Ridge to Reef – Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries

---

Mid-Term Review

Atlas Award ID: 00084701

Project ID: 00092601

PIMS ID: 5221

GEF ID: 5404

- DRAFT REPORT -

Revision 1

Prepared by:
David Coates, International Consultant/Team Leader: coatesbusiness@yahoo.co.uk
Ma. Susan (Bebot) J. Lucero, International Consultant: bebot_lucero@yahoo.com

I. Basic Report Information

Project Title: Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries			
Atlas Award ID:	00084701	MTR TIME FRAME:	
Project ID:	00092601	20 February 2019	Start MTR
PIMS ID:	5221	08 March 2019	Inception Report Submitted
Project Period:	August 2015 to August 2020	13 March - 08 April 2019	Field Mission
Management Arrangements:	Executing Partner - The Pacific Community	23 - 27 April 2019	Field Mission (Palau)
Pacific Region, Countries:	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu	10 May 2019	Draft MTR Submitted
		XXXX 2019	Final Report Submission
UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome:	Outcome 2; Output 2.5 – Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems in line with international conventions and national legislation; Output 2.5.2		
UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome:	Outcome 1: Output 1.4 – Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented: Output 1.4.2.		
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:	International Waters Strategic Objective 1; and Strategic Objective 3		
Project Objective:	To test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services		
Objective Indicator:	Extent of harmonization of sectoral governance frameworks for integrated 'ridge to reef' approaches achieved through national sustainable development planning		
Executing Entity/ Implementing Partner:	The Pacific Community		
Implementing Entity/Responsible Partner:	The Pacific Community		
Responsible Parties:	National Government Line-agencies in 14 Pacific Island Countries		
Acknowledgements:	68 persons representing the Implementing and Executing Agencies and National Stakeholders, as listed in Annex 1, provided valuable insights and information to guide the MTR.		
MTR Team	David Coates and Ma. Susan (Bebot) J. Lucero		

II. Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CBOs	Community Based Organisation(s)
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCCPIR	Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region
CRGA	Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations
CTI	Coral Triangle Initiative
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
EC	European Commission
EGS	Ecosystem Goods and Services
EMIS	Environmental Management Information System
ENSO	El Niño Southern Oscillation
ERC	UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FSM	Federate States of Micronesia
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEM	GeoScience Energy and Maritime Division (of SPC)
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
IDA	Island Diagnostic Assessment
IMC	Inter-Ministry Committee
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IWCAM	Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management
IW	1.1 International Waters
IWECO	Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management
IW:LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
IW R2R	The GEF International Waters Ridge to Reef Project (Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries)
JCSP	Joint Country Strategy Programmes
JCU	James Cook University, Australia
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MYCWP	Multi-Year Costed Work Plan
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change
Pacific RAP	Pacific Regional Action Plan of Sustainable Water Management
PacIWRM	Pacific Integrated Water Resource Management
PICs	Pacific Small Island Developing States Participating in the R2R Programme
PIMS	Project Information Management System

PIR	Annual Project Implementation Report
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PPR	Project Progress Reports
PSC	Project Steering Committee
R2R	Ridge to Reef
RapCA	Rapid Coastal Assessment
RBM	Results Based Management
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
RPC	Regional Programme Coordinator
RPCU	Regional Programme Coordination Unit
RPCG	Regional Programme Coordinating Group
RSC	Regional Steering Committee
RSTC	Regional Scientific and Technical Committee
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SDS-SEA	Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SoC	State of the Coast
SoE	State of the Environment
SOPAC	Applied Geoscience and Technology Division
SPC	The Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
STAR	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP RCU	UNDP Regional Co-ordinating Unit
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

II. Table of Contents

2 Executive Summary

2.1 Project information

Project Information	
Project Title: Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries	
UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome:	Outcome 2; Output 2.5 – Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems in line with international conventions and national legislation; Output 2.5.2: Number of countries implementing national and local plans for Integrated Water Resources Management.
UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome:	Outcome 1: Output 1.4 – Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented: Output 1.4.2: Number of countries with comprehensive measures - plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets - implemented to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives.
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:	International Waters Strategic Objective 1: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in trans- boundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change; and Strategic Objective 3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem- based management of trans-boundary water systems.
Project Objective:	To test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services
Project Outcomes:	Component 1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability. Outcomes: 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network] 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments 1.3 Community leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM Component 2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation Outcomes: 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation 2.2 PIC knowledge on climate variability, coastal area planning in DRM, integrating 'blue forest' and coastal livelihoods consolidated and shared to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning 2.3 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef'

		expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated Component 3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Planning Outcomes: 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs 3.3 Physical, natural, human and social capital built to strengthen island resilience to current and emerging anthropogenic threats and climate extremes Component 4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management Outcomes: 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established Component 5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination Outcomes: 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects				
Total resources required	**Total resources allocated**	**GEF**	**Co-financing**		
			UNDP	**Governments**	**SPC-SOPAC**
$98,025,614	$98,025,614	$10,317,454	$8,300,000	$47,926,605	$31,481,555

2.2 Project description

The objective of the project is to test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the Pacific Island Countries (PICS) through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services. The project outcomes are: Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking Integrate Coastal Management (ICM), Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and climate change (CC) adaptation (linked to national STAR projects via a larger Pacific R2R network); National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments; Community leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM approaches; National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation; PIC knowledge on climate variability, coastal area planning in disaster risk management, integrating 'blue forest' and coastal livelihoods consolidated and shared to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning; Incentive

structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated; National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally; Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs ; Physical, natural, human and social capital built to strengthen island resilience to current and emerging anthropogenic threats and climate extremes; National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects ; National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established; and effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects.

The project builds on previous IWRM investments and supports the ongoing development of 'Ridge to Reef' and 'Community to Cabinet' approaches in the targeted PICs through the multi-focal area GEF Pacific R2R Program. This regional project is implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) through the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of the Pacific Community (SPC-SOPAC) (now the GeoScience Energy and Maritime Division; SPC-GEM Division) in partnership with the 14 PICs. It is designed to improve the integration of water, land, forest and coastal management required to fashion sustainable futures for island communities. The project strategy includes: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management; establishing evidence-based approaches to R2R planning; and improved consolidation of information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. The project provides support in areas of coordination, capacity building, technical assistance, and monitoring and evaluation for the operation of the broader Pacific R2R Program and, therefore, linkages with the national GEF STAR multifocal projects and LDCF project. It facilitates dialogue and action planning through national Inter-Ministry Committees (IMCs) on responses to emerging issues and threats in environment and natural resource management. The project fosters solidarity among the PICs, particularly with respect to the political will required to support more integrated approaches to R2R in natural resource management.

2.3 Project Progress Summary

Progress towards results (as per the Project LogFrame) varies among the components and outcomes and between individual PICs but overall is moderately unsatisfactory. Despite extended periods of senior staff vacancies in the Regional Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU), other staff in position performed well and kept the project going under challenging management conditions and an extended start-up period. This included generating scientific and technical guidance, training and capacity building, supporting communications and, after a belated start, starting to develop an integrated and simplified results reporting framework. The introduction of a multi-year costed work programming approach was instrumental in stimulating implementation of national level activities. National demonstration projects are at various stages of advancement, with some only just starting. Many

PICs had staff recruitment and turn-over challenges. Project implementation and management have been rated moderately unsatisfactory. A somewhat top-down and inflexible approach to project management previously at the RPCU has resulted in limited adaptive management at regional level. National level project implementation has exhibited good adaptive management. Monitoring and evaluation procedures are in place but reporting from national level is variable. There remain significant challenges to achieving the project's role in coordinating the broader Pacific R2R Program, mostly not of the project's making. It is moderately likely that at least some of the project's outcomes will be sustained beyond the project, especially if the project implementation now seeks to integrate or mainstream R2R into existing local/sub-national/state/national governance and management mechanisms and processes. However, it is unlikely that the project objective will be fully, comprehensively and sustainably achieved within the project lifetime and will require long-term sustained support. The project's capacity building and lessons learned will therefore be paramount to future sustainability. A summary of the MTR ratings of the achievement of measures adopted by the Project is as below:

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary[1]	
MTR Rating	**Achievement Description**
PROJECT STRATEGY	
N/A	The project strategy as per the Project Document remains valid. Objectives are still widely supported at national and local government levels. The project strategy supports national, regional and international policies and frameworks. The project scientific and technical strategy needs to adopt an ecosystem goods and services framework approach. Capacity building needs to be maintained as the primary strategy of the project and guide all project activities.
PROJECT OBJECTIVE: To test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services	
Achievement Rating: 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory)	Composite measure based on progress towards outcomes as listed individually below.
PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS:[3]	
Outcome 1.1: Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory)	Most PICs are behind schedule due to delayed start-up. Indicators/metrics/parameters developed by the project are weak for monitoring social factors and CC vulnerability. Plans and methods for baselines/diagnostics are in-place, but few actual baseline

[1] Rating scales and their descriptions are included in Annexes 7 and 9.

[3] A detailed assessment by individual outcome and activity is provided in Section 4.2 Table 1.

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary[1]	
MTR Rating	**Achievement Description**
	data/diagnostics yet undertaken. 12 country plans for stress reduction measures have been produced (except Fiji started late and no data Kiribati) but gender analysis and mainstreaming still weak. Actual stress reduction measures implemented in Cook Islands, FSM, Nauru, Niue, PNG, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu. In most PICS: it is unlikely that actions at project sites will lead to verifiable reductions in stressors (or improvements in habitat quality) by project end; there is limited evidence of testing methods etc. best practice examples, community action; limited evidence of demonstrations and forming committees etc. leading to actual improvements on the ground.
Outcome 1.2: National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory)	Only a limited number of diagnostic analyses have been completed (Cook Islands, Palau, PNG). Significant risk that future diagnostic analyses might be fast-tracked and have more limited capacity-building impact. Some progress made in developing and testing methodologies and identifying baseline environmental and some socio-cultural information but limited in scope regarding ecosystem goods and services (ecosystem benefits) and CC vulnerability.
Outcome 1.3: Community leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory)	Limited establishment of "inter-ministry committees" with functions as intended in Project Document. No common understanding among PICs regarding the intended functions of IMCs and PSCs. Cook Islands, Vanuatu and PNG have PSCs specific to IW R2R and no joint PSC with STAR and no IMC, Fiji, Niue, RMI, Tonga and Tuvalu have a IW R2R PSC sharing functions with the STAR PSC but no clearly identified IMC; Palau and Samoa have an IMC that also functions as the PSC for IW R2R and STAR; only FSM and Solomon Islands have both a PSC and an IMC. Nauru plans a joint PSC. No data for Kiribati. MTR notes ambiguity in Project Document regarding IMCs (etc.) and therefore differing interpretations of progress on this. Limited engagement by private sector has been achieved.
Outcome 2.1: National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation	
Achievement Rating 5 (Satisfactory)	Design of post-graduate training and implementation of training has progressed well. The target (10 people trained with at least 5 women) has been exceeded with 51 people enrolled in the course on ecosystem dynamics and 44 enrolled in the courses on project management and tools for R2R. Overall, 52% of enrolees were women. All PICs are represented. Further training and courses are ongoing.
Outcome 2.2: Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately	Indicator 2.2.1 refers to tracking R2R personnel and identifying capacity needs for R2R in national and local government units etc. with a target

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary[1]	
MTR Rating	**Achievement Description**
Unsatisfactory)	of 14 achieved by project end; no assessments yet made (except some scoping of needs for the JCU course). Re. indicator 2.2.2 - no recommendations on practitioner retention have been made.
Outcome 3.1: National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory)	RPCU reports refer to measures to begin to compile national policies and legislations, etc., draft methodologies etc.; but awaiting IDAs and SoCs (well behind schedule). Limited actual progress.
Outcome 3.2: Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs	
Achievement Rating 2 (Unsatisfactory)	Limited evidence of demonstrated "R2R networks" (that is, policy networks and forums) or "broader R2R frameworks" being strengthened or established. Most PICs have not established IMCs as per the intention/function in the Project Document (although in many cases because existing institutional arrangements for this already exist). No evidence of changes in perception (as required by indicator).
Outcome 4.1: National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects	
Achievement Rating 4 (Moderately Satisfactory)	After slow start the integrated and simplified results framework for integrated multi-focal projects is now progressing. Limited evidence as yet of "simplification" but the initial stage of compiling existing reporting and M&E requirements is well underway. Training and support on M&E, results framework and results based management has been provided.
Outcome 4.2: National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established	
Achievement Rating 4 (Moderately satisfactory)	Communications strategies, guidance and support to PICs have been provided. Participation in IW:LEARN activities on track. Pacific R2R network (of R2R practitioners) is already established and being developed/strengthened. Plans in place to upgrade the website and R2R network support (but delays in procurement procedures).
Outcome 5.1: Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects	
Achievement Rating 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory)	Although the project now has a near full staff complement (regional and national level), previous delays in recruitments have been highly unsatisfactory (especially at SPC). The project has responded to some limited requests for support from STAR projects and undertaken some joint activities with STAR on an ad-hoc basis. But the RPCU is not systematically supporting STAR projects (the Pacific R2R Program) - due largely to lack of demand from STAR projects. There are serious challenges to the project (and its RPCU) performing Pacific R2R Program coordination functions (although not all due to the

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary[1]	
MTR Rating	**Achievement Description**
	project itself).
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	
Achievement Rating 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory)	Senior SPC management has allowed significant delays in staff recruitment and retention. This has affected support and coordination provided by the RPCU. Staff recruitment challenges at national level have led to low financial delivery at national level. Almost full staffing is now in place. There has been good adaptive management at national level but limited at RPCU (SPC) level. The absence of an effective inception process and previous "top down" management style of the RPCU is a root cause of many current challenges the project faces. The establishment of inter-ministerial committees is not in-line with as intended in the Project Document leading to challenges in coordination and mainstreaming R2R. The project has introduced a well-designed multi-year costed work plan approach that has proved useful in getting implementation going at national level. Financing and co-financing arrangements are satisfactory but with issues with lengthy procurement delays at SPC reported. Project M&E systems are established but over complicated and human resource intensive for national project staff considering the small national budgets involved. There are significant challenges to reporting with many PICs with significant gaps in report submission. Reporting by STAR projects to the project (as part of its intended coordination) is very weak. Stakeholder engagement at national demonstration sites is, overall, good. There are some weaknesses in stakeholder engagement at higher levels in some PICs. The RPCU has provided communications support. Communication has tended to be on individual activities within a broader R2R framework and less so on actual R2R. Incorporating gender and gender training have been somewhat generic with remaining needs for gender analysis of project outputs. Support from the implementing agency (UNDP) has been satisfactory but that provided by the Executing Agency (SPC) has been unsatisfactory.
SUSTAINABILITY	
Achievement Rating: 3 (Moderately Likely)	There are no identified significant financial, socioeconomic, environmental or institutional/legal risks to project sustainability during its lifetime. The project does not have an exit strategy but there are signs that some of its outputs/outcomes will continue after project end. Achieving R2R requires a long time horizon. The project is also "testing" R2R approaches and therefore intended to guide or influence future investments. A capacity-building, lessons learned and

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary[1]	
MTR Rating	**Achievement Description**
	mainstreaming approach provides the best chance of sustaining Project gains.

2.4 Concise Summary of Conclusions

There is a high level of national support for what the project aims to achieve and the Project Objectives and Strategy remain in-line with stated national, regional and international priorities. Poor implementation performance is due mainly to: (i) failings at senior management level at SPC leading to extended gaps in staffing at the RPCU; and (ii) limited adaptive management by the RPCU and the absence of an effective inception period can be identified as a root cause of many of the challenges now being faced. Challenges remaining include: R2R mainstreaming and implementation mechanisms for doing so; involving national staff in implementing components 3, 4, and 5; coordination and communication with STAR projects; creating a stronger "programmatic" vision across the programme; strengthening reporting by national IW R2R and STAR projects; and, overall programme coordination. Changes are needed to the project's scientific and technical approach to align outputs better with influencing policy, in particular by adopting an ecosystem goods and services approach as required by the Project Document. Now that the project has achieved near full staffing at regional and national levels there is reason to expect that implementation can be accelerated in many areas. A no-cost extension is warranted, subject to the other recommendations of this MTR, and it is expected that this will enable most national demonstration projects to catch up with implementation and achieve the targets as per their revised LogFrames. A provisional estimate of the revised project end date based on no-cost extension would be 31 December 2021 subject to checking the final figures and ensuring that the agreed allocation of SPC overhead costs is not applied to national project budgets which are to be maintained at current levels. Further conclusions drawn, challenges identified, and solutions to them are self-evident from the MTR recommendations as below.

2.5 Recommendations Summary Table

The recommendations are combined in the table below. The body text explains the background and justification for each recommendation. The MTR has assessed these recommendations as to whether they address project design, management/planning or budgets/finance and concludes they all address management issues. This supports a conclusion that the main challenges facing the project, and means to overcome them, relate to project management and are not directly related to project design or the budget.

The MTR has not prioritised these recommendations. They are all a priority (or they would not have been made). It is within the resources and capacity of the project to

implement them all and to do so would increase and not constrain the likelihood of project success.

