**UNDP-GEF TE Management Response**

**Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States: Pacific Islands Offshore Fisheries Management Project – PIOFM-II 67**

Project Title: Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States: Pacific Islands Offshore Fisheries Management Project – PIOFM-II

Project PIMS #: 4607

GEF Project ID (PMIS) #: 4746

Terminal Evaluation Review Mission Completion Date: NA

Date of Issue of Management Response:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Prepared by: | *UNDP Pacific Office, Suva, Fiji* |
| Contributors: | *Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Solomon; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome; UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji; UNDP-GEF RTA; the MTR team and the Project Steering Committee* |
| Cleared by: | *UNDP Pacific Office, UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Steering Committee* |

**Context, background and findings**

The Pacific Island OFMP-II was implemented to support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries. The project at a global scale was expected to provide the following environmental benefits such as: creating a multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters; restore and sustain marine ecosystems goods and services, including globally relevant biodiversity; reduce vulnerability to climate variability and climate-related risks. To achieve the objective and global environmental benefits identified, the project was designed into three technical components to address at different three levels – regional, sub-regional, and national, plus a component designed to provide for stakeholder’s participation and knowledge management. Through this mechanism, the project was able to: a) support Pacific SIDS as the major bloc at the WCPFC to adopt regional conservation and management measures; b) support innovative approaches being developed by Pacific SIDS at sub-regional level as they collaborate in fisheries of common interest; and c) assists SIDS to apply measures nationally in their own waters and to their fleets, a major component of the Project and improve understanding and awareness generally of the challenges and opportunities facing Pacific SIDS in oceanic fisheries management.

Below in summary is the objective and outcome; the progress towards these is measured through the following indicators:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project relative to the baseline (unless specified otherwise)** |
| Project Objective:  To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement & effectively enforce global, regional & sub-regional arrangements for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries | Number of Pacific SIDS meeting WCPFC obligations    Level of benefits to Pacific SIDS, including:  a) access fee revenue &  b) employment by gender | All Pacific SIDS’ subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and license conditions aligned with WCPFC requirements & systematic processes in place in all Pacific SIDS for adoption of new measures.  Employment in SIDS growing by up to 5% per year. with increasing proportion of women  Access fees increasing by up to 10% per year |
| **Component 1: Component 1: Supporting Ecosystem-based management at regional level** | | |
| **Outcome 1.1**  Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation & management measures (CMMs) adopted and applied by the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating rights-based and ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making & informed by sound scientific advice & information | Number of key target stocks to which comprehensive WCPFC CMMs are applied in EEZs  Number of key non-target species impacted by WCPO tuna fisheries to which WCPFC CMMs are being applied | Comprehensive CMMs applied to all four key target stocks in EEZs by 2017  CMMs reflecting Scientific Committee advice & best practice among tuna RFMOs in place for protection of all key non-target species |
| **Outcome 1.2:**  Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change (CC). | Extent to which understanding of impacts of CC is reflected in management arrangements, including impacts on jurisdiction | Management arrangements including jurisdictional arrangements have been reviewed to take into account effects of CC |
| **Component 2: Component 2: Supporting Ecosystem based management at sub-regional level** | | |
| **Outcome 2.1**  Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements are operationalized & enforced, including rights-based cap & trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability & incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications | Status of Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements | Sub-regional arrangements, including cap & trade arrangements in purse seine & longline fisheries & eco-certification arrangements are in operation & contributing to fishery sustainability |
| **Component 3: Supporting Ecosystem based management at national level** | | |
| **Outcome 3.1**  Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans & policies & with international, regional & sub-regional commitments & other relevant instruments | Number of Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations | At least 11 Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations |
| **Outcome 3.2**  Integrated data & information systems & scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring & compliance | Use of oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis by Pacific SIDS | Enhanced oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis being used by all 14 Pacific SIDS, reflecting upgraded data & information systems in at least 10 Pacific SIDS, and newly integrated systems in at least 4 SIDS. |
| **Component 4: Stakeholders Participation and Knowledge Management** | | |
| **Outcome 4.1**  Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national & regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement & participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities | Percentage of participation by industry & other civil society stakeholders in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities, including INGO & ENGO participation  Number of national consultative or advisory processes/committees created or strengthened & operational | Greater understanding of the need for management & the issues involved with proactive contributions from industry & other elements of civil society to the conservation effort  Formal advisory committees established & operational in at least 10 SIDS |
| **Outcome 4.2**  Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource & ecosystems management & impacts of climate change | Level of media coverage of relevant issues  No. of communiques from relevant regional fora, including Pacific Island Leaders’ meetings covering oceanic fisheries  Continuing donor interest in funding oceanic fisheries agencies & projects | Widespread, well informed coverage in Pacific Islands media of issues associated with conservation management of target & non-target species, & CC impacts  Oceanic fisheries management regularly addressed in Leaders’ communiques  Success in this Project & related activities encourages increased donor interest in Pacific Islands oceanic fisheries, attracted by the scope for increasing value through better management, |

