COPs and in the Rio+20 process, e.g., regional SIDS preparatory meetings, statements made by SIDS at the informal-informals, intersessionals, and PrepCom meetings; side-events were organized by SIDS at the Rio+20 Conference, and there was a significant number of ocean-related Rio+20 voluntary commitments led by SIDS in the “Oceans and Seas, SIDS” and "Climate Change" categories, namely:*

* *Laying the Foundations of an Ocean Economy (Mauritius)*
* *Signature of Cooperation Agreements between the IOC, and SPREP and IOC and 5Cs (Indian Ocean Commission, South Pacific Regional Program for Environment (SPREP) and the Community Center of Caribbean States for Climate Change (CCCCC))*
* *Smart Island Strategy—Government of Aruba (Government of Aruba, New America Foundation, Carbon War Room)*
* *Barbados Declaration – Voluntary Commitment by Island Governments (22 in total)*

1. Give examples of new ocean issues that have been moved on to the Global Ocean Policy agenda.

* Climate change including coastal vulnerability and environmental refugees, ocean acidification (not on agenda before the Manado Meeting), oceans as climate regulators and blue carbon;
* ABNJ—the endorsement at the Manado meeting lead to the GEF council approving a new program
* Large Marine Ecosystems (LME)
* Ecosystem based management (EBM)

If you were involved in the capacity building/strategizing meetings leading up RIO +20 and /or Oceans Day at Rio+20 please answer the following questions.

1. List your involvement—

participant, session organisers, presenter, steering committee , and working groups

1. How relevant were the meetings/activities in assisting your government or organisation in participating in Rio+20 and ensuring the ocean outcomes were represented in the sustainable development outcomes of the conference. (Rate using a scale of 1-5 where 1 is not relevant and 5 is highly relevant).\_\_\_**4.9**\_\_(n=9)
2. Give specific examples of how the meetings/activities assisted?

* GOF also benefited from the meetings as these were used to sharpen the recommendations on specific issues
* High level (Heads of State) officials attended and were educated
* Scientists presentations as sited policy deliberations
* Instrumental in facilitating learning on multiple perspectives
* Integrated approach to climate change
* The Road to Rio meetings provided venue for government, IGOs & NGOs to firm up alliances to support the Ocean agenda at Rio+20

*Quotes: These meetings were instrumental in learning about and understanding the multiple perspectives by different constituencies on ocean matters, some of which of a controversial nature because of their emerging on unresolved nature.*

1. How useful was the summary and report card “*How Well are we Doing on the Major Ocean Commitments”* (Rate using a scale of 1-5 where 1 is not relevant and 5 is highly relevant) **4.8***\_ (n=8)*
2. Any other comments or issues?

**Major Benefits**

* The Report card was used as a chapter in a UNESCO publication Focus oceans & coast into National Policy
* Assisted capacity building of governments (e.g. Vietnam, Indonesia, Korea, Japan)
* Crucial role in moving forward the ocean agenda
* Inclusive and brings diverse people together
* A big tent but can lack focus.

*GOF has also graciously contributed to building the leadership capacity of ocean state governments, by providing the enabling support necessary for a succession of govts to take the lead as global convenors around priority regional & national ocean issues; for example Vietnam on climate issues in hosting the Global Conf on Oceans, Coasts & Islands, Indonesia with Bintan process around World Ocean Conf, Korea as champion of ocean-linked innovation in advancing global green economy, Japan as host for Nagoya Ocean Day at CBD, & all the UNFCCC Ocean Day host countries as advocates for embedding the ocean agenda.*

*After most of the topics, considerations, and goals contained in Chapter 17 of Agenda 21 were ignored in the outcomes from Johannesbourg, as well as from Rio +20 ; the Ocean Forum has become the only organization that systematically and science-based  deals with ocean,coasts and islands issues, needs, risks, vulnerabilities, lessons learnt exchanging, creative policy proposals designing, governance building and decision-making processes in a comprehensive, holistic and integrated approach.*

*Given the fact that The Ocean Forum comprehends parties from every continent and region of the world, it is considered the most important organization outside the UN to enhance States involvement in ocean agendas that actually produces good useful, qualitative and quantitative results at both international and domestic levels. A project such as the Ocean Forum should become permanent to ensure that the ocean agenda is not forgotten, undermined, or misrepresented at any of the international related meetings.*

*The organization is effective, it brings people together, is inclusive and produces results.*

*The global ocean forum is truly the only tent that gathers groups together that is not highly partisan…that is both its value and its weak spot….it is a big tent—which is good---but also lacks focus which can make it difficult to document accomplishments*

**Questionnaires and analysis for Component 2**

1. ***IWC5 Meeting & Organisation***

Dear All and greetings to those I know personally.