#	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
1	The RPCU, together with National Project Managers, should review and update all current national project LogFrames and ensure that, if not already done so, each is approved at the next national PSC and RSC meetings.	RPCU and National Project Managers, national PSCs, RSC
2	The RPCU, in collaboration with national agencies, should review the impact of previous IWRM, ICM and R2R (if any) investments, and particularly the GEF IWRM Project, based on current realities and with the objective of deriving further lessons learned, particularly regarding impact, up-scaling and sustainability.	RPCU, National Line Agencies
3	Each national demonstration project should re-evaluate its linkages to and relationships with other relevant projects and activities at local and national level, and with local planning mechanisms and institutional arrangements, to ensure that its activities and outputs are coherent with, and build upon and strengthen, these other activities and governance systems.	National Project Managers/Project Coordinators, national PSCs, with support from RPCU
4	The RPCU in collaboration with national agencies should: (i) map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities; (ii) identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks; (iii) develop a clear and coherent approach to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks, prioritising immediate opportunities based on existing scientific/technical knowledge and practical experience (without waiting for IDAs or SoCs); (iv) discourage activities that result in the development of new or parallel "strategic frameworks for R2R" or R2R planning mechanisms or frameworks, and instead build on existing processes; and (v) consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministerial committees" (as per the Project Document) fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed.	RPCU, National Line Agencies, National Project Managers/ Project Coordinators
5	The project should adopt an ecosystem goods and services framework as the foundation of its scientific and technical approach by: (i) integrating ecosystem goods and services indicators into the RapCA, IDA and SoC, not as a "supplement" to existing indicators but as their foundation; (ii) integrating an ecosystem goods and services approach/context as the basis for all relevant project activities including for R2R planning, mainstreaming and policy; (iii) testing an ecosystem goods and services and	RPCU, RSTC, National Project Managers (with technical advice from a targeted consultancy)

#	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
	valuation approach as the entry point in a limited number of appropriate demonstration projects that have yet to commence or have only recently commenced (subject to country needs and buy-in); (iv) commencing basic training on ecosystem goods and services (including valuation) for national capacity building, including considering a dedicated module on this topic as part of the on-going post-graduate training delivered through an appropriate institution (subject to resources availability).	
6	The project should re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs based on the following criteria: (i) Focus on objectives/outcomes - the IDA or SoC is not an outcome, the outcome required is mainstreaming R2R; (ii) Identify and prioritise existing opportunities to mainstream R2R without having an IDA or SoC (important short-term opportunities are currently being missed); (iii) The absolute priority is capacity building - this in turn determines the impact of an IDA or SoC on policies - this requires ownership of and participation of PICs in the IDA/SoC process; (iv) IDAs/SoCs must be country-driven, where countries see an IDA or "SoC" as a necessary or priority need the process can go ahead, but if this is absent beware of doing the SoC; (v) The priority is for the IDA and/or SoC to be integrated with and build on, add value to, existing activities and processes at national level (notably the State of Environment reporting process and similar undertakings), the process need not necessarily result in a stand-alone "SoC" report but it can achieve its purpose equally as well through integration of information generated into other reports/processes; (vi) Timing of outputs needs to be compatible with timescales for information needs (particularly for informing on-going policy processes); (vii) Focus on quality not quantity - reduce outputs accordingly; (viii) Where all the above criteria are met consider proceeding - where any is not met there is limited justification for the SoC; and (ix) Re-assess the need and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC in PSCs and re-present the IDA/SoC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review.	RPCU, Line Agencies, RSC
7	The project should, with national counterpart participation, map its potential contributions to the SDGs, identify relevant linkages and interdependencies (including potential indicators currently in use), explore the extent to which R2R is a tool to achieve integrated delivery of, and has already delivered, the natural resources based or dependent SDGs and use this process as a means to: (i) test the relevance of its approaches; (ii) promote visibility and relevance of the project; and (iii) identify and potentially monitor the contribution of the project to sustainable development outcomes.	RPCU and National Counterparts
8	The RPCU should ensure that the website and associated databases developed under activity 4.2.3 is kept as simple as possible, primarily builds on existing efforts, learns from	RPCU

#	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
	previous efforts, and is limited to the purpose of communicating and sharing lessons learned on R2R and supporting the development of a network (or community of practice) on R2R.	
9	The project should re-assess the advisability of integrating the integrated results framework for multi-focal GEF projects under the same platform as the communication/networking platform for R2R. If it continues as such then the ability to separate the two functionalities must be in-built.	RPCU
10	The project should identify how it is going to deliver outcome 4.2 (in particular activity 4.2.3) at national level, as required in the outcome description, and present this plan to the next RSC meeting.	RPCU, RSC
11	The RPCU should play a lead coordinating role in developing or compiling lessons learned on R2R, including from the previous IWRM/ICM/R2R investments, including by providing guidance to current R2R projects (STAR and IW R2R Projects) in order for them to begin now to maximise extraction of lessons learned from investments.	RPCU
12	The project should have a no-cost extension subject to implementation of the further recommendations of the MTR.	UNDP/SPC
13	The Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG) should strengthen technical information sharing and reporting links between the implementing agencies and the RPCU.	RPCG
14	The Regional Steering Committee (RSC), with the support of the Regional Programme Coordination Group, at its next meeting, should clarify what is required from the RPCU regarding programme coordination, and identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP), and specify the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.	RSC, RPCG
15	The project should implement all its activities from a capacity building perspective, even if resulting in compromises on scientific quality and/or timelines.	RPCU, National Project Managers/Project Coordinators, national PSCs, National implementing Agencies
16	The RPCU and RSC should: (i) re-assess the composition and *modus operandi* of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) in the light of the scientific and technical scope and needs of the project, specifically strengthening its social and economic expertise; (ii) as far as feasible, put more emphasis on opportunities to build scientific and technical capacity among the PICs by providing for improved engagement of national PIC science stakeholders in project/programme science and technology decision	RPCU/RSC

#	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
	making; (iii) explore how the R2R network and platform (component 4.2) might contribute to the sustainability of science and technology support to PICs after the project finishes; and (iv) explore opportunities for expanding inter-active workshops and training on the project's science and technology agenda under RSTC oversight.	
17	Recommendation 17: Communications should be considered and integrated into project activities (e.g. IDA-SOC/R2R, mainstreaming plans etc.) from their very beginning and be used to identify target audiences, influence the nature of data collected and indicators being used and improve the understanding of how constraints to R2R uptake can be reduced to increase the impact of the project on policy.	RPCU, RSTC
18	The national demonstration plans and activities that are still currently being prepared should be gender-analysed to ensure on-site project management is gender-responsive in specific ways anchored on the objectives of these these plans. The completed RapCAs and IDAs must be gender-audited before they are incorporated in the SoC. The SoCs and Strategic Action Frameworks themselves must be gender-audited.	RPCU, National Project Managers/Project Coordinators

A summary of MTR findings regarding activities needed prior to, and issues to be considered at, the next Regional Steering Committee meeting is provided in Annex 13.

3 Introduction

3.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives

The UNDP-GEF project *"Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries"* (the IW R2R Project) is a full-sized project and therefore requires a Mid-term Review (MTR). The objective of the MTR, as per its Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex 2), was to provide the project implementing and executing partners (UNDP and SPC) and the relevant Governments of the Pacific Islands Counties (PICs) collectively with an independent MTR of the project.

The purpose of the MTR was to:

- Assess any achievements, under-performance and challenges at mid-point;
- Recommend corrective actions to achieve stated outcomes;
- Identify opportunities to enhance the delivery of outcomes;
- Consider sustainability issues and future directions of the project; and
- Make recommendations for the remaining period of the project and its scheduled end date, including options, if any, for no-cost project extension.

This MTR is of the IW R2R Project. It was not tasked with reviewing any of the other projects (STAR projects) under the Pacific R2R Program. However, the IW R2R Project has a coordination role for the Program and its STAR projects. Where feasible, national STAR projects were interviewed but primarily from the viewpoint of support received from, and inter-linkages and coordination with, the IW R2R Project.

The MTR assessed progress towards the achievement of the project objectives, outputs and outcomes as specified in the Project Document focussing on signs of project success or failure and identified the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR also reviewed the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

3.2 Scope and Methodology: Principles of design and execution of the MTR, the MTR approach, data collection methods and limitations to the MTR

The MTR was guided by its Terms of Reference (Annex 2) and followed the guidance outlined in the *Guidance For Conducting Mid-term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*[4].

The MTR guiding principle is evidence-based credible and reliable information obtained through a collaborative and participatory approach. This has ensured close commitment of the Implementing Agencies, Project Team, national government counterparts, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders to the MTR findings and recommendations. A wide variety of documents were considered (Annex 3). Five countries were visited (Cook Islands, Fiji, Palau, Tuvalu and Vanuatu) where face-to-face consultations were held with a wide range of stakeholders (Annex 1) and visits to project sites undertaken. The MTR mission was unable to interview the project team in Nauru or Kiribati due to scheduling and communication constraints but a review of documentation was undertaken for these. For the other seven countries consultations were held remotely (usually by phone or video conference). The interviewees were selected based upon their knowledge of and association with the project and/or the degree to which they are affected by the project or may influence it. Semi-structured interviews, with a key set of questions in a conversational format (Annex 4), were used to standardise methods across countries.

A standardised evaluation matrix (Annex 5) was used to assess the project and derive evidence-based conclusions on performance. Assessments and ratings used standardised terminology and grading following the *Guidance for Conducting Mid-term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, further details of which are included in relevant tables and sections.

[4] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Mid-term Review_EN_2014.pdf

3.3 Limitations of the Mid-Term Review

The MTR is limited by the quality, detail and timeliness of project reports, notably those relating to periodic assessments of project performance and progress (e.g. PIRs, annual and quarterly progress reports etc.). Due to time and resource constraints only 5 of the 14 PICs were visited, with another 7 interviewed by remote. The MTR team is, however, highly confident that its overall findings are sound and evidence-based.

3.4 Structure of the MTR report

This is a complex project with a detailed assessment framework. To improve readability this MTR report places the bulk of the quantified and detailed results of assessments into its annexes. Section 4 of the report provides a summary of the findings of the MTR covering *Project Strategy (*project design, project LogFrame and results framework), *Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management (*management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, communications, gender and development mainstreaming) and *Sustainability.* Section 5 summarises the MTR conclusions and its key recommendations.

4 Project Description and Background Context

4.1 Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope

The PICs are distributed through an oceanic area covering ten percent of the Earth's surface, vary considerably in their size and geomorphology, ranging from high volcanic islands to tiny low coral atolls, and have varied economies and systems of governance. Some PICs consist of a few sparsely inhabited islands while others are more densely populated island groups and some have no confirmed freshwater (dependent on rainwater and desalination). Consequently, there is a need for a variety of different governance and resource management strategies and approaches focusing on different scales, and different levels of capacity. PICs do share some common environmental features such as: many are small, low-lying and isolated, with vulnerability to climatic influences such as storms, drought and sea-level rise.

The ability of PICS to manage their resources and ecosystems in a sustainable manner while sustaining their livelihoods is crucial to their social and economic well-being and is clearly directly related to GEF's mandate for protection and sustainable management of biodiversity and international waters. PICs have specific needs and requirements when developing their economies. These are related to small population sizes and human resources, small GDPs, limited land area and natural resources. The small size of most catchments, shallow aquifers and lack of

storage affects most water users from urban and rural water supplies, commercial forestry, agriculture and tourism.

The fourteen developing PICs are home to over nine million people, speaking about 1,200 languages, with the majority of Pacific islanders (about 80 percent) living in rural areas. There are about 1,000 islands covering a land area of just over half a million km^2, spread across 180 million km^2 of ocean. The ecosystems supported across these islands are unique and among the most endangered in the world. Many of these same islands are globally significant with regards to biodiversity, having flora and fauna exhibiting high endemism and with global biodiversity significance. These fragile island ecosystems are increasingly exposed to external and internal anthropogenic impacts threatening endemic terrestrial and coastal biodiversity. Many PICs have high population growth rates. Some have population densities greater than some large cities and are becoming increasingly urbanized. In most PICs, land is a very limited resource and pressures on it high. Pressures on coastal, estuarine and inshore marine areas can also be high.

The PICs face similar challenges managing coastal resources as other developing countries, including access to sanitation and safe drinking water, protecting sensitive ecosystems and productive use of limited resources. All fourteen of the PICs have development challenges in common with, and are recognised as, Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Emigration is a significant factor in maintaining capacity within PICs with a loss of skilled and educated workers particularly evident in this region. Agriculture, fisheries and tourism are the primary economic sectors in most PICs. Half of the fourteen countries receive official development assistance (ODA) exceeding 30 percent of their GDP.

Water resource availability differs dramatically across the region. Papua New Guinea is endowed with two of the largest rivers in the world (by run-off). Other PICs (e.g. Tuvalu) have no rivers to speak of and rely on rainwater and limited groundwater. Faecal waste from humans and animals (mostly pigs and cattle) cause pollution of surface waters and water supplies in nearly all PICs and eutrophication of waters from these sources and agricultural fertiliser use has been identified as the major environmental threat to Pacific aquatic ecosystems. Sediment loads arising from deforestation, mining and agricultural activities are also a significant threat to ecosystems and potentially compromise water treatment capacity in water supplies. Land availability and tenure are both an impediment to, and provide unique opportunities for, poverty alleviation and sustainable development of land. Land tenure in PICs is typically very high.

Fresh groundwater on atolls, coral and limestone islands is often a delicate balance between rainfall, evapo-transpiration and groundwater extraction. On low-lying islands, this balance can be further complicated by storm surges, during which saline water mixes with fresh groundwater. Land management is an important aspect of water resources management. PICs freshwater and coastal resources are highly vulnerable to many of the impacts of climate variability and change, in particular increases in rainfall variability, sea-level rise and the frequency of tropical

storms. There is a very high level of confidence that water resources in small islands will be seriously compromised by climate change.

4.2 Problems that the project seeks to address: threats and barriers targeted

The Pacific Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters (IW) of the Pacific Islands (1997) developed a strategy for the integrated sustainable development and management of IW to address the priorities of PICs. The SAP identified a variety of priorities: pollution of marine and freshwater supplies (including groundwater) from land-based activities; physical, ecological and hydrological modification of critical habitats; and excessive exploitation of living and non-living resources. Water and climate related threats are the focus of the Pacific Regional Action Plan for Sustainable Water Management (Pacific RAP). The Pacific RAP focuses on turning key threats into sustainable solutions through a series of key actions, agreed to by 16 Heads of State in the Pacific Region.

The principal barriers to date that have confounded introduction of more integrated approaches to environmental and natural resource management in PICs include:

i. Fragmented, single sector development efforts (including donor funded) across different landscapes and government levels that do not include needed spatial management techniques due to unclear institutional responsibilities, weak policies, communication and coordination;

ii. Limited knowledge and application of integrated coastal management (ICM), integrated water resources management (IWRM), sustainable land management (SLM) and sustainable forest management (SFM) practices and tools in the Pacific Islands;

iii. Limited human and institutional capacity for integrated management in the PICs with much capacity lost to emigration;

iv. Limited experience and capacity in linking sustainable land management in watersheds, through IWRM, with the livelihood needs of downstream coastal residents and ecosystems through ICM;

v. Limited PICs knowledge and national/local capacity on SLM, SFM, IWRM and ICM as well as carbon sequestration opportunities;

vi. Insufficient involvement of key civil society and other stakeholders spanning the 'ridge to the reef';

vii. Rising development pressures on a small taxation base, and environment and natural resource management provided with inadequate resources;

viii. Weak governance structures and lack of government/donor interest in supporting integrated approaches across sectors, which are more difficult to achieve; and

ix. Insufficient political and public awareness of the role water, land, and biological diversity play in economic development, public health and environmental protection.

The GEF Pacific IWRM Project (2009 - 2014) made rapid, significant and demonstrable progress at both the national and regional levels in overcoming these barriers. The national water and sanitation policy and IWRM planning reforms achieved as a result of that project has resulted in the formal national adoption of almost 90 percent of the policies, legal reforms and implementation plans for IWRM.

The Pacific R2R Program and the IW R2R Project seek to further address these barriers and threats through further strengthening and expanding the methods and approaches of previous investments in this area.

4.3 Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites

The project strategy has a long history of development. On the basis of the Pacific SAP 1997, the GEF International Waters focal area subsequently invested in a series of regional initiatives. In response to growing pressures on the water resources of the PICs, calls have been made for a revision of the regional strategy and action plan to address urgent issues pertaining to the sustainable management of water resources and delivery of water and sanitation services. This revision is on-going and timely coinciding with other significant changes in regional strategies such as the Pacific Forum Leaders' decision to graduate the Pacific Plan to a Framework for Pacific Regionalism with the primary objective of "*sustainable development that combines economic social, and cultural development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and the use of the environment sustainably*", driving sector integration strategies. The regional agreement to integrate Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation into a Strategy for Disaster and Climate Resilient Development in the Pacific exemplifies this. The integration of water, land and coastal management through the Pacific R2R Programme at national and regional levels is therefore in alignment with national and regional integration strategies.

The immediately previous GEF Pacific IWRM Project (2009 - 2014) built on achievements of prior GEF investments via a focus on national IWRM demonstration projects. The practical on-the ground solutions to water and sanitation issues acted to stimulate support at both community and national government levels for policy reform and the mainstreaming of integrated approaches as part of national sustainable development planning. The experience and local capacity generated as a result of the GEF Pacific IWRM project was recognized both nationally and regionally as an appropriate entry point for the testing of innovative approaches and measures to integrate land, forest, water and coastal management, including climate change adaptation in PICs. The GEF Council at its 44th meeting approved the UNDP/UNEP/FAO multi-focal area "*Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods*"

programme, the goal of which is to maintain and enhance PICs' ecosystem goods and services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural) through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience. This goal, under the Pacific R2R Programme, will be achieved through a series of national multi-focal area ' Ridge to Reef' (R2R) demonstration projects which will support and address national priorities and development needs while delivering global environmental benefits in line with GEF focal area strategies (Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Climate Change Mitigation, International Waters) and Climate Change Adaptation. The PICs emphasized the need to focus on their own priority national activities as they utilize STAR resources. Experience has shown that an integrated approach for ridge-to-reef (R2R) is necessary for poverty reduction, sustainability, and capacity enhancement for small countries with few human resources to undertake projects.