The PIOFMP-II project started implementation in 2015 implemented by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisations (FAO) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) with the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) as the Executing Partner. The implementation of the project has been supported by SPC, MSG, PITIA, PNA, TVM and WWF. The participating Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are: the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Between July – September 2021, a consultant was recruited to conduct Terminal Evaluation (TE) and provide an independent assessment of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of GEF agency programming. The TE process promotes accountability, value-for-money, and transparency.

A summary of the overall project ratings and achievement is provided in the table below.

| **Criteria** | **Rating** | **Comments** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)** | | | |
| M&E design at entry | **Satisfactory** | The M&E plan was developed using the standard UNDP/FAO template for GEF-financed projects. The indicative M&E budget was USD 431,578, or 4.3% of the USD 10 million GEF project grant. The M&E plan included a USD 36,028 line item for carrying out a “baseline study to refine and measure logframe indicators”. This baseline study was an important output, although delivered fairly late in the implementation timeframe (February 2017). For a few indicators, information sources were not in place to quantitatively assess progress. | |
| M&E plan implementation | **Satisfactory** | The project implementation reports (PIRs) were the primary M&E reports, providing assessment of progress towards results, internal ratings, and adaptive management measures. The quality of the PIRs steadily increased over time, culminating with the 2021 PIR, having a new evidence based format with links to specific reports and records. Some of the baselines, indicators, and end targets in the project results framework were not clarified during project implementation. A few adjustments were recommended in the midterm review, but the suggested revisions were not reflected in the PIRs. There were shortcomings in tracking and reporting progress towards achievement of project results, e.g., legislation and policy instruments at the national levels, participation of industry and civil society, existing national consultative processes, and changes in awareness among different stakeholder groups. | |
| Overall quality of M&E | **Satisfactory** | Overall, the quality of M&E on the project is rated as satisfactory. The RSC was an important mechanism/platform for M&E, providing strategic feedback and guidance. A significant level of adaptive management was applied during the COVID-19 pandemic. There were some shortcomings with respect to designing M&E procedures, and collecting and reporting quantitative information towards achievement of results. | |
| **2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution** | | | |
| Quality of UNDP-FAO Implementation / Oversight | **Satisfactory** | The UNDP Pacific Office colleagues based in Fiji and the Regional Technical Advisor based in the Asia-Pacific Regional Hub in Bangkok remained closely involved throughout the project cycle. FAO also provided operational and technical support from multiple officers. With the project under FAO’s Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM), the regional office in Bangkok had oversight from an operational point of view. The Pacific Office based in Samoa provided technical support.  The decision to prepare joint PIR’s each year was sensible and provided a consolidated annual snapshot of project progress. However, the joint implementation modality of this project presented challenges, in terms of progress reporting, financial expenditure reporting, and sharing of information across the different parts of the project overseen by the two GEF agencies. | |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution | **Satisfactory** | The FFA was the logical choice for Implementing Partner (Executing Agency), considering their mandate in supporting the Pacific SIDS. The enabling structure and systems of the FFA was beneficial for the execution of the project, delivering high level advice, strategic guidance in fisheries management, fisheries development, and fisheries operation, as well as procurement and financial management, and provision of office space and services for the PMU.  Direct technical support to the PMU was limited. The work of the two PMU members (Project Coordinator/CTA and Finance Officer) was spread thin, tasked with coordinating the work of multiple sub-partners, monitoring progress towards achievement of results, preparing progress and financial reports, and facilitating information and knowledge sharing. | |
| Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | **Satisfactory** | Overall, the quality of implementation and execution is rated as satisfactory. The implementation oversight delivered by UNDP and FAO was satisfactory separately; however, the joint implementation modality posed operational challenges to the project team, contributing to diminished efficiency and shortcomings in overall coherence of the project. | |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | | | |
| Relevance | **Highly Satisfactory** | The project is relevant across several fronts. The objective was consistent with the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. The design was aligned with the 1997 regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP), which was endorsed by ministerial level officials in the 14 Pacific SIDS. The project was developed to contribute towards the achievement of Objective 2 of the GEF-5 IW focal area strategy; at closure, the project remains relevant to current GEF-7 IW focal area strategy, specifically Objective 1.  At a broader level, the project is relevant with respect to The Pacific Plan, and the FFA Regional Tuna Management and Development Strategy.  The project has contributed to the priorities outlined in the UNDP sub-regional programme document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (2018-2022), specifically Output 1.3: “Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services and waste”; and also with respect to the FAO multi-country programme framework for the Pacific Islands (2018-2022), namely Output 2: “Sustainable and climate-smart practices promoted to help build resilient agriculture, fisheries and forestry production systems. | |