I am the team leader for the Terminal Evaluation of the **GEF IW:LEARN/CTI;** Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia-Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes Project.

 I am soliciting your input to the accomplishments of one of the components coordinated by IW:LEARN. I know you all are very busy, and your involvement was a few years ago but I hope you will be able to take about 5-10 minutes to answer the following questions. As unfortunately I am on a very tight time frame I would appreciate that your response is returned to me by 27 June. All responses are confidential and when reported they will be aggregated and not ascribed to any individual or organisation.

 One of the main activities of this component was the planning, organisation and implementation of the IWC5 Meeting in Cairns Australia in 2009. You were involved in the steering committee and participated in the meeting. All reports including the participant evaluation and the Mid Term Review of IW:LEARN suggested this was a successful event. In this Terminal Evaluation I am trying to identify examples of **longer term** Outcomes and Impacts of this meeting.

Thank you for your assistance. I would appreciate if you can very briefly answer the following:

*Very limited formal response but additional comments received from members of organising committee via Skype & other email exchanges have been added.* ***N=5***

1. Can you give any examples of increased exchange of knowledge and expertise as a result of IWC5?

*IWC5 (Oct 2009) provided practical examples in linking freshwater and marine & coastal resources management across national & regional boundaries. The field visit to the Great Barrier Reef, relationship of ground water systems with the oceans, etc.  demonstrated contribution of land-based sourced pollution, tourism, and fishing pressures on environmental degradation including climatic variability and change.  Knowledge on replication of improved management practices and effective public-private partnerships to country context are important considerations for practical application.*

*Exchanges in knowledge and expertise as a  result of IWC5 include  (i) dialogues on mainstreaming climatic variability and change; (ii)  participation of technical working groups, practitioners/researchers/scientists in the world coral reef conferences; (iii) transboundary cooperation in ecosystem based management through CTI, PEMSEA, Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecosystem, ATSEA, COREMAP, &  BIMP-EAGA initiatives in fisheries and food security, youth camp on coastal and marine resources management and climate change adaptation, global conference on land-ocean connections,  etc.; (iv) cross regional training, and local/district level meetings on common issues.  Some of these activities are also featured in the website:* [*www.ctknetworg.org*](mailbox://C:/Users/ken/AppData/Roaming/Thunderbird/Profiles/mlnflu3a.default/Mail/pop.gmail-1.com/www.ctknetworg.org) *with calendar of events cited and shared globally.*

*it was indeed a great conference but I am not sure if it has actually resulted in any of the outcomes and impacts you list - just the usual networking and lessons sharing at the conference itself*

2.    Are there any other examples of outcomes and impacts from IWC5 visa vie?:

 a.    Coral Triangle Initiative;

*The design of the ADB-GEF RETAs on CTI were informed by IWC5 and its linkages to GOF supported by GEF. Efforts were also coordinated among multiple agencies in the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation considerations into development plans and programs, creation of national coordination bodies for climate change.  Momentum picked-up on research/ modeling effects of climate change on food security (e.g. IFPRI study on Future Prospects and Adaptation Strategies for the Fisheries Sector under Climate Change in the Pacific Coral Triangle Countries; Climate Change Adaptation Strategies for Coastal Communities of the Pacific-Coral Triangle Countries: Knowledge Generation, Investments, Policy Outreach and Setting Priorities) and development of tools on vulnerability mapping, habitat mapping, supply chains by CT Atlas, World Fish Center, AIMS, WWF, TNC, FAO  etc.*

b.    Australian Government Involvement;

* Considerable Australian contributions from government, institutions and private sector;
* Contributed to strong Australian commitment to CTI and strong Australian support on Ocean issues at the GEF council

c.    Other UN agencies, NGOs, or other organisations.