The Pacific R2R Programme was designed to complement the implementation of relevant national priorities including the CBD National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan (NBSAP), UNFCCC NAPA, UNFCCC National Communications, REDD+ Policies, UNCCD National Action Plans, National Sustainable Development Strategies and other documents.

The IW R2R Project *"Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries"* is part of the Pacific R2R Programme and intended to build on nascent national processes built in the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each participating island nation through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; and improved consolidation of information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. The project also is to provide coordination functions and linkages with GEF Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), biodiversity and land degradation focal areas in the national STAR projects, facilitates dialogue and action planning through national Inter-Ministry Committees and facilitates coordinated exchanges of experience and results of the GEF portfolio of investments in the broader Pacific R2R Programme.

The IW R2R Project builds on the abovementioned stepwise approach to catalysing transformational change. It also supports participating countries in the replication and scaling up of IWRM approaches within a broader "Ridge to Reef" and "Community to Cabinet" framework designed to guide the integration of water, land, forest and coastal management required to fashion sustainable futures for island communities. The project also aims to address the recent high-level recognition and calls for results-based approaches to the management of development assistance programmes and projects, and provides support in areas of coordination, capacity building, technical assistance, and monitoring and evaluation for the Pacific R2R programme.

The guiding principles for the application of the Ridge to Reef approach in PICs as determined through previous investments are:

i. Acknowledging Inter-Connections of Land, Water and Coastal Systems;
ii. Promotion of Ridge to Reef and Community to Cabinet Approaches;
iii. Catalysing Community Action via Locally Driven Solutions;
iv. Doing is Seeing the Need;
v. Investing in Island-based Human Capital;
vi. Gender Mainstreaming in R2R;
vii. Supporting National and Regional Planning;
viii. Application of Marine Spatial Planning in Ridge to Reef Planning and Management;
ix. Integrating Climate Variability and Change;
x. Supporting Results Oriented Planning and Action;
xi. Effectively Communicating the Benefits of Integration and Lessons Learned;
xii. Guiding Coordinated Investment in the Sustainable Development of Island Communities; and
xiii. Promoting Public-Private Partnerships.

The Project Objective is *to test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services*. In order to achieve this objective key project components include:

i. national demonstrations to support and inform integrated land, water and coastal planning and the scaling-up of IWRM for island resilience and sustainability;
ii. island-based investments in human capital and knowledge consolidation to prepare local institutions for ICM;
iii. improved integrated governance for local pilot institutions and national policy development for scaling-up IWRM to integrate land, water and coastal management in an ICM framework;
iv. establishment of regional and national R2R indicators, monitoring and evaluation frameworks, and knowledge management to support national inter-ministry committees and results tracking; and
v. strengthened national and regional coordination of investment in R2R.

4.4 Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements and institutional levels of engagement

The IW R2R project is implemented by UNDP and executed regionally by the Geo-science Energy and Maritime Division (previously the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division, SOPAC) of the Pacific Community (SPC). The project is supported by a Regional Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU), located at SPC, Suva, Fiji, with technical and administrative support staff headed by a Regional Programme Coordinator. The project has operations at national level, usually supported by a National Project Manager. Each PIC usually has a national site-level R2R demonstration project. These vary among the PICs in terms of their scope.

There is a Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG) for the overall Pacific R2R Programme consisting of the main implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP) together with representation from the GEF. There is a Regional Programme Steering Committee (RSC), often referred to as the Regional Steering Committee, comprising the implementing and executing agencies, representatives of the national STAR projects and various other stakeholders. The RSC is also the main project board for the IW R2R Project. Each national IW R2R project component has its own Project Steering Committee (PSC) that is mandated to be a joint PSC with national STAR projects. At national level there are also a number of pre-existing or project-promoted "Inter-Ministry Committees", or equivalent, that operate at various levels, from local/catchment scale to national development planning, that serve as forums for discussion and consensus building to mainstream R2R. They also have an important role in monitoring UNEP's Regional project to promote forestry and protected area management in Fiji, Niue, Vanuatu and Samoa under GEF's Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Programme.

The Regional IW R2R project is intended to be the programme support project for the Pacific R2R Programme and is expected to coordinate the implementation of not only the IW R2R national demonstration projects but also the GEF Pacific R2R Programme national R2R STAR projects in terms of capacity building, knowledge management and harmonization of technical methodologies in the integrated management of forest, land and water management. Coordinating these along with the UNDP, UNEP and FAO STAR Pacific Projects is vital to the success of R2R.

The GEF Pacific IWRM (2009 - 2014) project had established close linkages with a number of projects and programmes (mostly now concluded) including: the GEF/UNDP/UNEP Implementing Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in Atlantic and Indian Ocean PICs; and, the GEF/UNDP/UNEP Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) in the Small Island Development States of the Caribbean to reflect more than 30 SIDS globally. The IW R2R Project is to maintain and grow these linkages including via the successor GEF/UNEP/UNDP project to IWCAM, Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management (IWECO). Coordination is also to occur during implementation with other related UNDP/GEF projects including: the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC); Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the

Seas of East Asia (SDS- SEA); and, Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) through UNDP's Asia and Pacific Regional Office. The ADB/GEF Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase II) provides significant opportunities in piloting the integration of coastal and inshore management within the R2R approach and capturing those benefits is important for the CTI Participating PICs. The Melanesian Spearhead Group's Annual Environment/Climate Change Ministers and Senior Officials Meeting enables high-level coordination and integration of these. The project is also to be implemented in close coordination with other regional projects that are also being executed by SOPAC/SPC, which this project builds on. Execution of the regional project through the SOPAC Division of SPC is designed to ensure the closest possible coordination of project and co-financed activities with other regional SPC work programmes in disaster risk management, oceans and islands, water and sanitation, sustainable land use, coastal fisheries, climate change and education. The integration and coordination of these at a national level is through an agreed Joint Country Strategy Programme which is a periodically developed and agreed as integrated strategic action plans between each Member PIC and SPC. The annual Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA) meeting provides regional coordination and review. This process includes close coordination of project activities with the activities of other donor-funded projects.

4.5 Project timing and milestones

The scheduled start date of the project was April 2015 and the actual start date 31 August 2015. The current scheduled end date is 31 August 2020. This Mid-Term Review was, therefore, held at 0.71 of the scheduled duration (based on the actual start date).

The Project LogFrame contains few time-bound milestones except the establishment of effective coordination and management support (at the RPCU and national level) by the end of year one and the production of 14 "State of the Coast Reports" by the end of year 3.

4.6 Main stakeholders

The project links directly into the very strong stakeholder relationships built by the Pacific IWRM Project Community to Cabinet (and back) approach. The primary stakeholders for the project are the 14 governments of the PICs (particularly institutions dealing with water, land and coastal management, environment, disaster risk management and climate change) and communities within the R2R pilot demonstration projects. The lessons learnt will however eventually benefit all SIDS globally. There will also be global benefits as the project will seek through innovative approaches to coordinate multifocal area approaches within a R2R framework and to use demonstrated local benefits to progress national level policy reform and action. As an integrated project, private and public sectors are also to participate and benefit and this include tourism, agriculture, fisheries, health, environment and locally selected industries. The NGO community has a significant

stakeholder role in promoting awareness of water, land and coastal management and use issues and concerns, especially in demonstration project areas and in presenting the linkages both to social development and to sustainable, ecosystem-based management. At the local/demonstration site level, the Project focuses on community involvement for watershed and coastal resource management, including ICM, and will also look at the capacity building requirements at this level.

Main stakeholders and their roles are listed in Annex 10.

4.7 The Project as "testing" R2R

It is important to recognise that the project design is to "test" R2R. It is to continue to gain experience and lessons learned with R2R and to continue to build capacity in R2R. This has important implications for project evaluation. Not least, it highlights that the important contribution of the Project is lessons learned. The lessons learned from failures can be as important as from successes, provided, of course, the failures are not due to failures in project implementation.

5 Findings

5.1 Project Strategy

5.1.1 Project Design

Current guidelines on project evaluation now include an assessment of the project's *Theory of Change* at design and evaluation. The Theory of Change is a useful tool in project evaluation, including by helping clarify objectives and the degree to which targets, indicators and activities are contributing to that objective at both project design and implementation stages. However, the Project and Programme Framework Documents were designed prior to a Theory of Change statement and analysis being mandatory. There is, therefore, no explicit Theory of Change articulated in the Project Document. The project's implicit Theory of Change can nevertheless be derived from the descriptions in the Programme Framework and Project Documents and their LogFrames. Simply stated, a basic Theory of Change for the Project is that:

i. *the existing condition* (baseline)

is inefficient natural and human resources use across the landscape and seascape and sub-optimal outcomes in terms of sustainable development (including its social, economic and environmental pillars);

ii. *the hypothesis* (or assumption) (what we think causes it)

is that fragmented sector, and other, policies result in conflicting outcomes, a lack of integration (etc.) and contribute to this condition (and by default that improving these policies etc. will improve the condition);

iii. *the change that is required* (the result we want)

is to make positive changes to the baseline condition by achieving improved efficiency in natural resources use, leading to improved sustainable development outcomes;

iv. *the means to achieve that change* (interventions to achieve the change, or drivers of the change)

are to move policy, planning and investment towards an integrated approach across sectors and landscapes by providing interventions as listed in detail in the Project Document that include, for example: building national (and regional) capacity to manage natural resources in an integrated fashion; developing and applying tools to support integrated management across landscapes and seascapes (IWRM, ICM, R2R); building or strengthening governance mechanisms for integrated management; and, building experience with, and on using tools for, integrated management and communicating and sharing the lessons learned.

It is important to note that, as the Project Document describes, the required improvements in the governance (institutional and policy) landscape are a means to achieve the desired change in sustainable development outcomes, and are not an end in themselves. The critical assumption in the above is that the interventions undertaken actually deliver the required change (improved socioeconomic outcomes). This has not been explicitly expressed in the Project LogFrame but nevertheless should have been the main criterion for identifying adaptive management requirements during the inception phase (see further discussion on this point under Section 4.1.2 project LogFrame below).

To some extent the Project Document describes "*a priori technical solutions*" that are implicit in the problem description and have conditioned or subordinated the project strategy toward these pre-conceived solutions. For example, when the problem is described as a lack of something, it implicitly states that once these solutions are applied, the problem will be resolved (e.g. "the problem is lack of capacity" therefore the solution is "build capacity" and the problem will be resolved). This can be an incorrect underlying assumption; for example, experience shows that building capacity (including scientific/technical tools) frequently does not resolve problems. This is especially the case where the actual problems are political, not technical. The MTR does not conclude that the project design is in significant difficulties in these regards. It does, however, stress that the need to be constantly vigilant of the change that is required and critically assessing and measuring whether interventions achieve that change is fundamental to achieving project objectives. There are examples where the project has drifted from this principle in project implementation (see sections 4.2 and 4.3 below).

The Project (and Programme) has the significant benefit of building on previous investments in integrated natural resources management in the region and a strengthened consensus built among PIC governments that such is a priority. This includes, not least, the previous GEF Pacific IWRM Project (2009 - 2014). This is one of the main foundations of Project/Programme preparation. That reliance, however,

highlights the importance of continuing to track the impact of those previous investments and especially since it is now 5 years since those previous investments were made.

The Project and Programme documents use the terms "Integrated Water Resources Management" (IWRM) and "Integrated Coastal (Zone) Management" (ICM) somewhat loosely. Other similar concepts introduced include "Sustainable Land Management" (SLM) and "Sustainable Forest Management" (SFM). These are all largely terminologies used by different stakeholder groups that aim at similar outcomes (integrated natural resources management). This can be somewhat confusing for the reader. For example, on an island with a small landmass it would be challenging to identify the difference between IWRM and ICM (if both tools are used broadly, as they should be) and SLM and/or SFM are integral to each. The attempts to move the discussion towards Ridge to Reef (R2R) as the framework help in understanding, communication and breaking down barriers between specialist groups but could be more consistently adopted.

The minutes of the first Regional Steering Committee meeting (October 2016) note that the Pacific R2R Programme was developed under a tight schedule on a "use it or lose it" basis regarding funds. The MTR concludes that, under the circumstances at the time, those involved in programme preparation are to be complimented for securing significant GEF resources to support an important investment, in an important region and regarding a priority intervention.

Issues with Programme Coordination were identified early in the project. The first RSC meeting highlighted confusion about the links between the National R2R projects and the STAR projects. It was noted that GEF had already approved the programme and, therefore, changes could not be made to the Programme Framework Document. With hind-sight, some flaws in design can now be identified but this is normal and such matters are supposed to be addressed during an effective inception process. Section 4.3 below (on Project Implementation and Adaptive Management) points out that the absence of such adaptive management at regional project level is a leading cause of a number of the challenges the project now faces, including on "coordination".

5.1.2 Results Framework/LogFrame

When using the Results-Based Management (RBM) approach, indicators throughout should enable tracking from inputs/activities, through outputs, to outcomes and objectives that reflect progress towards the desired change. In this Project, the "result" (in RBM) is change (as described above). That trail should link outcomes better to a described, and preferably quantified, development benefit (e.g. increasing income generation, gender equality, increased delivery of ecosystem benefits - that is, to the identified change). The MTR stresses that there is confidence that the project outcomes will lead to such development benefits. The assumption that improved integrated natural resources management and planning will support sustainable development outcomes is entirely reasonable. But the links through to development benefits should be clear, better identified in the LogFrame

and monitored where feasible, in order to keep the project on track regarding its purpose.

The terms used to describe many outcomes, such as "successful pilot projects achieved", "diagnostic analyses undertaken", "community leader roundtable networks established", and "national and regional platforms established", do not clearly articulate the desired change. It is assumed that these will contribute to change, but change itself is not specified. Likewise for many indicators the links to desired change are unclear or absent. In an RBM framework all activities, outputs, outcomes, and objectives should be linked and tracked to the desired change, using change related indicators throughout. Put another way, many of the current outcomes (and indicators) assume that if they are delivered then the change will occur. This raises three important points. First, if that is the case then it should be possible to identify indicators that make that link (input to output to outcome to change) and for consistency should be included. Second, important assumptions should be constantly reviewed (e.g. at inception and periodic monitoring) and the only way to test validity of the assumption is through monitoring using appropriate indicators. Third, having a complete (and expanded) Theory of Change (or RBM framework) encourages "bottom line" or "whole thinking" approaches to implementation and adaptive management.

The MTR observes that the Project Document, in several places, makes it clear that a focus of delivering the desired outcome (sustainable development) is to conserve or enhance ecosystem services. The term is mentioned in the Project's objective. The MTR agrees with that emphasis. However, the LogFrame would have been much more appropriate had it been designed from an ecosystem services perspective. That would have enabled linkages between project activities, targets, indicators, outcomes and the desired change to be much more explicit and easily identified. Section 4.2 discusses further the Project's use of an ecosystem goods and services framework/approach.

The Project objective is to "*To test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services "*. The indicator for this is "*Extent of harmonization of sectoral governance frameworks for integrated 'ridge to reef' approaches achieved through national sustainable development planning*". However, the indicator as just stated, does not actually indicate whether livelihoods are sustained or ecosystem services are preserved. The test of whether ridge to reef is working, that is achieving the desired change, is whether it results in improved natural resources sustainability and related sustainable development outcomes. That is, the criteria for whether planning is successful is whether it results in change. This would need to be better reflected in the Project LogFrame if it is to be fully aligned to RBM.

Addressing how project monitoring and evaluation tracks contributions to development through adjusting the LogFrame would require substantial changes.

The MTR concludes that, at this stage, addressing how outcomes, targets, and indicators address the required sustainable development outcomes can instead be improved through: (i) using ecosystem goods and services (that is, benefits for people) as the framework for project implementation, including incorporating ecosystem goods and services indicators into site-level assessments and diagnostic assessments (etc.), which would create better links to socioeconomic (development) outcomes, as discussed and recommended in Section 4.2 (below); and (ii) identifying the linkages between the project outcomes, targets and indicators and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals, with attention to identifying indicators where feasible, as proposed in Section 4.2.1 (section referring to progress under Component 3).

Section 3.7 (above) points out that the Project is to "test" mainstreaming of R2R and notes, therefore, that lessons learned, including from failures, are critical. However, the LogFrame design centres heavily on achieving project outcomes and objectives and although lessons learned is included in some sub-activities they are not dominant. A solution might have been to elevate "lessons learned" to the level of Project Component. Subsequent sections (4.2, 4.3, 4.4) stress this point and make recommendations in this regard.

Some of the indicators in use (e.g. for stress reduction measures) are getting closer to measuring desired change yet still assume that reducing a stress (pressure) results in change related benefits. Better to measure that change. Also, these apply only to demonstration sites and it is not clear if they actually result from "R2R", meaning that in some cases the stresses could be reduced without an R2R framework. So it remains difficult to identify the added value of R2R.