| Effectiveness | **Satisfactory** | The project was successful in satisfactorily achieving expected results, which were consistent with national and regional priorities and aligned with SDGs and regional programming objectives of UNDP and FAO. | |
| **Project Objective:** | | | |
| *To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement & effectively enforce global, regional & sub-regional arrangements for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| **Component 1: Regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** | | | |
| *Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation & management measures (CMMs) adopted and applied by the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating rights-based and ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making & informed by sound scientific advice & information* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| *Outcome 1.2: Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change (CC)* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| **Component 2: Sub-regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** | | | |
| *Outcome 2.1: Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements are operationalized & enforced, including rights-based cap & trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability & incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| **Component 3: National Actions for Ecosystem-Based Management** | | | |
| *Outcome 3.1: Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans & policies & with international, regional & sub-regional commitments & other relevant instruments* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| *Outcome 3.2: Integrated data & information systems & scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring & compliance* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| **Component 4: Stakeholder Participation & Knowledge Management** | | | |
| *Outcome 4.1: Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national & regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement & participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities* | | | **Moderately Satisfactory** |
| *Outcome 4.2: Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource & ecosystems management & impacts of climate change* | | | **Satisfactory** |
| Efficiency | **Moderately Satisfactory** | Building on achievements from the first phase and having partnership roles and responsibilities clearly articulated at the project preparation phase boosted project efficiency. Initiating implementation was delayed, with the official start date and inception workshop (May 2015) were approximately one year after CEO endorsement was obtained in June 2014. The multiple reporting demands associated with the joint implementation modality diminished project efficiency, i.e., an inefficient use of human resources of the project team. The project did a good job adapting to the restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and was able to redirect funds earmarked for travel and workshop expenses for several technical activities that were not originally envisaged in the project strategy.  A moderately satisfactory rating is applied primarily because of the delay in initiating project implementation, and the inefficient use of human resources associated with the compounded reporting demands resulting from the joint implementation modality. | |
| Overall project outcome rating | **Satisfactory** | The project remains highly relevant at project closure, and the project’s objective and expected outcomes were achieved. Efficiency was rated at moderately satisfactory, but considering the relevance and effectiveness ratings, the overall outcome rating is satisfactory. | |
| **4. Sustainability** | | | |
| Financial sustainability | **Likely** | This representation by Pacific SIDS officials strengthens the likelihood that the priorities facing the individual countries and the region as whole are integrated into strategic planning frameworks. Donor commitment to sustainable oceanic fisheries in the WCPO continues to be strong, including proposals under advanced development for follow-up GEF funding for the third phase of the OFMP project, as well as the ABNJ Tuna Project. | |
| Socio-political sustainability | **Likely** | Oceanic fisheries are an important part of the socioeconomic fabric in the participating Pacific SIDS and across the region as a whole. There has been a steady increase in tuna fisheries related employment in the region, and an increasing number of officials from the 14 Pacific SIDS are holding positions within the WCPFC and its subsidiary bodies. This representation strengthens the likelihood that the priorities facing the individual countries and the region as a whole are integrated into strategic planning frameworks. | |
| Institutional framework and governance sustainability | **Likely** | There are strong institutional framework and governance structures in place in the region, including those of the WCPFC, FFA, and PNAO. A rigorous set of compliance requirements have been established and are being adjusted and adapted to emerging threats and circumstances. Well-designed systems are operational for monitoring and reporting on compliance, guided by multi-stakeholder collaborative arrangements. | |
| Environmental sustainability | **Likely** | The potential impacts of climate change underscore the importance of the work of the regional fisheries management organizations, donors such as GEF, and the broader stakeholder community at strengthening deliberative processes and reaching judicious agreements that help ensure sustainable management of migratory stocks and maintains socioeconomic benefits for the Pacific SIDS. | |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability | **Likely** | There are strong sustainability structures in place at project closure that help ensure the durability of project results achieved and long-term sustainable management of migratory tuna stocks in the WCPO. | |