* Incorporation of considerations to mainstream climatic variability and change into all GEF projects subsequent to the IWC5...this was the theme, objective and purpose of the meeting.

3.    Any Other Comments

* A detailed evaluation at the end of IWC5 rated the meeting (26% response rate) found a high ranking for a successful meeting and applicable to their work.
* A follow up survey was carried out in 2013 to determine what had been implemented one year after attending IWC5 but the response rate was very very low.

**Component 2 Learning Exchange Questionnaire**

 I am soliciting your input to the accomplishments of one of the components coordinated by IW:LEARN. I know you all are very busy, but I hope you will be able to take about 5-10 minutes to answer the following questions. As unfortunately I am on a very tight time frame I would appreciate that your response is returned to me by 27 June. All responses are confidential and when reported they will be aggregated and not ascribed to any individual or organisation.

You were involved in either a project to project twinning or a stakeholder learning exchange. I am trying to identify examples of **longer term** Outcomes and Impacts of these activities.

Thank you for your assistance. I would appreciate if you can very briefly answer the following:

*Very low response rate (***N= 3)** *and many of the email addresses where no longer valid.*

*Quotes are in italics.*

1. What twinning or exchange event were you were involved in and what dates?

***Not documented to retain confidentiality given low # of respondents.***

1. Give up to 3 examples of important knowledge, lessons or expertise that were exchanged by this activity.

* Analytical tools for Valuation
* Information on how other GEF Projects have used these tools
* Information on ECE Water Convention
* Discussion on twinning Asian projects

*Broad multi-sectoral projects based at the LME level require strategies to fill the gap between expectations and actual funding level. The formation and maintenance of a number of important strategic alliances and partnerships can be successful in doing this but the considerable time commitment and funding required to make the partnerships work, needs to be recognised.*

*Regional cooperation on shared fish stocks in the Indonesian Seas region is critical for the future sustainable development of fisheries in the different LMEs. Promoting cooperation and coordination, however, is costly and politically sensitive in some cases. An incremental approach to build up confidence and trust is essential.*

*MPAs as a common tool for protecting and enhancing marine habitats are also an effective tool for fisheries management, although in the past the objectives of developing MPAs have not often considered both habitats (biodiversity conservation) and fisheries, especially the fishing communities impacted by the MPA. This is a high priority area for all projects.*

1. Give up to 3 examples of how this activity has assisted your project.

* Provided information on value of GCLME for Policy advocacy
* Provided Forum for dissemination of GCLME outputs

*The one-day workshop on “Learning exchange and twinning program of the Indonesian Seas Large Marine Ecosystems: promote exchange among the projects” was a very interesting and worthwhile exercise. Knowledge and experience was shared on important technical topics (coastal and marine environment conservation and fisheries management; e.g. stock assessment, EAF, MPAs, oceanography, marine pollution etc.) and on procedural/operational topics (TDA-SAP process, governance, project administration, implementation and management). These have been distilled into a series of “lessons learned”.*

1. Give up to 3 examples of how this activity has assisted you personally.

*Improved understanding of the economics of ecosystems services.*

*This activity has assisted me in linking with former colleagues and meeting new colleagues in coastal and marine resources/fisheries management, in knowing the challenges in working with implementing and executing agencies, and in learning that there are kindred spirits across the seas.*

*The twinning has been an opportunity to strengthen the existing network of colleagues and to make new contacts.*

1. Any Other Comments

*IW:LEARN is very useful for information exchange between various regional projects*

*The staff of IW:LEARN is commendable in applying the concept of non-formal education, by pairing similar projects, that will allow the exchange of knowledge of subject matter and of lessons from experiential learning between project staff.*

*Lessons learned were applied to the brainstorming on a new “Indonesian Sea LME”, a large area of the Indonesian archipelagic waters not yet covered by a holistic / comprehensive project. It was recommended that for the new envisaged project: This new project is now under development (PIF and PPG approved by GEF). The results of the twinning were then presented at the Asia Conference on Oceans, Food Security and Blue Growth (ACOFB).*

**Component 3 Evaluation Questionnaire**

Presented below is the evaluation questionnaire in the form distributed to a total of 39 RETA 7307 stakeholders:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Terminal evaluation of ADB RETA 7307 (Regional Cooperation on Knowledge Management, Policy and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative)**

**1-30 June 2014**

The questionnaire is directed principally at RETA 7307’s four outputs and only obliquely at the Project’s longer term impacts. The phrasing of questions deliberately departs from the wording of RETA 7307 documentation (esp. its design and monitoring framework) in order to encourage a fresh look at the implementation experience.