It could be reasonably argued that it can take a long time for policy change (e.g. mainstreaming R2R) to deliver sustainable development benefits. However, this should not be an excuse for not trying to measure them. In addition, it is now over 10 years since significant GEF investments in "R2R" commenced and it is now critical to establish whether the stated objectives/benefits are being delivered.

There are a number of current indicators in the LogFrame that in general refer to the need to disaggregate data by gender where appropriate in addition to the inclusion of several gender specific targets. Although important in themselves, these gender related indicators and targets do not necessarily fully reflect the extent to which women (and vulnerable or minority groups) are fully and effectively involved in decision making. The underlying socio-cultural factors that determine full and effective participation in decision-making, and not just numerical representation in decision-making forums, need to be also addressed. More detailed observations on how the Project and its LogFrame are addressing monitoring and evaluating Gender and Development (GAD) are made in Section 4.3.7 dedicated to this topic. This makes suggestions as to how to improve GAD considerations including better approaches to incorporating GAD into national project LogFrames many of which are being revised.

In analysing how SMART are the project's outcomes, targets and indicators, the MTR found the following:

Specific: As above, some outcomes, targets and indicators did not use a 'change' language or were described with enough clarity for a specific future condition.

Measurable: Indicators of quantitative changes in material conditions are not necessarily enough to dent an outcome in a sustainable way; and indicators need to measure progress towards change that contributes to the Theory of Change.

Achievable: In only a few cases are the targets unrealistic in that the project does not have the capacity to achieve them.

Relevant: In terms of outcomes, despite the above-mentioned drawbacks, the MTR concludes that the project will, if implemented effectively, make important contributions towards national development priorities. There are, however, some needs to realign some targets and indicators towards creating the required changes.

Time-bound: All Outcomes have specified the targets at the end of project. It would have been helpful if the inception process identified time-bound targets and milestones within the project duration (e.g. by mid-term). This would have enabled better and quantified tracking of project implementation.

An assessment of the degree to which each individual target or indicator is SMART is presented in Annex 7.

At this stage the MTR does not recommend major changes to the LogFrame but has already noted that this is less an issue with Project Design and more an issue with opportunities for adaptive management during project inception. The practical point is that future implementation needs to be clear about what change is required and how to achieve it and avoid just mechanically achieving targets as per the LogFrame.

Some recommendations regarding adjusting some of the LogFrame targets and indicators (but not outcomes at this stage) are made in Section 4.4 (and in Annex 6). These include some minor adjustments arising from the current section (detailed in Annex 7) but also changes required due to implementation challenges (Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4).

5.1.3 Adequacy of the Project Budget

The project budget is in-line with its intended outputs and outcomes. There are no indications that the project is seriously over or under funded. Financial resources availability has not been raised as a serious constraint to implementation. Regarding allocations for national demonstration projects, the USD 200,000 for each PIC is, in general, adequate to achieve the outputs/targets of the national Project LogFrames. The problem, however, is that when viewed from a national perspective this allocation is over several years (between 3 and 5) and makes this (financially) a small project. Yet the administrative, including monitoring, evaluation and reporting, burden at national level can be as high as a much larger project (e.g. STAR

projects). This has raised issues in some PICs and contributed to delays in start-up at national level (see Section 4.3.1 below).

The MTR concludes that this is an important project that can demonstrate that small investments can lead to big improvements. When considering its role within the overall GEF Pacific R2R Programme, and its intended role in coordination, the project becomes even more significant. But, unfortunately, in some circles the importance of a project is often equated to the size of its budget.

In hind-sight, an alternative might have been to elevate this IW R2R Project to being the Programme, with the STAR projects under its budget as its national demonstration activities. That would also have resolved some of the constraints the project has in programme coordination (see Section 4.3.1 below). It is likely that this was considered but not feasible at the time.

5.2 Progress towards results

5.2.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis

The project LogFrame does not include mid-term targets except for one (3.1.3 requiring "State of the Coasts" reports finished and presented at summits in all PICs by the end of year 3). Mid-term targets should have been discussed and set at the inception stage.

Table 1 presents the MTR findings regarding the progress of the project towards its intended results as per the Project Document, using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. Of the 29 individual targets set by project-end: none have yet been achieved; 11 are on target to be achieved, with 18 not on target to be achieved, and with a number of these now unachievable within the project's current duration. Progress for only two targets is assessed as satisfactory, eight moderately satisfactory, 12 moderately unsatisfactory, six unsatisfactory and one highly unsatisfactory. The reasons for, and solutions to, this poor performance to date vary across targets.

The MTR also assessed the targets and indicators in the LogFrame regarding their compliance to "SMART" (in Section 4.1), and made further recommendations for adjustments to some of the targets and indicators resulting from observations and assessments in the current section, in Annex 6. The MTR also has some important observations and recommendations on the approach that the project is taking towards achieving a number of the targets.

Table 1: Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets)

"Cumulative progress reported" is that reported by the RPCU at a workshop in December 2018 and based on the latest PIR (2018). The MTR assessment and rating was based on this information, additional country reports, interviews and country visits and independently assessed. Where assessments of progress differ between these two sources justification for the assessment and ranking is stated. Assessments in this table are based on the current end date of the project (that is, not factoring in a no-cost extension).

MLA = Midterm level and assessment - Indicator Assessment Key:

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

AR = Achievement rating - Progress towards results rating scale: Highly satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately satisfactory (MS); Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) Unsatisfactory (U); Highly unsatisfactory (HU).

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability							
Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]							
1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	1.1.1 Baseline environmental and social data is unconsolidated	**None**	1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed	PIR: Off track. Self Assessment: On track. As an initial step, environmental monitoring plans were developed in accordance with the approved monitoring guidelines. RapCA planning and conduct in Vanuatu, and planning for Samoa underway. RapCA in Sol Is, Samoa and PNG Environmental monitoring SOP for coastal		MU	Baseline environmental state, social and CC vulnerability indictors/metrics and information limited (see narrative). Plans are in-place, but no actual diagnostics yet at many sites.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
				water and compost developed Environmental monitoring field proformas for - revegetation - WQ - compost - land rehab National diagnostic procedure finalised with report template – this collates socio-economic baseline and RapCA data Result report/project progress Fact sheets - Science and Policy - HRR - MYCWP - RapCA Video Vanuatu FAQs Benefits R2R Principles RSC3 Resources/Online			
1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators * Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) * Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) * Area of restored habitat (ha) * Area of conserved/protected wetland * Area of catchment under improved management (ha) Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods * Status of mechanisms for PM&E *	1.1.2 Limited community and cross-sectoral participation in the planning of coordinated investments and stress reduction efforts in land, forest, water and coastal management in PICs. (Baseline for water, environmental and social economic		1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management,	PIR: Off track. Self-Assessment: On track. 12 PICs are implementing their respective projects (except Fiji just started and no data for Kiribati). Training on Gender mainstreaming was carried out in 6 PICs (FSM, RMI, Palau, Solomon, Tuvalu, & Vanuatu) Regional gender mainstreaming toolkit		MU	Most national project delayed start-up. Gender analysis and mainstreaming still weak. Most PICS - It is unlikely that actions at project sites will lead to verifiable reductions in stressors (or improvements in habitat quality) by project end. Most PICS - Limited

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans	status indicators for municipal waste pollution, pollution to aquifers, areas of restored habitat, area of conserved/protected wetland, area of catchment under improved management, and number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods, will be obtained at project start.)		and resulting in: * Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites) * Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites) * 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) * 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7 sites) * 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities * Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites) * 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results * Direct national pilot project beneficiary	Gender action plans for countries WQ baseline assessment in Tuvalu			evidence of testing methods etc. best practice examples, community action. Most PICS - Limited evidence of demonstrations and forming committees etc. leading to actual improvements on the ground. Most PICS - Limited evidence of adoption Further information on timelines in Annex 12.
Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments							

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	1.2.1 Choice of sites for GEF and other donor investment in natural resource and environmental management does not adequately represent the range of biological, environmental and socio-economic conditions in PICs		1.2.1 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs	PIR: On track Self-Assessment: On track. IDA Draft Report written for Cook Islands, PNG and Palau. Preliminary IDA workshops held in Samoa, Cook Islands, FSM Concept note for diagnostic analysis procedure RFP for contractor to develop/deliver diagnostic analysis (closes 4 Jan) Need IDA Reports		MU	Only a limited number of some IDAs have been done. The only way to complete all 14 by project end would now be to engage RPCU staff and/or consultants to complete them which undermines capacity building.
1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites	1.2.2 Lack of a scientifically sound and objective procedure for the selection of locations for investment in integrated natural resource and environmental management in PICs		1.2.2 Up to 14 ICM-IWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project	PIR: Off track. Self-Assessment: NA Delay. No new progress since last report. TOR for Geospatial scientist Draft methodology for prioritizing and characterizing coastal areas Data collection from Vanuatu to trial methodology		MU	Some progress is made in developing a list of indicators but the list is sub-optimal for purpose (see narrative). Methodology in development and testing but unlikely 14 can be completed by project end.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM							
1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks	1.3.1 Limited engagement of community-based governance mechanisms in national policy and planning		1.3.1 Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national "Ridge to Reef" Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS	PIR: Off track. Self-Assessment: On track. Rounding up the series of inception workshops are the ones in Tonga, FSM, Kiribati & RMI held during the first half of 2018. Representatives from the various sectors attended the workshops led by the PICs' implementing agency. The IMCs discuss R2R topics serving as an interim multi-stakeholder leader roundtable network. Collation of all ICM member – collection of minutes of meetings held (newly formed IMC – Sol Is)		MU	Representatives from sectors attending project inception workshops does not qualify as substantial or sustainable engagement. Most PICS have not established "IMCs" as intended in the ProDoc. Cook Islands, Vanuatu and PNG have PSCs specific to IW R2R and no joint PSC with STAR and no IMC, Fiji, Niue, RMI, Tonga and Tuvalu have a IW R2R PSC sharing functions with the STAR PSC but no clearly identified IMC; Palau and Samoa have an IMC that also functions as the PSC for IW R2R and STAR; only FSM and Solomon Islands have both a PSC and an IMC. Nauru plans a joint PSC. No data for Kiribati. Further details in the text Section 4.3.1 (management arrangements) In its M&E - the RPCU is mixing up PSCs and IMCs in its assessment (see narrative in Section 4.3.1).
1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for greements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable	1.3.2 Low level mobilization of the private sector in environmental		1.3.2 Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums	**PIR: Off track/delay.** Self-Assessment: Delay. No new progress since last report.		U	There is limited evidence of engagement with the private sector that has been initiated by the project

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
development	investment and planning in PICs		for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions	Muri Lagoon Action Group engaged with Cook Islands, membership includes Tourism operators of Muri			(except inclusion of some private sectors in demo sites in a limited number of PICs – Cook Is, Solomon Is and Palau) No evidence of private sector investment stimulated by the project.
Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation							
Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation							
2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management.*Data will be gender disaggregated	2.1.1 Zero R2R postgraduate training courses available specific to the PacificRegion.		2.1.1 At least 10 people with postgraduate training in R2R management. *At least 5 people will be women At least 3 innovative post-graduate training programs for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring programme with results documented	PIR: On track Self-Assessment: On track. Ongoing implementation of the Post Graduate Certificate in R2R Sustainable Development with James Cook University (JCU), with 51 enrolees on course on ecosystem dynamics and 44 enrolees in courses on Project Management and tools for R2R. Overall, 52% of enrolees were women. Complaints received from students especially re programme management course (response from JCU hardly received)		S	Due partly to an increased budget allocation from UNDP, the target by project- end has now been exceeded in terms of numbers of people. Further course delivery is expected to be on target.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	2.1.2 Limited national and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation constrains achievement of best practice in integrated management in PICs		2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. *Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented	PIR: On track Self-Assessment: On track. No new update on this indicator		S	
Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated							
2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity	2.2.1 Required functional competencies of national and local personnel for environment and natural resource management in PIC contexts undefined and untracked		2.2.1 Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM)	PIR: Off track Self-Assessment: Delay. Of the 44 currently enrolled in the JCU PGC, 15 are R2R project personnel, while 29 number are employees of the gov't. agency with the tasks of managing & implementing programs & projects.		MU	Reports of cumulative progress refer to the JCU course personnel that is not clearly related to the indicator or target which refers to personnel identified, competencies tracked benchmarked and analysed and studies produced. .

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
building support secured with results documented.			implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented.				Limited progress. The terminology and intent of this activity/indicator/target is indeed ambiguous in that it is not clear if the primary intention here is to assess/track/benchmark actual capacity needs or to train staff. The MTR has favoured the former interpretation based on the stated baseline condition.
2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels	2.2.2 Retention of skilled and experienced practitioners in environment and natural resource management low, particularly in project based investments, including limited dialogue on human capacity needs for cross-sectoral		2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.	PIR: NA Self-Assessment: On track. No new update on this indicator since last report. Recruitment of consultant that will do the competency study – NOT RFP BECAUSE NO RPC TO MAKE THE DECISION		MU	No evidence of "on track" - no progress towards target.
Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks							
Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally							
3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised	3.1.1 Constrained and inadequate sectoral		3.1.1 National recommendations for	PIR:		MU	No progress or activity is

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks	planning and investment of natural and social systems in PICs		14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks	Self-assessment: On track. No new update on this indicator since last report. Compilation of existing national policy, legislation for 14 PICs to be catalogued. No activity. No new update on this indicator since last report. Regional database in development with Geo-Informatics unit as SPC GEM "Nothing" Science to Policy Interface Factsheets			evident.
3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans	3.1.2 Lack of national and regional policy and plans to support the mainstreaming of R2R approaches in development planning		3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders	PIR: Off track Self-Assessment: Delay. Awaiting the results of assessments (i.e. IDA and RapCA) Draft methodology developed for consultation with national leaders and stakeholders. Off track. Awaiting the results of assessments (i.e. IDA and RapCA)		U	Given the stated length of time to develop the frameworks and delays in production of supporting information (e.g. IDAs, SoC) the target will not be met within the timeline.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment	application of evidence-based approaches in PICs national development planning in the areas of: freshwater use and sanitation; wastewater treatment and pollution control; land use and forestry practices; balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation; hazard risk reduction; and climate variability and change	3.1.3 National 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports for 14 PICs completed and launched to Pacific Leaders during National Coastal Summits (Yr 3) in coordination with national R2R projects and demonstrated as national development planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal		PIR: Off track Self-Assessment: Delay. No new update of this indicator. Awaiting the results of IDA and RapCA, which are inputs for the SoC/SoI. RFP for contractor to develop/deliver SoC Reports for 4 countries – in procurement process		U	IDAs, SoCs are well behind schedule and have not been finished on schedule meaning that their demonstrated use/impact is extremely unlikely by project end.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
		areas					
Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs							
3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	3.2.1 National IWRM task forces and local coordinating committees in 12 countries and a need exists for strengthened coordination of IWRM plan implementation within broader R2R frameworks		3.2.1Up to14 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project interministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and programme levels	**PIR: On track** **Self Assessment: On track**. Except Kiribati, 13 PICs have their IMC established and functional. Highlighted in this report is that both STAR and IW have Joint IMCs in the 7 PICs namely: Cook, FSM, Fiji, RMI, Samoa, Palau & Tuvalu		U	The MTR notes that IMCs are different to PSCs - the RPCU is basing progress on PSCs. Most PICs have not established IMCs as a result of the project (but parallel institutions exist). There is limited evidence on "national" IWRM committees (there are some local/catchment ones). There is no known/demonstrated "network" (initiated by the project) currently functional for R2R strengthening and no known "broader R2R frameworks" established by the project except in Palau (but parallel frameworks do exist). See narrative for further explanation.
3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.2 Limited number and variety of stakeholders participating in national coordinating bodies to ensure community to Cabinet		3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with	**PIR:** On track. Self-Assessment: **On track.** As mentioned in 3.2.1, only Kiribati still needed to establish its IMC. Contrary to what has been stated in the indicator, the project shall advocate for a functional IMC		U	See above comments on "IMCs"

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
	planning of investment in sustainable development of PICs		meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	with multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary membership including representatives from LGUs, community-based organizations, NGOs, private sector, etc.			
3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	3.2.3 Limited exchange between communities on best practices in environment and natural resource management		3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits	**PIR:** Off track. Self-Assessment: **Delay.** The planned community tech exchange visits did not materialize. No further update for this indicator since last report. The planned community tech exchange visits did not materialize. Upon further investigation, it wasn't feasible as there was no functional piggery in RMI but alternative technical visits are planned.		MU	So far there is limited evidence of "networks" being established.
3.2.4 Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.4 Limited learning on effectiveness of investments in country-driven approaches to development assistance in PICs		3.2.4 At least 20 ICM members total from the 4 pilot PICs (sub-regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) gauge in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques. *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	PIR: On track. On track. Self-Assessment: **On track.** A one-day MSC (Most Significant Change) Technique training was held in Tonga with 18 participants from STAR and IW projects. During the cluster meetings in November and December 2017, and the recruitment of the new project managers, the MSC technique was again presented. During these meetings, four countries volunteered to apply the MSC technique nationally (Cook Islands, Palau, Samoa, Vanuatu).		MU	See earlier comments on "IMCs" and further discussion on IMCs in Section 4.3. Although MSC training has occurred - although not necessarily with members of IMCs - there is no evidence that this has led to "change in perception through participatory