The Overall Quality Rating of M&E, Implementation/Execution, Effectiveness, Project Outcome were Satisfactory while the Overall Likelihood of Sustainability Rating was Likely. Based on the rating, the following recommendations were put forward to which management responses have been identified accordingly.

.

**Recommendations and management response**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Advocate and facilitate mainstreaming SAP priorities at the national level.** The national tuna management plans are one of the key instruments for mainstreaming SAP priorities. There should be a concerted effort to align these national level plans with the regional SAP - FFA, national gov’t partners. | | | |
| **Management response:** | PIOFMP2 did not have the benefit of an updated SAP to guide priorities. The new project is entirely built around implementation of the findings of the 2019 SAP. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| SAP is reflected in PIOFMP3 annual work plan and budget | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Strengthen feedback mechanisms for better quantifying environmental additionality.** It would be advisable to work with regional partners in establishing mechanisms for evaluating stress reduction outcomes resulting from wider adoption of improved management approaches and emerging technologies - FFA, sub-partners | | | |
| **Management response:** | Improved quantification of environmental additionality will be factored into the new PIOFMP3 project including specific linkages to the environmental aspects of other projects and in relation to project activities in support of emerging and innovate technology. This can perhaps be measured via an indicator such as `environmental enhancement linkages adding value to project initiatives are clearly demonstrated’. PIOFMP2 and the successor project have and will continue working with regional partners such as SPC, PNAO, PITIA and others. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| Environmental additionality considerations and associated indicators are taken into account in PIOFMP3 annual work plan preparation | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator  UNDP |  |  |
| Environmental additionality activities and performance against indicators are reported in project technical reports | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator  UNPD |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Strengthen project coherence by embedding additional technical support positions into the project team.** Apart from the Project Coordinator/Chief Technical Advisor and Fisheries Management Advisor roles, it would be advisable to include a Monitoring-Control-Surveillance (MCS) and a Knowledge Management (KM) Officer as technical support positions embedded into the project team. - FFA, UNDP | | | |
| **Management response:** | Recommendation is acknowledged and will be incorporated into PIOFM3 project design. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| Discuss with the RTA to incorporate the two identified position as technical positions into the project document | December 2021 | UNDP/RTA | KM will be outsourced. The TOR of the Fisheries Management Advisor will be expanded to include M&E. Likewise, CTA/PC will also cover this. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Develop an adaptive national stakeholder engagement strategy.** Formulating specific national level activities through consultation with local stakeholders at the project preparation phase and holding minimum annual stock-taking sessions to make adaptive management adjustments. Include colleagues from the GEF agency country offices, joint presence offices, and field offices in national level activities, where possible - FFA, national gov’t partners | | | |
| **Management response:** | The PIOFMP3 PDD includes detailed national annexes which include lists of national priorities to be address under the new project. These will form the basis **to establish an adaptative national stakeholder engagement strategy,** scope and frame up the national activities. Specific activities will be implemented, reported and reviewed in national specific annual planning processes. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| Project national annual activity priorities established in annual consultation and review process | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator  National administrations | This will be conducted annually during the implementation of PIOFM3 |  |