Partner collaboration and shared financing feature strongly In CTI. In answering, please attempt –difficult as it may be in some cases—to address the contribution of ADB TA project (RETA 7307) only. Please type in your replies, don’t forget to enter the scores, and kindly e-mail the completed questionnaire back to me. Please do not hesitate to venture outside the questionnaire if you feel there are important things to say about RETA 7307 that the questionnaire does not capture.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

How successful do you consider the Project (RETA 7307) to be in terms of:

(a) Contribution to strengthened CTI cooperation

a.1 Which were, in your view, RETA 7307’s most useful contributions to improved regional cooperation? And the less useful or less effective? Please rank the following 1-5 where 5 is the most useful/effective and 1 the least useful/effective contribution to improved regional cooperation.

Support to the Interim Regional Secretariat Ranking: XX

Hosting of regional workshops Ranking: XX

Championing a regional approach to knowledge management Ranking: XX

Other (please specify) ………………………………………… Ranking: XX

a.2 Thanks largely (or in part?) to RETA 7307, CT6 countries: (please rank the answers 1-5 where 5 indicates strong agreement):

More effectively share scientific and other CTI-relevant information Ranking: XX

More actively engage in CTI-relevant adaptive learning Ranking: XX

a.3 Any other observations (positive or negative) on regional cooperation

……………………………………………………………..

*Overall rating of RETA 7307’s contribution to improved regional coop. Rating (1-5): XX*

(b) Establishment of CTI regional and country learning mechanisms

b.1 To what extent has the Project helped identify and address information and learning needs (Rank 1 to 5 in terms of impact)

- at a CT-wide (regional) level Ranking: XX

- at a country or your organization’s level Ranking: XX

b.2 With RETA 7307 now completed, would you say (please rank 1 to 5 as above) that CTI stakeholders are

Better informed in their CTI-relevant areas of professional or civic

responsibility Ranking: XX

Better able to engage in continuous learning (and do so on a

regional basis) Ranking: XX

Better able to turn this RETA-acquired knowledge to practical use? Ranking: XX

b.3 Are the knowledge management processes, promoted by RETA 7307, firmly embedded (Rank 5) or tenuously embedded (rank less than 5) in the work of

-your organization Ranking: XX

-country institutions Ranking: XX

- regional institutions or mechanisms Ranking: XX

b.4 Any other observations (positive or negative) on regional learning mechanisms

…………………………………………………………………..

*Overall rating on establishment of CTI learning mechanisms Rating (1-5): XX*

(c ) Communication and dissemination activities

c.1. Do you, at the close of RETA 7307, consider the CTI communication and dissemination activities to be anchored in a clear plan or be conducted in an “as needed” or opportunity-driven manner (Rank 5 for the most structured approach) Ranking: XX

c.2. Among those promoted by RETA 7307, which have been the most effective components of the Project’s communication and dissemination activities? (Please rank 5 the most effective)

Websites (which ones?) Ranking: XX

State of Coral Triangle reports Ranking: XX

Economics and sustainable finance-related products (PES, EFACT) Ranking: XX

Other (please specify)……………………………. Ranking: XX

c.3 Any other observations (positive or negative) on communications and information dissemination

……………………………………………

*Overall rating of RETA 7307 on communication and dissemination action Rating (1-5): XX*

(d ) Contribution to sustainable financing of CTI activities

d.1 Which of RETA 7307 activities linked to the question of financing of regional and country plans of action do you consider the most useful/successful? (Rank 5 for the most useful/successful)

PES-related work Ranking: XX

EFACT study Ranking: XX

Identification of financing gaps under NPOAs Ranking: XX

Other (please specify)………………………………………… Ranking: XX

d.2. Would you say that at least in part (or mainly?) thanks to RETA 7307, CT6 countries have (Rank 5 if you strongly agree)

A significantly better appreciation of the scale of financing needs Ranking: XX

Greater ability to quantify their financing needs Ranking: XX

Better understanding of different mechanisms of financing national

and regional plans of action? Ranking: XX

d.3 Any other observations (positive and negative) of sustainable financing of CTI

……………………………...