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
				This indicator be fully reported at the end of the project.			techniques".
Component 4 Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management							
Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects							
4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme	4.1.1 Calls from Pacific leaders for strengthened emphasis on results in the planning and financing of development in PICs		4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs	**PIR:** On track. **Self Assessment:** On track. CCMEA recruited in November 2017. Various planning and reporting templates were developed (such as the Annual Progress Reporting, Mid-Term Report, and Results-Oriented Planning Tool (multi-year costed workplan). Participation at Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Forum and Voluntary National Report (VNR) workshop in Tanoa, Nadi.		MS	This is one area where the project has made progress - since the recruitment of the CCMEA. The MTR team has reviewed a draft of an early stage integrated and simplified results framework for integrated multi-focal projects.
4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	4.1.2 Lack of results tracking and reporting approach tested via GEF Pac IWRM project, including training of a cadre of national WatSan sector staff		4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	**PIR:** On track. Self-Assessment: On Track With the focus of-harmonizing results reporting along the GEF Focal Areas, a simple Harmonized Results Reporting (HRR) template and corresponding guidance document was prepared, and will be presented to the RSTC and the RSC3. HRR Factsheet and template. Advocacy IWC9; SAMOA Pathway		MS	

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
				Need follow up from RPCU and UNDP			
4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 An increasingly large myriad of national level reporting requirements for natural resource and environment agencies constrains the timely and accurate reporting of results of development assistance in PICs		4.1.3 Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment: On track Request from UNDP STAR projects for orientation and/or training on Results Based Management was supported. The importance of linking planning-monitoring and reporting results were highlighted during the orientation/ training sessions.		MS	
Outcome 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established							
4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations	4.2.1 Absence of public-private partnership in support of communicating benefits of IWRM initiated via GEF Pac IWRM project		4.2.1 Regional 'ridge to reef' communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project including at least 10 partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment: On track The communication strategy and guide to developing national communications plans supports both STAR and IW projects in designing/formulating their respective communication plans and implementation. Project Manager Training Social Media RSC3		MS	
4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published	4.2.2 Limited regional and global sharing of information on best practice and lessons learned from the GEF Pacific Alliance for		4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment: Participated in the IW Learn events that were held in Cape Town (Nov- Dec. 2017) and in Bangkok (April- May 2018).		MS	

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
	Sustainability		combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant	At least 3 experience notes published by IWC 2018. IWC9 SAMOA Pathway RPCU participated in IW Learn and IWC			
4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Need for media platforms and targeted communications in support of efforts to harness support for inter-ministerial coordination and policy and planning elements of the R2R programme		4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc.	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment: On track The R2R Website that was previously established is undergoing enhancement to ensure its optimum functionality. Negotiation is ongoing with a service provider and a proposal submitted to RPCU in October 2017. RFP Website/associated databases Included here the weblink to the current website and R2R Network. https://pacific-r2r.org/		MS	
Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination							
Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects							
5.1.1 programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained	5.1.1 No coordination unit and full time personnel established	overall R2R programme coordination unit with alignment of development		**PIR:** Off track. Self-Assessment: delay The project suffered several setbacks with the resignation of the Regional Programme Coordinator. CKMA was Officer-in-Charge of Regional Project and RPCU with no reliever for the CKMA function as it was uncertain of the return of the RPC		HU	Although the project now has a full staff complement, the history of recruitment of RPCU staff and catering for periods of vacancies in key positions is highly unsatisfactory.

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
		worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1)		CCMEA was hired in Nov. 2017. A consultant was also commissioned to act as interim PSL. Since May 2018, the Director of GEM-SPC acted as the interim Regional Programme Coordinator. Regional Programme Coordinator and Science and national project leader now in place since February 2019			
5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit	5.1.2 Limited national level experience and capacity in delivery of large integrated natural resource and environment projects and programs		5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall programme goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively.	**PIR:** On track. Self-Assessment: On track. RPCU provided technical and management support to the 12 PICs in reviewing their quarterly and annual plans and progress reports.		MU	The project has responded to some requests for support - but mainly from national IW R2R demo projects. There is limited support to STAR projects - other than training on M&E and RBM on an ad-hoc basis and minor joint support between IW and STAR at national level (e.g. water quality assessment in Tuvalu). But in general the RPCU has not supported STAR projects - although this is known to be largely due to absence of requests from STAR projects. There are a number of examples of where STAR projects have deliberately side-stepped the RPCU when seeking technical support.
5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing	5.1.3 Low-level familiarity with GEF minimum standards for results-based management, monitoring and		5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment: On track As mentioned in 4.1.3, RBM training conducted for both STAR and IW highlighting the importance of linking		MS	

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
	evaluation, and financial and progress reporting requirements of GEF and its implementing agencies		building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing.	planning-implementation- monitoring and reporting. Pre RPC and follow up through country visits: - SI - Nauru - Samoa - FSM - RMI - Palau - Fiji			
5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories	5.1.4 Existing GEF IWRM interactive website with a cadre of national project stakeholders trained in its operation		5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices	**PIR:** On track. Self Assessment: On track Consolidation of available programme information and communications products into the website conducted. Continuing environmental management database system with consultant led workshop in February and ongoing with SPC.		MS	
5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-	5.1.5 Limited sub-regional and regional coordination and planning workshops		5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted	PIR: On track. Self-Assessment:		U	Despite activities to support "coordination" (as listed) - the MTR notes that the criterion for success of

Indicator	Baseline level	Midterm target	End-of-project target	Cumulative progress reported	MLA	AR	Justification for rating
effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	conducted in association with intergovernmental meetings for cost efficiency purposes		for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network	Further to the usual technical and management backstopping support to the PICs, the RPCU also held cluster meetings in November and December 2017, aimed to support the project managers in their respective tasks. RPCU staff provides technical support to UNDP projects (STAR project managers and coordinators) by acting as resource person in planning and management meetings, orientation, and workshops. To be planned and carried out after MTR (pre RSC) Comms support and training for PMs RSC3			this is "to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting". The MTR concludes that by-and-large there is now an almost complete separation between STAR projects, IW demo projects and serious absence of "coordination" by the project. See narrative for further discussion on this point. Marked as red and unsatisfactory to flag this as a problem area for the project.

1

The following is a summary of the MTR findings by component, outcome and target, as appropriate:

Component 1: National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability

Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]

There intended to be 14 national demonstration projects, one in each PIC. Progress among these varies significantly. Information on Kiribati is currently missing. Some have almost completed (e.g. Palau, Tuvalu), others have only just started (e.g. Fiji), and in others implementation picked up only in 2018. Further details on milestones, timelines and reasons for delays are presented in Section 4.3.1 (Management Arrangements), below. Only Samoa, Vanuatu and Niue are progressing with their original national project LogFrame. In all other cases the activities and targets of LogFrames of national projects have been adjusted from their originals in the Project Document. This was usually done in the light of either change in circumstances since project design, local practical realities and/or after a re-assessment of national priorities and/or institutional mandates. However, all remain consistent with the project's intended outcomes and objectives. The MTR team supports such adjustments as a good example of adaptive management. However, it remains unclear to the MTR which revised national project LogFrames were approved by the national PSCs and RSC, and which not.

> **Recommendation 1:** The RPCU, together with National Project Managers, should review and update all current national project LogFrames and ensure that, if not already done so, each is approved at the next national PSC and RSC meetings.

(The MTR team considers such approval should be a formality and the objective here is not to delay any activities but to ensure that the project terminal evaluation assesses the national projects against approved revised LogFrames, not the originals, where appropriate).

In some cases, there is evidence that IW R2R national demonstration projects have stimulated broader R2R thinking. Although the extent to which this can be attributed to the current project or the previous IWRM project can be difficult to determine, the continuation of efforts to mainstream R2R approaches is a positive outcome and continuing need.

Twelve PICS have produced and/or are finalising and/or implementing plans for their respective demonstration projects that test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples (etc.) as per Target 1.1.2. Fiji has only just started its national demonstration project and there are no data for Kiribati. Most of the demonstration projects involve planning and promoting local and community-based integrated resources management activities. Most are at an early stage due to delays in project start-up (see Section 4.3.1) and it

is too early to expect that they will have a measurable impact on actual stress reduction and/or contribute to measurable improvements in environmental condition. It is, therefore, premature to assess progress towards the quantified stress reduction (or outcome) targets/indicators as per target 1.1.2. The Targets/indicators in 1.1.2 also need to be revised in the light of changes to national LogFrames (see Annex 6). Nevertheless, many PICS (including Cook Islands, FSM, Nauru, Niue, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu) have started implementing some direct stress reduction measures at their sites that include habitat restoration, re-vegetation for coastal protection or water quality improvement, wetland habitat management and/or improved waste management. National demonstrations in Palau mainly support planning and management with limited direct stress reduction activities undertaken directly by the project itself. In Tuvalu stress reduction measures have been demonstrated (re. dry litter piggeries) but it is still too early to assess actual implementation of the measures by communities. Again, even for the actual implemented stress reduction measures it is too early to evaluate if they are impacting environmental conditions as per the Target/indicator 1.1.2.

A significant weakness of the demonstration projects is that most rely on "demonstrating", or "testing" R2R approaches, but the critical test of success is uptake or broader adoption of the approach. For example, in Tuvalu, the "dry litter" approach to pig manure management is a highly logical solution to reducing stressors on water quality and has the significant benefit of closing nutrient loops through using the waste to support family farming, which also has the significant advantage of improving food security, livelihoods and the island economy. The Tuvalu IW R2R national project has done a good job in demonstrating the feasibility of this approach but so far there is limited evidence of community uptake, without which it will be difficult to justify significant investment in up-scaling. In its remaining time the project will be focussing on this point. A similar observation can be made for many of the national demonstrations of improved catchment management where various community and local/national level structures and processes have been, or are being, established but so far there is no evidence yet that they are being effective in improving management outcomes in practice, including reducing stressors, nor that they are sustainable.

There is clear evidence that the previous GEF IWRM Project (2009-2014) had positive impacts. However, the MTR team was alerted to relevant experiences on sustainability of its demonstration projects. For example, in Tuvalu a key output of the IWRM project was to demonstrate the use of "dry" toilets ("Ecosan") which was followed by investment (from the European Commission) in up-scaling Ecosan to 40 households. But in 2019 only two Ecosan toilets are known to remain. Similarly, in Tonga, sustainability of Ecosan is questioned due to lack of consumer acceptance (e.g., labour-intensiveness and inconvenience due to no easy access to leaves for compost). In Vanuatu and Palau, the IWRM project successfully demonstrated catchment management planning approaches and the established various community and local/sub-national governance arrangements for the Sarakata Catchment on Santo Island and the Airai State Watershed, respectively. In both

cases, in 2019 practically nothing remains in either catchment (including IWRM governance arrangements). However, in both cases some lessons were learned from the previous catchments and are now being implemented in new catchments by their IW R2R Project national demonstration projects. Vanuatu counterparts made the useful observation that projects should "start with a plan, not finish with one".

Sustainability of project benefits is a common issue with most projects in the PICs. The MTR certainly got the impression that some of the outcomes of the GEF IWRM Project are indeed more sustainable than is the norm in this region. But since the IW R2R Project is a continuation of previous investments these experiences with sustainability with some of the GEF IWRM Project outputs point to opportunities for the IW R2R Project to build very important lessons learned on the basis of a now longer time horizon.

Such observations on sustainability also question the criteria of "success" of demonstrations of the current IW R2R project. It is reasonable to expect that it will take time for R2R approaches to deliver sustainable outcomes and that the need for demonstrations and project support will continue into the future. But it is now over 10 years since the "R2R" approach was first promoted through GEF support (by the IWRM project in 2009) and it is reasonable to expect that after 10 years of significant investments there should be a clearer picture of uptake, up-scaling and impact. The current project LogFrame and project strategy run the risk of repeating a mistake made by IWRM: that a demonstration alone is not a measure of sustained impact or success. This point reinforces the conclusion also made elsewhere that a critically important and valuable output of the project is “lessons learned.”

> **Recommendation 2:** The RPCU, in collaboration with national agencies, should review the impact of previous IWRM, ICM and R2R (if any) investments, and particularly the GEF IWRM Project, based on current realities and with the objective of deriving further lessons learned, particularly regarding impact, up-scaling and sustainability.

Sustainability of the outcomes of the IW R2R Project is discussed further in Section 4.4.

The MTR has noted much progress in the IW R2R national demonstrations in integrating better with on-going activities/processes on the ground. These include integrating with local and national planning mechanisms, processes and institutional arrangements as well as with other relevant projects. Palau successfully brokered the membership of Airai State into the Belau Watershed Alliance through an Airai State formal resolution. Vanuatu had its Tagabe River Management Plan launched as a national document, but is looking for more sustainable financing by having it integrated into a regular public financing. Most of the countries have also initiated efforts in this direction and are exploring extant opportunities for such integration. For example, several countries have started aligning their coastal, catchment and protected area establishment and management planning with the provisions of national law: PNG in the declaration of Tuna Bay as an MPA, RMI in the preparation of the Laura Integrated Coastal Management Plan

through the *Reimaanlok* process supporting the country's National Conservation Area Plan*;* Samoa in having the Letongo Fagalii Catchment Management Plan endorsed by the Cabinet, parliament and Head of State; Solomon Islands in ensuring the Mataniko Catchment Management Plan supports the implementation of its Conservation Act; Tuvalu is working on having its 8,000 head dry-litter piggery project included in its next National Strategy for Sustainable Development for 2021 onwards; FSM is looking at composing its Freshwater Management Plan for Kosrae in collaboration with the Micronesian Red Cross – Kosrae Chapter and the Community Water Resources Management Plan it's implementing; Tonga is planning to engage with its Health Department for its Ecosan component and the Coastal Division of its Natural Resources Department for its fishery refuge component; Niue is exploring synergies/complementarities with related projects such as the EU and GIZ Wastewater Project and, Cook Islands is exploring mainstreaming relevant approaches into infrastructure permitting systems and investments plans to build infrastructure resilience in the face of climate change. However, there remain further opportunities and needs for integration among some of the projects and PICs.

> **Recommendation 3:** Each national demonstration project should re-evaluate its linkages to and relationships with other relevant projects and activities at local and national level, and with local planning mechanisms and institutional arrangements, to ensure that its activities and outputs are coherent with, and build upon and strengthen, these other activities and governance systems.

Most National Project Managers focus mainly on component 1 (the demonstration projects) despite them having a role in components 3, 4 and 5 (as per the Project Document and usually in their own terms of reference). This is discussed further below.

There are some important observations regarding how the national demonstration projects are "linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network" that are discussed further under component 5 (below) and in Section 4.3 on coordination.

Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments

It remains unclear to the MTR team why this outcome is included under Component 1 since all models show it inputs into Component 3 and as such is discussed further under that Component (below).

Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM

The national projects have had overall limited progress (so far) in establishing multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks for strengthening R2R. Current mechanisms for "community to cabinet ICM/IWRM" include establishing local site-level management committees and various forms of project steering committee arrangements. Most of these centre on the implementation of the local

demonstration projects and it is unclear how they "network" through to "cabinet" level. For most PICs, there is currently no clear project strategy for delivering the prescribed "network" (nor in fact what that actually means, or for engagement at the higher levels of national planning, e.g. at Ministry level).

In several components and outcomes, including this one, the establishment of "inter-ministerial committees" (IMCs) is referred to. These are regarded as high level structures/institutions, and not site-based local structures/institutions, and not the same as Project Steering Committees. This topic is discussed further under coordination (inter-ministerial committees) in Section 4.3.1, with recommendations, that provides more detail for individual PICs.

There is also limited evidence of substantial engagement to discuss "opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation" (indicator 1.3.2) and no clear or comprehensive project strategy to deliver this at present. The MTR notes the efforts of some PICs, albeit still limited, to engage with the private sector at demonstration site level (for example an electric power company in Vanuatu, and with the tourism sector in Palau, Cook Islands, and Solomon Islands). Some PICs (e.g Cook Islands) note that the national project has neither the resources nor the influence to engage seriously with the private sector, noting that there are however other processes doing this that could be accessed. This topic refers to the objective of the project to mainstream R2R and is discussed further under Component 3 (below).

Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation

The MTR notes that only outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 (discussed below) are listed in the LogFrame but that the main capacity building activities of the project arise, or potentially arise, from its activities ("on the job") under components 1, 3, 4 and 5. This could be better reported by the project and linked to Component 2.

Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation

Post-graduate training (indicator 2.1.1) has progressed well through the custom designed courses at James Cook University (JCU), Australia. There were 51 enrolees in the course on ecosystem dynamics and 44 enrolees in courses on project management and tools for R2R. Overall, 52% of enrolees were women. A fourth course on governance is on-going. All PICs of the GEF Pacific R2R Programme are represented in this course. Cook Islands has sent the most number of participants with 8, while Samoa only has 1 enrolee; FSM and Niue have sent 5 students; Tuvalu has 4; Fiji, Nauru, Palau, PNG and Tonga each have 3 students; while RMI, Solomon and Vanuatu each has 2.

Those staff interviewed (Annex 1) that had undertaken or were currently undertaking the courses expressed overall satisfaction with the usefulness of the

courses. One even mentioned that an initiative that he introduced in his project site was a course output from JCU. A number remarked about having difficulties balancing course requirements and actual project related-functions. This is especially the case for late entrants. The poor internet connections in the islands was also cited as a major concern since the programmes are offered online. Most participants commented that they especially appreciated the module on practical tools for R2R, with some reporting uptake of this knowledge already into project implementation. In terms of course content. It was remarked that the project management course was weak on adaptive management. The MTR team also observe that the ecosystem dynamics course is very natural sciences based and would benefit from better inclusion of ecosystem goods and services and bridging natural and social sciences. Alternatively, subject to time and resources availability and PIC demand, there is opportunity to add a course on ecosystem goods and services and related economics.

Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated

This is a problematic outcome in terms of original design. It is certainly the case that high staff turnover is a serious constraint to project outcome sustainability across the PICS in general, not just regarding R2R. However, changing incentive structures to mitigate this problem involves major government and societal change, across the entire government sector. It is unrealistic to expect that the IW R2R project can have a significant influence on this; although it can contribute to existing dialogues on this topic where they arise. However, the MTR supports the activities under this outcome related to identifying capacity building needs for R2R (partly undertaken so far by the project regarding design of the James Cook University course content with more still to be done). Consequently, the MTR has made recommendations to change the indicators and targets under this outcome in Annex 6.

Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks

Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally; and Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs

There are a number of discussion topics prompted by this component that are cross-cutting outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 and have a bearing on other project components and outputs including: the Rapid Coastal Assessment (RapCA)/Island Diagnostic Analysis (IDA)/State of the Coast (SoC) process; the scientific/technical approach of the project to these and other outcomes; the status and role of "inter-ministerial committees" (IMCs); and, community to cabinet (C2C) approaches. The latter two (IMCs and C2C) are discussed further in section 4.3 (findings on Project Implementation and Adaptive Management).

To guide assessment of project performance under this component (and related components), and to identify ways to improve project delivery, reference is made to

the title of this component. This makes it clear that its purpose, against which outcomes, outputs and activities under it should be assessed and implemented, is to ***mainstream R2R into National Development Frameworks.*** The MTR concludes that (as quoted just previously) this is a critical objective and contribution of the project.

Outcome 3.1 refers to developing and subsequently endorsing "National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM ". The subsequent indicators, targets and activities remain open to loose interpretation and the title of outcome 3.1, might suggest that the project should develop "stand alone" strategic action frameworks ***on R2R***. The MTR does not know if this was the intention but does conclude that the development of a (separate) strategic action framework "on R2R" is inconsistent with an R2R approach (which requires integration across policies and sectors and not the creation of an independent or parallel mechanism) and with the concept of mainstreaming R2R approaches into national development frameworks (which, likewise, requires mainstreaming R2R into existing frameworks, not creating new parallel frameworks). But the nature and inter-relations of these frameworks varies among the PICs, as do needs to promote "specific" R2R frameworks.

The MTR concludes that the baseline assumption of outcome 3.1.2 ("*Lack of national and regional policy and plans to support the mainstreaming of R2R approaches in development planning application of evidence-based approaches in PICs national development planning in the areas of: freshwater use and sanitation; wastewater treatment and pollution control; land use and forestry practices; balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation; hazard risk reduction; and climate variability and change*") is incorrect. In fact, although terminology varies among them, all the PICs have multiple existing frameworks for considering all of these topics (and more). For example, all PICs have signed up to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals, or have equivalent supportive national agendas that steer national action, including on all the topics mentioned in 3.1.2. All countries have a "national sustainable development plan" or its equivalent. All countries also have a national disaster risk reduction plan and climate change adaptation plan (often combined) and a national biodiversity strategy and action plan. Crucially, most of these are currently under review or further development and major investments decisions are already being made or planned. As this is self-evident, this should have been noted and addressed at project inception.

The project is over-focussed at present on delivering strategic action frameworks (indicator 3.1.1 and 3.1.2), or impacts on national development frameworks, primarily through the route of undertaking the IDA/SoC process to underpin national and regional consensus building on R2R (indicator 3.1.3). This is unlikely to work (see discussion on SoCs later) and results in more important immediate opportunities to mainstream R2R being missed.

It is crucial that the project actively mainstream R2R into these existing and on-going processes and does so now. The project does not appear to currently have a clear delivery mechanism for this.

> **Recommendation 4:** The RPCU in collaboration with national agencies should: (i) map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities; (ii) identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks; (iii) develop a clear and coherent approach to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks, prioritising immediate opportunities based on existing scientific/technical knowledge and practical experience (without waiting for IDAs or SoCs); (iv) discourage activities that result in the development of new or parallel "strategic frameworks for R2R" or R2R planning mechanisms or frameworks, and instead build on existing processes; and (v) consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministerial committees" (as per the Project Document) fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed (see also Section 4.3).
>
> [The latter point (v) is appended to this recommendation following discussion of IMCs under Section 4.3].

Interestingly, the lessons learned identified by the Tonga STAR project Terminal Evaluation include: "*Working directly through existing government structures brings dividends and that doing so has proved very successful not only in empowering government by providing experience and training, but also in developing effective government 'ownership', engagement, participation and motivation, thereby promoting long-term sustainability of the project's achievements*."

The project's scientific and technical approach

Referring to the title of the project, the purpose of testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management is to *Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods*; and technically the latter three are ecosystem services, or services dependent. In addition, the goal of the Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme (under which the IW R2R project sits) is to *maintain and enhance Pacific Island countries' ecosystem goods and services*. In addition, under the project's risks and assumptions (Project Document, section 2.5, Table on page 62) *".....appropriately **valued*** [emphasis added] *coastal environmental **services*** [emphasis added] *supporting food security, tourism and blue carbon have the potential to yield sustainable financing opportunities*" is a response to the risk of insufficient up-scaling of R2R investments. Therefore, ecosystem goods and services (EGS) is already the technical framework mandated in project design. The

current project approach is, however, almost wholly lacking attention to EGS and is not fit-for-purpose for assessing EGS.

The scientific and technical approach of the project is dominated by a natural sciences-based approach and is very weak on socioeconomic-based criteria and indicators. The focus is on the environment as the end point of assessments, not people. This will result in sub-optimal influences upon policy that tends to respond to social and economic factors - not "environment" as such. For example, the end point of an IDA is identifying impacts on the environment (listed as Deforestation, Losses in species and ecosystem integrity and Desertification/land degradation), not impacts on people (source - the GEF-R2R- *Developing and Islands Diagnostic Analysis ver. 2*). The suggested indicators list for the SoC does indeed refer to "governance", "environment" and "socioeconomic" indicator categories. But of the latter, most refer to socio-economic parameters as drivers of environmental impact (e.g. population pressures). Few refer to benefits (that is, EGS) such as livelihoods, food/water security, natural resources dependency (except for fishing but that again is regarded as a driver of impacts).

The scientific approach to indicators adopted by the project is DPSIR framework (Driver, Pressure, Status, Impact, Response). It is debatable whether this framework is best for purpose. One problem is that the DPSIR framework is restrictive and not good at capturing ecosystem benefits. A good example is for agriculture (food production) - is this D, P, S, I or R? Attention to agriculture throughout the IDA/SoC process is very weak, if not almost absent. It arguably might be included under "land use". As such, the current approach has it listed as either a Driver or Pressure. However, the agriculture sector would probably regard sustainable agriculture as either a Response or as positive land-use change. Sustainable agriculture can deliver substantial and multiple benefits, including not least food security but also sediment control and water security. It is also often the dominant land use (and therefore often the source of land-based EGS). For example, the Cook Islands IDA notes that over 50 percent of households rely on family farming (but is weak on recognising how family farming delivers EGS). The lack of more explicit and significant attention to agriculture in the IDA/SoC process also illustrates that it is yet to embrace a full landscape/seascape/R2R approach (and that the agriculture sector may not have been fully involved in IDA/SoC formulation).

An EGS framework for assessment would be much more appropriate and effective. In an EGS framework ecosystem components (e.g. "habitat", "land", "shorelines", "wetlands") are viewed primarily from the viewpoint of their functionality - that is, their ability to deliver benefits to people (that is - EGS). In an economic/accounting sense, natural (environmental) assets are regarded as natural capital that generates, or can generate a future, economic benefit ("interest" in economic terms) that is the EGS. The purpose of policies aimed at sustainable natural resources use is to maintain, or enhance, those EGS so that they meet human needs (not to sustain the "environment" as such). EGS are not delivered only by natural landscapes and in most developed areas most EGS are delivered by managed landscapes. EGS delivery can be managed and some EGS enhanced through management change (notably in

farming and urban environments). Valuation of EGS enables economic benefits and losses to be quantified and identified, and to whom these benefits and losses accrue and therefore what incentives are required, enabling policies to promote sustainable economic development to be identified (which is what we want).

The current end point of the IDA/SoC process is impacts on the environment. Assessments will then have to retrofit EGS into the conclusions in order to identify socially and economically relevant policy advice. This will be challenging. Better to integrate EGS at the outset. This applies to the RapCA, IDA and SoC outputs, but also should be integrated across the whole Project (and programme) approach.

There is also the need, and opportunity, to integrate an EGS framework/approach into national demonstration projects. For example, in Fiji, where the demonstration project has only just started, the problem addressed is the impacts of upper catchment activities (principally mining) on downstream users. Significant natural and physical capital assets are in-play: these include community buildings undermined by river-bank erosion and a water treatment plant (high capital value) vulnerable to siltation. This is a classic integrated catchment (R2R) management problem, ripe for the application of an EGS approach. In particular, EGS valuation would identify current beneficiaries and losers in the catchment and therefore pathways to identify incentives to reduce system losses and thereby move towards integrated sustainable catchment management. A similar opportunity exists in the Cook Islands where a small, degraded catchment leaches sediments into Muri Lagoon (a high value natural capital asset), exacerbated by the conversion of a wetland, to domestic housing, that previously formed a buffer zone. Infrastructure options are to be assessed. These would potentially include restoration of the wetland (as green or natural infrastructure), and by default potential compensation for removal of the house (among other potential options). EGS valuation would help identify the economic costs and benefits of these, and other, infrastructure options. Probably most of the PICs also have similar needs and opportunities.

It is also unclear how the current project strategy will address "resilience" (as per the title of Component 1 and as referred to in several other places including numerous targets and indicators). The MTR observes that this term "resilience" is often used loosely and can prove difficult to define (and the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel has been trying to shed light on this). It does, however, under any reasonable interpretation, include both ecosystem and social (community) dimensions and is, therefore, more amenable to an EGS approach. A similar conclusion could be drawn for assessing "climate change adaptation".

Recommendation 5 : The project should adopt an ecosystem goods and services framework as the foundation of its scientific and technical approach by: (i) integrating ecosystem goods and services indicators into the RapCA, IDA and SoC, not as a "supplement" to existing indicators but as their foundation; (ii) integrating an ecosystem goods and services approach/context as the basis for all relevant project activities including

for R2R planning, mainstreaming and policy; (iii) testing an ecosystem goods and services and valuation approach as the entry point in a limited number of appropriate demonstration projects that have yet to commence or have only recently commenced (subject to country needs and buy-in); (iv) commencing basic training on ecosystem goods and services (including valuation) for national capacity building, including considering a dedicated module on this topic as part of the on-going post-graduate training delivered through an appropriate institution (subject to resources availability).

The IDA and SoC process

The proposed IDAs (including under outcome 1.2) are designed, inter alia, to provide technical inputs for the identification of priority areas for scaling-up R2R investments and technical background for the development of the SoCs, which are in turn designed to be incorporated into reports on national and regional action planning for R2R investment (indicator 3.1.3). The LogFrame requires that all 14 SoCs (and therefore supporting IDAs) be completed by the end of year 3 in order to allow for a two-year period for them to influence national and regional planning and investment. At mid-term, no SoC report has been finished and only three draft IDAs (Cook Islands, Palau, PNG) were available. There is now the danger that the project may be pressured into expediting SoC delivery, even under an extended time-frame, through a process that is incompatible with the desired function of a SoC (to influence policy). For that function to be fulfilled, it is essential that IDAs and SoCs be country led/driven and with their full participation. Without that, it is unlikely that IDAs or SoCs will influence policy. Neither will the process build national capacity (which is effectively the same as concluding they will be ineffective). Nevertheless, for the Palau and PNG IDA reports desktop research was done by the National Project Managers with further literature review and write-up done by the RPCU in Suva. In-country stakeholder consultations were not conducted for these countries because of time constraints, overlapping schedules and logistical setbacks (source - consultancy report by Ron Simpson, 2018). In the case of Palau, additional clarification revealed that the RPCU was informed that in-country workshops need not be held because they had already been conducted under the STAR Project. It was agreed then that the output of those workshops would be incorporated into the IDA being written by the RPCU Consultant. Additionally, no SOC had been planned for Palau because they had requested not to partake because of their comprehensive State of the Environment (SoE) report. Since the IDA still proceeded this signals that the IDA-SOC process, at least in this case, has not necessarily been country-driven, and has not approached the IDA from an integrative mainstreaming perspective from the start.

There are further technical issues with the current IDA/SoC process (other than the absence of an EGS framework as above). Most national staff interviewed consider the term "Coast" to mean "marine". Over-emphasising one part of the landscape/seascape is not consistent with an R2R approach. Although the approach taken by the project is somewhat broader than this based on the IDA/SoC indicators

list, guidance on their preparation and their table of contents, a marine bias in the process/approach is still evident. For example, throughout, land-based activities tend to be assessed in terms of their impact on the coast (as pressures) whereas under R2R land-based activities need to be assessed irrespective of impacts on the "coast". The SoC draft Table of Contents has a section "Risks at the Coast" (e.g. shoreline erosion) but no equivalent section on risks inland. This could be due to the intention to broaden the scope of the previous IWRM Project approach to more explicitly include coast/marine but, if so, it seems to have gone too far.

There are parallel activities and processes on-going in the PICs that are highly relevant to the IDA/SoCs. Notably, most PICS have a "State of the Environment" (SoE) report. Previously these were supported by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). SPREP is also currently updating SoEs in a number of PICS (but not all). The second meeting of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (January 2018) discussed the relationship between the SoC and SoE reports. Few conclusions were drawn but it was opined that *"from the communications point of view, SoE versus SoC, and since most of the islands are coastal, then the relevance of SoC is higher and it is synonymous with the State of the Islands"*. This is incorrect. As already stated, almost unanimously in PICs "coast" means marine. Furthermore, it is notable that despite the spectacular marine environment that PICs are endowed with (which is truly an asset of global biodiversity significance) most of the priority natural resources issues faced by the PICs are land-based: for example, drinking water quality, land productivity, food, water and energy security. In fact, the smaller the land area, the more important land becomes because of increasing pressures on it. The Cook Islands IDA, for example, prioritises natural resources issues as: deterioration of water quality; stress on ground and surface water resources; deforestation, riparian and vegetation clearance; ecosystem degradation – near shore, terrestrial and surface water, inland flora and fauna, lagoon flora and fauna and wetlands; eutrophication; and, solid and liquid waste management. Few of these are particularly a "coast" problem.

A number of PICs also commented that their information requirements were driven by deadlines in other processes: the need to gather information in order to compile 6th national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity being commonly referred to (the deadline for which has already passed). SoCs, therefore, are sometimes seen as a source of information for reporting purposes and not primarily as a way to influence policy (which is their purpose).

The MTR concludes that the project needs to pause and re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs. The MTR is not sufficiently knowledgeable about the IDA and SoC status to pre-determine which IDAs/SoCs should stop, start or finish. The MTR does however identify the following relevant criteria for re-assessing the strategy:

> **Recommendation 6:** The project should re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs based on the following criteria:

i. Focus on objectives/outcomes; the IDA or SoC is not an outcome, the outcome required is mainstreaming R2R;

ii. Identify and prioritise existing opportunities to mainstream R2R without having an IDA or SoC (as outlined further above) (important short-term opportunities are currently being missed);

iii. The absolute priority is capacity building; this in turn determines the impact of an IDA or SoC on policies; this requires ownership of and participation of PICs in the IDA/SoC process; IDAs/SoCs must be country- driven; where countries see an IDA or "SoC" as a necessary or priority need – the process can go ahead, but if this is absent beware of doing the SoC;

iv. The priority is for the IDA and/or SoC to be integrated with and build on, add value to, existing activities and processes at national level (notably the State of Environment reporting process and similar undertakings);

v. The process need not necessarily result in a stand-alone "SoC" report but it can achieve its purpose equally as well through integration of information generated into other reports/processes;

vi. Timing of outputs needs to be compatible with timescales for information needs (particularly for informing on-going policy processes);

vii. Focus on quality not quantity; reduce outputs accordingly;

viii. Where all the above criteria are met consider proceeding; where any is not met there is limited justification for the SoC, and

ix. Re-assess the need and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC in PSCs and re-present the IDA/SoC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review.

The MTR has included recommended adjustments to the IDA/SoC related targets in Annex 6.

The MTR is not convinced that STAR projects (in general) are the main source of SoC data due to: (i) their scope and (ii) timing. Neither is access to STAR project data a constraint to doing the IDA or SoC because at national level they do have access to STAR data (it is their project/data). "Access" to STAR data (re. IDAs/SoC) is only a

problem if the SoC process is centralised at the RPCU, which is inconsistent with capacity building and will be counterproductive anyway.