| National level project activity reporting systems in place across all FFA members. | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator  National administrations | This will be conducted annually during the implementation of PIOFM3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Align sub-partner agreements with the project’s results-based management systems.** Sub-partner agreements and performance should be better tied results-based management requirements, including monitoring and evaluation towards achievement of performance metrics, co-financing contributions, synergies with complementary initiatives, etc - FFA | | | |
| **Management response:** | The project partnership agreements will be developed and agreed in the early stages of project implementation. These can be reviewed while in preparation to ensure that they adequately aligned to project results-based management requirements including monitoring and evaluation. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| Project results-based management requirements, including monitoring and evaluation are clearly reflected in project partnership agreements. | Q 1 2022 | FFA CTA and Project Coordinator  Project partners |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Develop a process for improving coordination with complementary projects and initiatives.** There are a number of complementary projects and initiatives in the region. It would be advisable to arrange regular coordination meetings or other mechanism to better align project activities. **FFA, UNDP** | | | |
| **Management response:** | Recommendation acknowledged. In the development of PIOFM3, UNDP and FFA have identified how the project will support national strategies, plans and needs. During the project implementation, UNDP with FFA will create dialogues or a platform of discussion with countries on how the project is addressing country needs and plans etc  FFA has already taken steps to ensure there are synergies in place between PIOFMP3 and WB PROPER project currently in planning | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| Participate in yearly PSC meetings of PIOFM3 and ensure side meetings are organized with key country reps | April 2022- March 2027 | UNDP/FFA | This will be conducted annually during the implementation of PIOFM3 |  |
| Ensure there are well established inter-project communication and planning systems in place and fully operational | April 2022- March 2027 | PIOFMP3 CTA, FFA Executive and other project managers. | This will be conducted annually during the implementation of PIOFM3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation Review Recommendation** | **Further support securing of maritime jurisdictions as part of the regional actions towards responding to potential impacts of climate change.** Securing maritime jurisdictions is important for Pacific SIDS in their blue economy-based development - FAO, FFA, WCPFC | | | |
| **Management response:** | Maritime boundary delimitation and jurisdictional arrangements are already a component of the FFA work programme in close association with the Geoscience Division of the Pacific Community. The PIOFMP3 project will provide additional support for this work. | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking68** | |
| **Comments** | **Status69** |
| FFA’s wider work programme will integrate PIOFM3 activities on maritime jurisdiction | April 2022- March 2027 | FFA Legal Counsel  PIMFMP3 CTA | This will be conducted annually during the implementation of PIOFM3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | | | |

1. This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template f](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/templates/Independent-Evaluation-Management-response.doc)or UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre.
2. If the MTR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).