*Overall rating of RETA 7307 on contribution to CTI sustainable financing Rating (1-5): XX*

(e) Any other observations on the RETA 7307 experience (relevance? cost effectiveness? Anything else?)

…………………………………

Thank you very much

**Component 3 Analysis of questionnaire responses**

Activities or results of RETA 7307 ranked by respondents 1-5 where 5 is the most useful/effective/successful and 1 the least useful/effective/successful.

RETA 7307’s main output categories (enhanced regional cooperation, establishment of regional learning mechanisms, information dissemination plan, sustainable financing) are rated 1-5 in terms of perceived achievements.

A total of 39 invitations to participate in the interview were sent by 22 June 2014 based on the list in Annex 2. As of 28 June 2014, 11 replies had been received, of which 6 were from government respondents and 5 from non-government respondents. In view of the smallness of the sample the original intention to refine the results by different categories of stakeholders was abandoned and a single score has been established for the entire group. The analysed responses exclude those by RETA implementation consultants.

As the rating scale chosen for the questionnaire was 1 to 5 while the UNDP/GEF performance evaluation scale is 1 to 6[[1]](#footnote-1), the scores of the former were brought in line with the latter by multiplying them by 1.2 (=6/5). We leave aside some of the methodological complexities of that operation and caution against assuming perfect correspondence between the two evaluation scales.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \_ | All stakeholders  (n=30) | Philippines  (n=7) | Indonesia  (n=3) | Malaysia  (n=2) | PNG  (n=2) | Solomon Isl.  (n=3) | Timor Leste  (n=2) | Govt. stakeholders  (n=8) | Non-govt.  Stakeholrs  (n=12) |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Elements of Output category 1* |  | | | | | | | | |
| Support to the Interim Regional Secretariat | 3.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hosting of regional workshops | 3.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Championing regional approach to KM | 3.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More effective sharing of scientific and other CTI-relevant information | 4.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More active engagement by stakeholders in CTI-relevant adaptive learning | 3.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1: RETA 7307’s contribution to enhanced regional cooperation.** | **3.71** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Elements of Output category 2:* |  | | | | | | | | |
| Addressing information and learning needs at a regional level | 3.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Addressing information and learning needs at a country level | 3.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Making CTI stakeholders better informed in their area of responsibility | 3.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Making CTI stakeholders better prepared to engage in continuous learning | 3.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Making CTI stakeholders better able to turn RETA 7307activities to practical use | 3.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Embedding CTI-relevant learning processes in the work of organizations | 3.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Embedding CTI-relevant learning processes in the work of country institutions | 3.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Embedding CTI-relevant learning processes in the work of regional institutions or mechanisms | 3.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2: RETA 7307’s contribution to CTI learning mechanisms** | **3.60** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Elements of Output category 3:* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Giving a firmer structure to communication and information dissemination | 3.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development of website(s) | 3.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completion and distribution of State of Coral Triangle reports | 4.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation and dissemination of economics-related material (EFACT, PES) | 4.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3: Contribution to communication and information dissemination action** | **3.92** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Elements of Output category 4:* |  | | | | | | | | |
| Usefulness of PES-related outputs | 3.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usefulness of EFACT outputs | 3.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usefulness of costing of national plans of action | 4.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Better appreciation of the scale of financing needs | 3.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greater ability to quantify financing needs | 3.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Better understanding of different financial mechanisms of financing national and regional plans of action | 3.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 4: Contribution to sustainable financing of CTI plans of action** | **3.71** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Combined rating of RETA 7307a** () | **3.73** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: a simple average of the ratings of the four output categories . “n” denotes the number of respondents in each group

Given the statistical nature of the evaluation conducted and a very coarse interpretation to be given to each questionnaire score (unlike in the UNDP/GEF approach) we interpret the results as indicating about an average degree of satisfaction with RETA 7307’s contribution. This is a somewhat blunt and “unexciting” result but as a minimum it contains a degree of reassurance that the Project efforts were not wasted. If there is a pattern emerging it is the high appreciation of the State of the Coral Triangle reporting.