The Sustainable Development Goals - R2R as an implementation tool and linking project outcomes to the development agenda

There is a significant opportunity for the project to address how it relates to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These were adopted post-project design and are therefore not mentioned in the Project Document. But they should have been discussed in detail during the inception process, because the SDGs are now a major vehicle driving national, regional and international sustainable development policies and strategies and, therefore, an opportunity for R2R mainstreaming. There has been some discussion of the SDGs in project documents and meetings but not in a systematic way. What is on record suggests a somewhat limited understanding of relevant linkages: for example, attention dominated by SDGs 14 and 15, with limited recognition of others, e.g. food and nutrition (goal 2), water (goal 6), disaster risk reduction (goal 11), etc. This process would immediately highlight the shortcomings of the current indicators in use for the IDAs and SoCs and strengthen resolve on using an EGS framework. However, more importantly, the MTR notes that the objectives and purpose of the R2R approach is to promote sustainable natural resource use across landscapes and seascapes in an integrated fashion. The SDGs also promote such integration (in that all SDGs are to be delivered collectively and mutual interdependence between them is explicit). The MTR notes that "R2R" is effectively a tool to achieve the natural resources-based SDGs, collectively. It is in the project's interests to assess this relationship more effectively and to use the links identified as a means to communicate the strategic position of R2R and so improve the visibility and relevance of the project.

In addition, as pointed out in Section 4.1 (on project design) the current set of outcomes, targets and indicators in the LogFrame do not directly address the actual change as required in the objective of the project (which is to improve sustainable development outcomes via sustaining livelihoods and preserving ecosystem goods and services). As suggested in Section 4.1, rather than revising the LogFrame at this late stage, a means to address this point is to assess how the project contributes to the SDGs, including trying to identify any relevant indicators that may be currently in use (that is, existing use at regional/national level by other processes).

> **Recommendation 7:** The project should, with national counterpart participation, map its potential contributions to the SDGs, identify relevant linkages and interdependencies (including potential indicators currently in use), explore the extent to which R2R is a tool to achieve integrated delivery of, and has already delivered, the natural resources based or dependent SDGs and use this process as a means to: (i) test the relevance of its approaches; (ii) promote visibility and relevance of the project; and (iii) identify and potentially monitor the contribution of the project to sustainable development outcomes.

Component 4 Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management

Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects

This outcome refers to simplified results frameworks for GEF integrated multi-focal projects. It is not clear if this is the same as "R2R". But this outcome has transferability to other GEF multi-focal area programmes and projects.

After a slow start (given that the Country Coordinator Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser came on board only in November 2017), the digitised (in MS EXCEL) integrated results framework is now progressing. This, so far, is based on integrating all of the monitoring and evaluation frameworks (using indicators) from multiple sources including the IW Regional R2R Project, the STAR Projects, including progress indicators for GEF focal areas and other GEF requirements. The process has also been supported by capacity building on results-based monitoring (RBM), including training, and RBM approaches are being integrated into framework design.

However, the framework is yet to show any signs of being "simplified" (ref. target 4.1.1). It is early to conclude but, so far, creating a database for an integrated results framework is just digitising existing complexity. The MTR anticipates that it will be difficult to simplify because it is based on mandatory M&E requirements of the GEF and existing M&E requirements in project LogFrames. The pertinent question is whether the project will be able to identify means to simplify reporting; for example, through identifying better and integrated indicators that will reduce the number of indicators in use. But if so, this will be a useful and transferable benefit to other and future multi-focal projects, and not the current one (because its indicators and M&E might be difficult to change).

A common complaint at national level is that the integrated results framework being developed is too complicated. However, this is mainly because the activity only exposes an already "too complicated" underlying reporting framework (one currently on paper). Some national counterparts have rightly observed that the developing results framework has extended its scope: for example, by including indicators for contributions to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets or the SDGs, whereas countries have parallel reporting mechanisms for these. Such concerns appear to be more vocal among the IW R2R national project staff (as opposed to STAR project staff) although this was not quantifiably assessed. This is unsurprising. Many national IW R2R personnel rightly observe that a $200,000 national demonstration project is being expected to have similar M&E obligations (and consequent human resources commitment) as a multi-million-dollar STAR project.

PICs are already over-burdened with M&E and reporting requirements for many processes and projects, the R2R Programme is but just one. The approach of this

component must be to seek ways of reducing national M&E and reporting requirements, not increasing it.

However, the bigger issue at present is the lack of reporting in the first place; that is, delivery of information to input into the results framework. The RPCU is not currently being overwhelmed with reporting suggesting that the bottleneck is not the absence of a database or framework. It is unlikely that creating one will solve this problem. This relates to programme coordination discussed further in section 4.3 (below).

There was considerable work done on a results-based management framework for the GEF-funded IWRM project and an existing web-site on this (http://www.pacific-iwrm.org/results/). The MTR team have not seen an assessment of how well this functioned and, importantly, why it now appears to be dormant. Again, this reinforces the observation (and recommendation) made earlier that the project should critically re-assess the lessons learned from the previous IWRM Project.

Outcome 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established

There are a number of R2R related websites including: the Pacific Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Network (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=7696) that appears to be somewhat defunct now; IUCN have a facility to support Ridge to Reef including information dissemination and exchange (https://www.iucn.org/theme/water/our-work/current-projects/ridge-reef); and there is already a web-based platform for Pacific R2R hosted by the current project (https://www.pacific-r2r.org). Further R2R website development should address why previous websites have not been sustained (notably the IWRM one).

Activities under this outcome relating to website and associated databases development (activity 4.2.3) run a high risk of expanding beyond what is required in the Project Document and LogFrame. The scope of this activity, and its associated databases and website development, is limited to developing a network of R2R practitioners (perhaps more appropriately termed a "community of practice") and a platform to share lessons learned on R2R. It is not intended to be developing into an environmental management information system (EMIS) and the RPCU have confirmed this is not intended.

The current proposals for the website and associated databases are potentially complicated by the inclusion of operability regarding the integrated results reporting framework as outlined in outcome 4.1 (above). The user groups for the integrated frameworks for multi-focal GEF projects are specific and limited mainly to GEF and associated agency practitioners and project managers. It is primarily a reporting and M&E tool, not a communication tool. It is highly likely that in the longer-term the two activities will diverge and should the R2R platform be sustained beyond the project, it is unlikely that its managers would be motivated to maintain the integrated results reporting framework component (unless financially

supported by GEF). The MTR therefore cautions as to the advisability of developing these two products under the same platform. At the very least, facility for easily separating the two should be in-built from the outset.

Other regional processes are supporting national and regional database development including EMIS related. For example, a large GEF funded project at SPREP, the INFORM project, has developed excellent online repositories for national governments to use to house environmental reports and eventually data. The IW R2R Project is promoting the use of these. Any related regional database development by the project should: (i) be country driven; (ii) prioritise national over regional capacity building; (iii) build upon and avoid duplication of other efforts.

> **Recommendation 8**: The RPCU should ensure that the website and associated databases developed under activity 4.2.3 is kept as simple as possible, primarily builds on existing efforts, learns from previous efforts, and is limited to the purpose of communicating and sharing lessons learned on R2R and supporting the development of a network (or community of practice) on R2R.

> **Recommendation 9:** The project should re-assess the advisability of integrating the integrated results framework for multi-focal GEF projects under the same platform as the communication/networking platform for R2R. If it continues as such then the ability to separate the two functionalities must be in-built.

The current project activities under activity 4.2.3 are all regional, centred on SPC in Suva.

> **Recommendation 10:** The project should identify how it is going to deliver outcome 4.2 (in particular activity 4.2.3) at national level, as required in the outcome description, and present this plan to the next RSC meeting.

There is currently no obvious strategy for generating and compiling the lessons learned (ref. 4.2.3) from the previous IWRM Project or the current Pacific R2R Programme (at least in any systematic way). Although a key purpose of project terminal evaluations is to derive lessons learned, they can be variable in detail and sometimes have a tendency to over-focus on project management issues whereas the more important information relates to overcoming challenges to actual R2R implementation. Terminal evaluations also are delivered near project end or after a project finishes. It is noted that although the IW R2R Project focuses currently on national demonstration sites, the major lessons learned are from the overall programme and particularly the STAR projects. These, collectively, represent a total investment approaching 450 million US$ (including co-financing). In most cases it is likely the most valuable outcome (in addition to capacity building) will be lessons learned. There is a clear need and opportunity for the RPCU to become actively involved in promoting lessons learned across the programme and deriving (or compiling) lessons learned from previous IWRM/ICM/R2R investments. This would

include providing guidance to current projects (STAR and IW) regarding which lessons need to be derived and how to do it. This would also be a useful function of the RPCU regarding its coordination role under component 5 and as discussed further in section 4.3. It would also be a major contribution to the regional R2R platform on lessons learned from R2R (4.2.3). It is also unreasonable to expect the creation of a facility to share lessons learned (4.2.3) will automatically result in lessons being compiled for sharing. Stakeholders will need help in preparing the lessons to share.

The MTR Team notes, for example, that some of the key lessons to be learned in R2R approaches include conflict resolution, trade-off analysis, incentive measures, and the impacts of land tenure and land ownership rights. Interestingly, these challenges appear to have been reported on only by a few current national IW R2R projects. For example, PNG and Samoa have raised customary landownership issues in the management planning of their marine MPA and watershed, respectively. They are saying this will lengthen the planning and subsequent approval process because of required intensive consultations and negotiations. The trade-offs involved, conflicting uses and stakes between customary landowners, conservationists, tourism operators and informal settlers are being seriously dealt with by the national counterparts because they consider resolving these crucial to introducing sustainable management and to sustaining the project results. But the absence of this attention could be indicative of the still limited extent to which some projects have actually advanced to delivering site level management change.

> **Recommendation 11:** The RPCU should play a lead coordinating role in developing or compiling lessons learned on R2R, including from the previous IWRM/ICM/R2R investments, including by providing guidance to current R2R projects (STAR and IW R2R Projects) in order for them to begin now to maximise extraction of lessons learned from investments.

Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination

Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects

A number of aspects of this component relate to Project and programme management and are discussed further below in Section 4.3 (Project Implementation and Adaptive Management - Management Arrangements).

The current section refers to specific points relating to the targets and indicators under this component. Further remedies to improve management and coordination are included in Section 4.3.

Regarding indicator 5.1.1 (programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained), the target was to have a fully staffed and functioning coordination unit (RPCU) and staff established at national level within year 1. There are significant failings in this regard. The RPCU only achieved its full (and operational) staffing in February 2019. There were also delays in getting national staff in positions in almost all PICs, and frequent staff turnover. Fiji, for example, only appointed its National Project Manager in late October 2018. Further discussion is included in

Section 4.3. However, at MTR there was an almost complete staffing complement across the project. For this reason, this activity is marked "on track" but graded "most unsatisfactory".

Activity 5.1.2 relates to the RPCU providing technical backstopping across the programme, to both national IW R2R projects and Regional Pacific R2R Programme (STAR) projects. The project has produced some good guidance to support projects and PICs; for example, training on results-based management, most significant change, and monitoring and evaluation, and the production of a wide range of technical support documents such as communication strategies and approaches and methodologies for RapCA, IDAs and SoCs. The project has responded to some individual requests for support, but mainly from national IW R2R demo projects. However, a number of PICs reported that they received minimal feedback from the RPCU during the first three years of the project, particularly regarding guidance on changes to LogFrames. This was mainly during a period of instability at the RPCU (see section 4.3) and likely exacerbated by the absence of a substantive programme Coordinator taking decision-making authority. There has been limited support to STAR projects. A known exception is training on M&E and RBM on an ad-hoc basis and minor joint support between IW and STAR at national level (e.g. water quality assessment in Tuvalu). But in general the RPCU has provided minimal technical support to STAR projects. However, this is partly due to the absence of requests from STAR projects. It is clear that the RPCU (and SPC-SOPAC) are not automatically the first point of call for assistance to STAR projects. There are a number of examples of where STAR projects have deliberately side-stepped the RPCU when seeking technical support. For these reasons this activity is assessed "not on track" and "moderately unsatisfactory"; although it is noted that a primary reason for this is challenges in programme coordination which is not necessarily of the current RPCU's making (see Section 4.3).

Activity 5.1.4 refers to the volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories. Although this is on track, the MTR notes that the target for this (at least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/updated per year, total of at last 16 throughout the project) is unambitious for a programme of this size that also has five years of the previous IWRM project experience to build on. Interestingly, the target also refers to contributions to "*the online repository, ..., for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with [Sic] national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices*". Since this activity is assessed as "on track" by the RPCU (and 2018 PIR) it confirms that such online repositories and networks already exist (if they don't, then this activity is off track). This raises the question of how do these repositories and networks relate to the proposed website/database activities under 4.2 (see further discussion under that item above).

Activity 5.1.5 refers to building coordination across the Program. Based on the target (At least 4, 1 per year, planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network), the project has made progress.

For this reason, both the 2018 PIR and the recent RPCU self-assessment assess this activity as on-track. However, the MTR draws attention to the indicator for this which requires that the workshops " .....*ensure timeliness and cost effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting*". Without the latter, the target is met numerically but not effectively. It is abundantly clear that IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting remains one of the most significant challenges facing the project under its Program coordination role. For this reason, this activity is assessed "not on track" and "unsatisfactory", primarily to flag this as an area requiring attention. The MTR notes that the current RPCU has not been responsible for this current situation. Section 4.3 contains further discussion on Program coordination.

5.2.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

Some challenges to implementation regarding a number of the activities and outcomes, and recommendations as to how to respond to them to get the project back on track, have already been made as above (Section 4.2.1).

The project has been affected by serious challenges in project/programme management from the start, including in leadership, recruiting and maintaining staff (including at national level). The RPCU now has a full staffing complement, although with remaining skill gaps, and a near full complement of IW R2R staff at national level. This history of staffing and management constraints has caused significant delays in implementation. But now that staffing appears to have stabilised, the MTR concludes that the project is positioned to accelerate implementation and can be given an extended opportunity to do so. This applies in particular to attempting to deliver the full suite of outcomes for most of the national IW R2R demonstration projects.

> **Recommendation 12:** The project should have a no-cost extension subject to implementation of the further recommendations of the MTR.

A provisional estimate of the new project end date is 31 December 2021, based on expenditure figures provided by the RPCU. This estimate needs to be checked and refined based on updated expenditures (at the time of calculation), an exact figure for the cost of the overheads agreed to be paid to the SPC and the agreement that those overheads will not be applied to national project budgets.

This will address some of the time constraints to achieving many of the activities and outcomes (as above). Regarding the national demonstration projects, most are on-going and still way off finishing as per their LogFrames. For these, there is confidence that a no-cost extension will enable them to achieve their targets as per their revised LogFrames. A few, however, are more advanced. National projects should, therefore, re-assess their work planning and LogFrames once the new final end date is calculated and where necessary identify priorities for the remaining duration. It should be borne in mind that in addition to implementing the national demonstration (site-based) projects, national staff have a continuing role to play in R2R mainstreaming, building lessons learned and contributing to overall Program coordination. Therefore, even where some national demonstration projects are

already well advanced there remains still much work to do. Revised plans, as appropriate, should be discussed and approved at the next national PSC and RSC meetings.

There are some activities and outcomes based on the current LogFrame that will still be challenging, if not impossible, to achieve by project end, even with an extension. Solutions to some of these challenges are introduced above including proposals in some cases to change targets for some activities (in Annex 6).

There remain some significant project/programme management challenges that are discussed further in Section 4.3 (below) that also identifies additional responses and measures to address those challenges. Some of these cross-cut many of the project components, outcomes and activities and include in particular component 5 regarding programme coordination.

5.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

5.3.1 Management Arrangements

Self-assessment by the RPCU

The RPCU held a self-assessment workshop in December 2018. Its conclusions regarding management challenges and roadblocks included;

i. Capacity of the RPCU - a full complement of science and technical staff/consultants (with clear deliverables and appropriately resourced) is needed to enable implementation; key capacity gaps include environmental/natural resources governance, project management and skills in capacity building/training to cater to components 2 and 3;

ii. Leadership and Management – there is a lack of coordination and individuals tend to work independently without sharing or understanding each other's contributions; there is a need for a more "stable and caring" management or project oversight; leadership is also needed to ensure delegation and to operationalise the R2R Strategy;

iii. Internal coordination – regular staff meetings and updating sessions are not held;

iv. Procurement Processes – are ambiguous and inconsistent and cause delays in recruitment, leading to the lack of staff; procurement personnel of SPC tend to question the technical content of the work rather than focusing on the procurement process;

v. Approvals/Signing – work is hampered by delays in signing/approval of requests; there are several layers of approvals – PM, DD/Director, Finance (GEM) - with further delays due to there being no RPC and the interim manager being busy or away from office;

vi. Information flow – no systems and procedures for sharing of information from countries; where they exist (e.g. technical and financial process flow), they are not religiously and consistently being used;

vii. Capacity of Project Managers – the RPCU has no control over the selection of National Project Managers (PM); apart from irregular induction workshops, there is no consistent capacity building/learning for PMs;

viii. Communications and Knowledge Management – limited capacity of PMs in this area (planning, visibility/branding, writing), limited resourcing to fully operationalise the strategies; and

ix. Lack of Project Management tools (planning/reporting; communications/KM, etc.); there is no push from RPC to establish PM tools (online system suggested).

In their discussions, staff highlighted the need for transparency, trust, courtesy and respect, indicating a deep need for positive leadership and guidance. The MTR has noted these important observations and, where agreed with, reflected them, where appropriate, below.

Delays in national level implementation

There have been significant delays in project start-up at national level although the length of delays and reasons for them vary somewhat between the PICs. The June 2018 Project Implementation Review notes that "*several delays at the PICs level could be attributable to either the inability of the lead agency to hire competent project managers, or resignation of project managers, and/or prolonged inception period due to various reasons. These delays resulted in poor project performance and low financial disbursements.*"

Project milestone dates (signing of the Memorandum of Agreement - MoA - between SPC and the PIC, first funds tranche transfer, inception meeting, hiring of National Project Manager) are provided in Annex 12. In most cases national demonstration projects started subsequent to the hiring of the National Project Manager, after familiarisation with national LogFrames and training from the RPCU .