**Major donor-funded CTI regional projects and programs**

The performance of the IW:LEARN/CTI Project (of which RETA 7307 is a component) cannot be assessed adequately without taking into account the full range of recent and ongoing regional projects and programs not all of which are formally linked to CTI yet pursue similar objectives. This proliferation helps explain the integrating intent of the IW:LEARN/CTI. Shared understanding of, and learning from, a wide range of IW-type projects –and uniting CTI with the rest of the IW global portfolio-- was the principal objective of Component 2 of IW:LEARN/CTI. As to Component 3 of IW:LEARN/CTI (i.e. ADB RETA 7307), its knowledge management core had a similar integrating intent even if, at times, the Component found it useful to step out of its CTI boundaries and cast the net more widely. This was the case, for instance, in mainstreaming into CTI some of the lessons of sustainable financing or approaches to using particular financing mechanisms (such as PES).

Once country-level initiatives in each of the CT6 countries are added to regional programs, the picture (and the integrating task) become even more complex. One of the virtues of the National Plans of Action (NOPAs) prepared at the outset of CTI was to have also listed (usually in an appendix) activities being implemented at the country level only. This was an important reminder of the fact that new initiatives such as CTI are superimposed on, or added to, an array of existing (or recent) investment-, training- and research activities in each country. These in turn help determine the degree to which each country can respond to the new challenges introduced by CTI. In the present evaluation it also raises the problem of attributing outcomes and impacts to where they are due. Some of RETA 7307 outcomes (to the extent they can be established so soon after the Project’s completion) will almost certainly have reflected the contribution of other initiatives, whether formally embedded into the CTI or outside its formal structure.

Listed below first are the principal CTI-relevant regional activities. “Regional” is understood here to mean an activity involving more than a single CT6 country. In a number of cases, activities are co-financed (true especially of projects by GEF implementing agencies, but also of some projects and programs supported by major bilateral development agencies).

**ADB**(alone or with co-financing)

*Strengthening Sound Environmental Management in the Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines East ASEAN Growth Area* (RETA 6446, 2008-2014, GEF co-financing). Wide scope; marine resources one of the component. <http://www.adb.org/projects/41075-012/main>. RETA 6446 is the umbrella TA under which the various CTI TAs (RETA 7307 and RETA 7813) were designed as part of the proposed regional environment program, in which CTI is one of the main components. Among other things, RETA 6446 supported the preparation of the 2011 Comprehensive Action Plans of the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion (SSME), a subset of the whole CT region. (<http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/ssme-action-plans.pdf>). The SSME Action Plan is partly aligned with the CTI Regional Plan of Action.

*Coastal Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle - Southeast Asia* (“CTI-SEA”) RETA 7813. GEF co-financing. 2012-2016. Involving Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia to improve management in the Sulu-Sulawesi priority seascape. TA activities linked to the implementation of the CTI national plans of action. Loan project expected to follow. <http://www.adb.org/projects/44113-012/main>

*Developing Sustainable Alternative Livelihoods in Coastal Fishing Communities in the Coral Triangle: Indonesia and the Philippines* (2014–2017). JFPR-financed project in East Kalimantan (Indonesia) and Balabac Islands, Palawan (Philippines) <http://www.adb.org/projects/44129-012/details>

*Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management of the Coral Triangle in the Pacific*, Design Phase I 2008-2009 as RETA 6471, Implementation Phase II 2010-2013 as RETA 7753.Emphasis on climate adaptation in PNG, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Timor Leste. Co-financed by GEF and Australian Government. $18.5 million. In part a follow up on ADB’s *Climate Change Adaptation Project for the Pacific (CLIMAP)* finished in 2005 involving Federated States of Micronesia, Cook Islands and other PIDCs.<http://www.adb.org/projects/43427-012/main>

**World Bank** (with co-financing)

*Capturing Coral Reef and Related Ecosystem Services* (CCRES) (co-financed by GEF and Australia with parallel financing out of COREMAP-CTI—see below-- and Rural Development Project in the Philippines). To design innovative models for valuing mangrove, sea grass and coral reef ecosystems services in Indonesia and the Philippines.<http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P123933/capturing-coral-reef-ecosystem-services-ccres?lang=en>

**UNDP**(with GEF co-financing; only projects other than IW:LEARN/CTI project evaluated in this document are listed)

*Arafura-Timor Seas Ecosystem Action Program* (“ATSEA”): “To undertake a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), develop a Strategic Action Programme (SAP), and implement innovative demonstration projects….strengthen ATS Expert Forum… and….(foster)…regional cooperation” [www.atsea-program.org](http://www.atsea-program.org)

*Sulu Celebes Sea Regional Fisheries Management Project*(sometimes referred to as Sustainable Fisheries Management Project for the SCS-LME or Sulu-Celebes/Sulawesi Large Marine Ecosystem (SCS-LME)) (2010- ) “to improve the condition of fisheries and their habitats in the Sulu-Celebes Sea (Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion) through an integrated, collaborative and participatory management at the local, national and tri-national levels. …to formulate a Strategic Action Program (SAP), based on the existing Conservation Plan for the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion. Run from DENR Philippines. <http://www.ssme-fishproject.org/>

See the Regional Strategic Action Program for the Sulu-Celebes Sea <http://iwlearn.net/news/signing-of-sulu-celebes-sap-indonesia-malaysia-and-philippines-commit-to-sustain-shared-fisheries-resources/image/image_view_fullscreen>

*West Pacific East Asia Fisheries Management Project* (WPEA) (2010-2013) Objective: to extend the jurisdiction of the West Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) to East Asia for highly migratory species. See final evaluation <file:///C:/Users/ivan/Downloads/WPEA%20Terminal%20Evaluation%20FINAL%20ver%20Jan%2017.pdf>

*Partnership for Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia* (PEMSEA) GEF-cofinancing in three phases. Strategic Partnership with WB-Investment Fund. Started in 1994 as Prevention and Management of Marine Pollution in the East Asian Seas (SDS-SEA). Phase II (1999-2007) hosted by DENR Philippines. In 2006, PEMSEA transformed from a project–based arrangement into a

self-sustained, regional collaborative mechanism with the mandate to pursue the implementation

of regional marine strategy, the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of

East Asia (SDS-SEA). 12 partners. “To help turn knowledge into action”.[www.pemsea.org](http://www.pemsea.org)

*Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific Small Island Developing States* (2000-2005), implemented by SPREP.<http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/530/@@gefonlineview.html>

*Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project* (2005- 2011)<http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/2131>

With UNEP:

*Sustainable Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Pacific SIDS*

Under the GEF-sponsored Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (PAS). PAS Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in the Pacific Island Countries.[www.pacific-iwrm.org/](http://www.pacific-iwrm.org/)

**Other UN organizations**

*Reduction of Environmental Impact from Tropical Shrimp Trawling, through the Introduction of Bycatch Reduction Technologies and Change of Management* (“REBYC”); GEF financed, FAO-implemented 2002-2008. To improve trawl fishing, reduce by-trash fish, reduce IUU catch. mainly in Indonesia and the Philippines. With SEAFDEC involvement. <http://www.fao.org/fishery/gefshrimp/en>

*Strategies for Trawl Fisheries Bycatch Management* (“REBYC-II CTI”), 2012-Indonesia, Philippines, PNG, Thailand, Vietnam; GEF-funded, FAO-implemented. See <http://www.fao.org/fishery/topic/16920/en>

UNEP and its Regional Seas Program (<http://www.unep.org/regionalseas>)

UNESCO, especially various programs of its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission ([www.ioc-unesco.org](http://www.ioc-unesco.org))

**USAID**

*Coral Triangle Support Program (USCTI) and Partnership (CTSP)* (2008-2013)

USCTI was designed to facilitate the Coral Triangle countries’ implementation of the CTI Regional Plan of Action through assistance from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a Program Integrator contract, and the Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP). The majority of the funding supported the CTSP, a consortium of NGOs that included the World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy, and Conservation International. The program works with other donors including the Government of Australia and the Asian Development Bank. $42 mil $.Involves a large number of different projects in CT6 countries as well as activities regional in character (e.g. support to CTI Secretariat, support given to CTI working groups, etc.).Overlap (cross-fertilization?) with RETA 7307 activities. Large number of outputs many with regional applicability (e.g. support to Coral Triangle Atlas, Early Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation. Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Toolkit for Coastal Systems, Coral Triangle Marine Protection Areas System Framework and Action Plan, development of monitoring and evaluation indicators etc.). Possible next phase currently under consideration. [www.uscti.org](http://www.uscti.org)

**Germany**

*Support to the Implementation of the Tri-national Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Comprehensive Action Plan (SSME) Project* funded by BMUB 2012-2017, Implemented by GIZ working with DENR, MMAF, MOSTI in Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia respectively. To foster closer cooperation within the SSME region as well as the promotion of a cross-border network of marine protected areas .”.to jointly develop climate-relevant regional planning and development plans and successfully implement them” (and),,,” to consolidate cooperation within the SSME action plan”. Complements the UNDP/GEF Sulu Celebes Sea Regional Fisheries Management Project (see above under UNDP)

**Country-level projects**

Examples of major recent or new country-level projects and programs sharing CTI objectives or explicitly contributing to them include:

Philippines

*Integrated Coastal Resources Management* ADB, GEF cofinancing, 2007–2013) implemented in provinces and municipalities surrounding marine biodiversity corridors of national and global signiﬁcance. Seven priority marine biodiversity corridors and ecosystems covering 80 municipalities in the provinces of Cagayan, Cebu, Davao Oriental, Masbate, Romblon, Siquijor, and Zambales. Loan $33.8 million<http://www.adb.org/projects/33276-013/main>

*Integrated Natural Resources and Environmental Management*( ADB, 2013-2019) Ridge-to-reef management of coastal pollution. Loan $120 mil contains a major climate resilience strengthening component. <http://www.adb.org/projects/41220-013/main>

*Adaptation to Climate Change in Coastal Areas (“ACCCoast”).* Funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) under its International Climate Initiative. GIZ-implemented 2011-2014. To strengthen the capacity of DENR in Marine Protected Areas’ (MPAs) governance by supporting the implementation of the Philippine contribution to the Coral Triangle Initiative as delineated in the Philippine National Plan of Action (PNPoA). ACCCoast supports the coordination of the development of national climate change adaptation strategies and the implementation of selected measures to protect and increase the resiliency of the coastal environment and communities. <http://acccoast.bmb.gov.ph/>

*Protected Area Management Enhancement.*Financed by BMUB, GIZ-implemented. Until now only 50 of the 228 terrestrial and marine Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) identified thus far are afforded sufficient levels of legal protection while 41 areas are only partially protected and the majority, comprising 137 areas, as yet receive no protection at all. Objective: to improve the management of 60 existing protected areas and established 100 further terrestrial and marine protected areas in selected KBAa. Enahnce DENR skills, establish co-management (DENR-local authorities). <http://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/18221.html>

*Conservation and rehabilitation of coastal ecosystems*, BMUB financed, GIZ implemented 2011-2014. Policy advice support and capacity development for DENR, particularly to promote the Coastal and Marine Management Office. It also helps to develop the capacity of local bodies including cities, municipalities and provinces to improve the management of marine protected areas and the factors that impact these areas. This includes regulated fishing in coastal waters, sustainable use of water catchment areas, and reduction of pollutant levels.<http://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/18210.html>

A large number of Philippine projects funded under USAID CTSP (see [www.uscti.org](http://www.uscti.org) )

Indonesia

*Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program* (COREMAP-CTI)World Bank, ADB and GEF). The latest phase (2014-2018) of a program started in 1998. The design of COREMAP-CTI was partly funded by ADB TA 7813. The first phase (COREMAP I) established a viable framework for a national coral reef management system in Indonesia. The second phase (COREMAP II) consolidated the knowledge base and adopted a community-based approach tor decentralized coral reef management and built strong public awareness on coral reef conservation. ADB and World Bank project completion reports for Phase II ([www.adb.org/projects/project.asp?id=32176](http://www.adb.org/projects/project.asp?id=32176) and<http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?pagePK=51351038&piPK=51351152&theSitePK=40941&projid=P036048>) described lessons learned incorporated in the COREMAP-CTI Project design.

A large number of Indonesia projects supported under US Coral Triangle Support Partnership ([www.uscti.org](http://www.uscti.org)) .

****

1. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)