The length of time between the official project start date (August 2015) and signing of the MoA was 1 year or more (up to 1 year 8 months) for 9 PICs. The quickest was 8 months with four PICs taking 10 months (data in Annex 12). It would not be expected that a project with a national budget of only US$ 200,000 (over several years) would be given the highest priority at senior government level (including Finance Ministries) but normal administrative delays only partially explain the more lengthy delays in start-up. Additional factors contributing to delays in MoA signing given by national project staff and counterparts include:

i. Poor support from the SPC and RPC in helping explain the purpose and context of the project (in cases where senior officials were not familiar with the project and the previous IWRM project);

ii. Lack of clarity on what the project could achieve with such limited funding and consequential delays in approval at senior government level; and

iii. Delays in revising national project LogFrames, exacerbated by resistance to adaptive management by the RPC (which contributed to constraints to getting senior level approval and buy-in) and limited support from the RPC during project start-up.

Once the MoA was signed, 7 PICs managed to hire their Project Managers within 6 months, 4 hired them within 10 or 11 months with one (Vanuatu) taking a year and another (Fiji) taking a year and 7 months (data in Annex 12; data not available for Kiribati). In most cases these delays were typical of normal staff recruitment procedures at national level. Fiji and Vanuatu are both outliers in these regards and in both cases recruitment was abnormally delayed due to on-going changes to government public service procedures. In most cases, once Project Managers were in place national implementation (demo projects) started to pick-up.

Once the MoA was signed, 9 PICs held their inception workshops within 6 months or less (with 2 PICs holding inception workshops before MoAs were signed) and 3 PICs held them between a year and a year and 5 months after the MoA was signed, with one (Fiji) held 2 years and 2 months after the MoA was signed. In many cases these delays were due to delays in hiring National Project Managers but in some cases there were still lengthy delay between appointing National Project Managers and holding inception workshops (data in Annex 12). The inception process is normally undertaken between 1 to 3 months after start-up. These delays remain unexplained.

In most cases the availability of project funds to national level projects was relatively expeditious (Annex 12) and not a significant cause of delay. Some PICs report some delays in funds transfer (replenishments), after start-up, but at a reported "up to three weeks" this is not considered to be an unusually significant constraint.

In addition to delays in start-up at national level, some PICs (e.g., Cook Islands and Nauru) had further delays caused by resignations of their Project Manager after initial appointment.

Further constraints to national level implementation once national projects commenced include:

i. Lack of national capacity particularly in communications and project management skills including knowledge and availability of project management tools (although this was known in project design and one of its core activities is to build capacity); and

ii. Staffing constraints and loss of early momentum at the SPC/RPCU leading to sub-optimal support and encouragement of PIC national projects.

PICs have partly addressed these delays and constraints by implementing their national activities at different rates and according to their own national challenges and circumstances. But this has now led to a log-jam of most PICs now being well behind in implementation. The LogFrame was probably over-ambitious in its timelines and expectations for national project delivery, especially as capacity (both technical and human resources turnover) is well recognised as a key challenge in the Project Document.

The project was designed to build upon human resources infrastructure and capacity created at national level by the previous IWRM project. But although that capacity (in terms of personnel) is assumed to still largely exist, the institutional settings of the IWRM project and IW R2R project are not necessarily the same and in any case would be expected to have evolved over time. Delays between the closure of the IWRM Project and start-up of the IW R2R Project have no doubt made it more difficult for the IW R2R project to slot-in and take over the previous IWRM Project infrastructure. The MTR was not tasked with reviewing the previous IWRM Project but a recommendation that the IW R2R Project should re-evaluate the legacy of the IWRM Project has already been made (above).

A solution to these delays at national level is a no-cost extension, although this does not address the underlying causes of such delays. The MTR concludes that with a no-cost extension there is every expectation that national projects will (where relevant) get back on-track regarding implementation and achieve their targets (as per their ***revised*** LogFrames) by project end. This is provided that there are no further significant constraints through staff turn-over and that the RPCU, now fully staffed, will be able to accelerate its support to PICs.

Project and Program Coordination:

This is identified as an area of major concern and challenges.

According to its Project Document, the IW R2R project is intended to be the programme support for the Pacific R2R Program and expected to coordinate the implementation of the national R2R projects (including STAR projects, and the LDCF project) in terms of capacity building, knowledge management and harmonization of technical methodologies for the integrated management of forest, land and water management. Coordinating these through IW R2R project national level activities and along with the UNDP, UNEP and FAO STAR Pacific projects is considered vital to the success of R2R.

In the IW R2R Project LogFrame, the most relevant component is 5 "Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination" with one Outcome "*5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects*"; although it can be surmised from the project description (in the Project Document) that the coordination functions are also implicitly integrated into other relevant outcomes. However, the targets and indicators under this outcome refer to establishing the programme coordination unit, number of requests for support received, number of staff trained, volume and quality of information contributed, and number of coordination related workshops held (all except the first being passive). There is, therefore, an implicit

assumption that the STAR projects are going to automatically and voluntarily be "coordinated" by the RPCU.

To ensure "*adequate coordination between and among GEF supported national investments*", each national STAR project has been resourced with GEF International Waters funding (US$150,000 per participating country). These resources are to enable: representatives of national STAR projects to participate in Inter-Ministry Committee and regional meetings; effective national and regional level coordination of the communication of STAR project results and examples of best practices; STAR project stakeholder participation in programme capacity building exercises; as well as supporting good programme governance, including knowledge management and sharing. Considering the scale of STAR budgets compared to the IW budgets, and the fact that under the programme (and in many STAR project documents) STAR projects are supposed to be doing this anyway, a reasonable assumption is that this money reflects an understanding that such coordination needs additional encouragement.

However, STAR projects are independently nationally executed. It is unrealistic to expect that at national level a multi-million-dollar STAR project will automatically be coordinated by or significantly liaise with a national IW R2R demonstration project with a budget of only $200,000, not to mention in many cases the two projects having different sites and focus. There is no obvious incentive or enforceable obligation for STAR projects to be "coordinated". Whilst this constraint could have been identified during programme and project formulation, more importantly it should have been identified at the project inception stage. For example, STAR project willingness to be coordinated by the IW R2R Project could have been identified under risks and assumptions for this outcome at inception. Remedial measures could then have been taken under adaptive project management.

Partly as a result of not implementing such adaptive management, and very likely exacerbated by failings in work planning in the early stages of the project (see Section 4.3.1 below), this is now a major challenge area for the project. Some examples of "coordination" do exist: e.g. the RPCU has been supporting STAR projects on demand regarding monitoring and evaluation and provided training in results based management; there are some examples of STAR and IW R2R project joint activities (such as water quality testing in Tuvalu and Palau); sharing of resources and expertise also in Palau; some STAR projects providing IW R2R Project national demonstrations opportunities to promote their activities and R2R (e.g., FSM, Tonga). But, overall there is effectively an almost complete separation between STAR and the IW R2R projects in most countries (compared to what was intended). To help coordination, Memoranda of Agreements with national governments stipulate that IW R2R demonstration projects and STAR projects have the same Project Steering Committee. Very few now do. National counterparts have observed in many cases that it does not make sense to have joint PSCs where projects operate at different sites and often with different activities. But there is a lack of common "programme" thinking across the portfolio of projects (except in Palau).

There is some awareness among some national IW R2R Project staff, and very few STAR project staff, that the RPCU has a coordinating role but even so with limited understanding of how it is supposed to work. Hence this is all but ignored. Although the delivery mechanism for coordination at both national and regional levels is unclear from the IW R2R Project Document, the RPCU, and inception workshop, have not identified how full delivery of coordination will be achieved.

The overall programme at both national agency and regional UN system levels has an inordinate number of staff in "coordination" roles. Yet the coordination of the programme remains a weakness. There is room to improve communication between the implementing agencies and the RPCU (for example, the RPCU is not automatically sent copies of STAR project MTRs); although this is likely a legacy of the long absence of a Regional Program Coordinator. There is clearly scope to clarify coordination functions, reporting lines, communications and responsibilities across the programme.

A constraint to strengthening the ability of the RPCU to coordinate the programme is the somewhat fluid governance responsibilities and reporting arrangements for the programme. The Project Document states under "Programme Governance" that "*Coordination and Governance of the Regional Programme Framework of the National R2R STAR Projects and the IW R2R Regional Project will be undertaken by the Programme Coordination Group (RPCG) (comprised of the three Implementing Agencies, UNDP, FAO and UNEP) who will meet annually during the IW R2R Regional Project Steering Committee meeting. A representative of the GEF Secretariat will be invited at these meetings*". However, according to the minutes of its meetings, although the RPCG has been made aware of serious coordination issues it has not solved them; for example, at its meeting at the third RSC meeting it simply "noted" the problem exists. However, only recently has there been a substantive and functional Regional Programme Coordinator in position. Also, since the STAR projects are all nationally implemented, the ability of the RPCG to "govern" coordination may be more limited than its title suggests.

Expectations of coordination functions by the RPCU should be kept within realistic and feasible limits. For example, the RPCU has a clear role in supporting information management and communications, which some might argue is technically not "coordination". But "coordination" in terms of managing STAR project activities, given the institutional structures in play, is unlikely to be realistic. Technical support from the RPCU should be on demand and within resource limits.

The MTR and a now fully staffed RPCU create the opportunity to try to improve programme coordination:

> **Recommendation 13:** The Regional Programme Coordination Group should strengthen technical information sharing and reporting links between the implementing agencies and the RPCU.

> **Recommendation 14:** The Regional Programme Steering Committee, with the support of the Regional Programme Coordination Group, at its next meeting, should clarify what is required from the RPCU regarding

programme coordination, and identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP), and specify the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.

It has already been concluded in Section 4.2 that a key role of the RPCU should be to generate lessons learned from R2R including previous R2R activities (notably the previous GEF IWRM Project), national IW R2R demonstration projects and in particular the STAR projects. Recommendation 11 refers to this. This would be a significant, and potentially feasible, contribution to improved programme coordination.

Inter-ministerial committees (IMCs)

The project logframe makes numerous references to "inter-ministerial committees" (IMCs) across a number of activities. Fundamentally, an IMC has, among other functions, an important coordination role. There is, however, no universal approach across the project to what an "IMCs" is, its status and role.

Some guidance is provided in the Project Document. For example, "*Component 3 will build on the existing mechanisms* [developed by the GEF IWRM project] *by supporting the expansion of existing national APEX bodies for IWRM to Inter- Ministry Committees (IMCs) comprised of representatives of agencies responsible for land, water, forests and coastal management. The IMCs will oversee, inter alia, national level coordination of the Ridge to Reef* ***Programme*** [emphasis added]*, the planning of national pilot activities planned under Component 1 and the associated national STAR projects, the coordination of inputs to the preparation of State of the Coasts reports and associated national Strategic Action Frameworks, and monitoring and evaluation of R2R Programme results at the national level. Secretariat support will be provided by national lead agencies to facilitate quarterly meetings of these groups. The role and effectiveness of IMCs as central national bodies for the planning and coordination of environmental and natural resource management will be tested via IMCs being tasked with the national-level planning of the use of GEF STAR funding available to the Pacific PICS through the GEF's sixth replenishment*."

One problem is terminology. Since any R2R activity involves more than one sector, or ministry, any body established under it would by definition be inter-departmental or inter-ministerial. Therefore, catchment management organisations or Project Steering Committees (PSCs) are "inter-ministerial". But according to the Project Document, the IMCs and PSCs are not the same. The aforementioned description of some IMC functions differ from the terms of reference for a PSC. Figure 7 (page 94) in the Project Document is definitive and clearly shows the IMC (although referred to as the National Inter-Ministry Sustainable Development Committee) functioning at the highest level of national coordination (in the R2R Program governance structure). The MTR does, however, recognise that there are indeed potential ambiguities in the Project Document, and particularly its LogFrame, regarding IMCs.

Of 13 PICS (data not available for Kiribati): 3 (Cook Islands, Vanuatu and PNG) have PSCs specific to the IW R2R national demonstration project with no official sharing of roles with STAR PSCs (although this does not imply that national IW R2R and STAR staff do not cooperate or communicate with each other) and in all 3 IW R2R staff were not familiar with the concept, need or purpose of an IMC; 5 (Fiji, Niue, RMI, Tonga and Tuvalu) have a IW R2R demonstration project PSC (or "Board") sharing functions with the STAR PSC (or "board") but no clearly identified "IMC" and in all cases the attendance by stakeholders from both IW R2R and STAR has been less than ideal; 2 (Palau and Samoa) have an IMC that also functions as the PSC for IW R2R and STAR but its function are more to do with project coordination than strategic or mainstreaming R2R into broader government policy; only 2 (FSM and Solomon Islands) have both a "PSC" and an IMC, in the case of FSM the PSC is referred to as a Technical Advisory Committee which is joint with the STAR project, and Solomon Islands do not have a STAR project. Nauru plans a joint PSC (Joint National Board) with STAR but this has yet to materialise.

Thus, the MTR found only two PICs that have clearly established the desired IMC structure separate from the PSC (as described, intended and termed in the Project Document): FSM and Solomon Islands. FSM has what it calls a joint Technical Advisory Committee with STAR at the state level (Kosrae where both operate) that functions mainly as a PSC, but also has a joint IMC that is by intent broader in membership and higher level because it is supposed to bring in the R2R perspective into national agenda-setting and decision-making. Solomon Islands initially thought the IMC and PSC were one and the same but upon advice by the RPCU, established as higher-level IMC for R2R. Its PSC used to be the National Coordinating Committee from the previous IWRM that was revived to deal mainly with IW R2R operational matters. There is not yet clear evidence so far that these two IMCs have fully mainstreamed R2R, or strengthened R2R.

According to MoAs (between SPC and PICs) there are to be joint PSCs for STAR and IW R2R projects. Reasons given for not having joint PSCs include different start-up times of IW R2R and STAR Projects and different mandates/objectives and working in different locations (and in some cases regions). Many national project staff regard IMCs, catchment management bodies and/or PSCs to be the same thing. Some others are either not aware of the requirement for IMCs or regard them as redundant since there are already national level committees or forums performing these functions. These ambiguities cause much confusion and make it challenging to assess progress of the project regarding IMCs and their role in project/programme coordination. For example, the RPCU has self-assessed its progress on outcome 1.3.1 as "on track" but assumed that PSC's qualify as IMCs, whereas the MTR has assessed this as off-track using the contrary interpretation (Table 1).

Palau appears to have made the most progress on this outcome so far, because it was able to leverage the social capital from existing similar networks and structures (e.g., National Environmental Protection Council and Conservation Consortium) to strengthen R2R. It established a joint IW R2R and STAR IMC that functions both as an IMC and PSC. It is multi-stakeholder with effective civil society representation

and chaired by the Minister of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism (MNRET). It functions both for cross-sectoral coordination of programs and projects (principally within the MNRET governance regime which includes also Agriculture and Fisheries) and to steer STAR and IW R2R operations. Cross-sectoral coordination is done to ensure all projects signed on to by the MNRET are aligned with, and add value to, national priorities and goals, and each contributes to advancing national and local capacities for sustainable NRM and tourism. Cross-project coordination is done for more efficient institutional resources management (avoiding duplication, rationalizing the engagement of essentially the same players, optimizing resource sharing and consolidating contributions to shared goals). The main benefit of the joint IW R2R and STAR IMC is considered to be how it has brought in a lot of perspectives and how it has helped stakeholders see the connection of different activities and projects.

The MTR recognises that most PICS have small populations and compact governance structures. In many cases everybody knows everybody else. There is a danger of over-engineering governance structures and mechanisms. It is recognised, therefore, that assessing the way in which governance is structured, and information flows, from community through to cabinet, and how "networks" work and R2R is mainstreamed, is challenging using the current terminology and criteria laid down in the project document. Given this context it is not surprising that some PICs have applied adaptive management to interpreting "IMCs" and PSCs. What needs to be monitored is how "community to cabinet", networking and mainstreaming R2R across scales is working. This requires a more flexible country specific approach that embraces country specific circumstances, existing governance structures and terminology.

What an "IMC" is intended to achieve is improved integrated resources planning (R2R) outcomes, including through improved participatory decision making. But such activities/outcomes can and will occur at different scales or levels (site, local, catchment, national, regional). The issue is actually about how well governance structures function across landscapes and seascapes, how well they manage information flow from one level to another (top-down and bottom-up) and how meaningful, effective and equitable participation in decision-making is achieved across the entire governance structure. It would help if these structures and their functions were better mapped and different terms were used for structures/mechanisms at different levels (instead of labelling everything as an "IMC"). However, this will differ widely between PICs.

The MTR concludes that in order to make progress, where necessary, on inter-ministerial coordination, community to cabinet approaches to, and mainstreaming R2R the RPCU and national counterparts of the IW R2R and STAR projects should:

> (i) First and foremost - recognise that there is potential confusion and ambiguity regarding IMCs across the project and programme and differing interpretations among countries; this means that the intended functional role of IMCs may not be being achieved;

(ii) Although the organisational/planning status of "IMCs" will differ among countries - they are not catchment management bodies or Project Steering Committees (or Boards); they function at a higher level; and

(iii) Rather than attempt to achieve consistency in terminology and approach across the PICs (and change the IW R2R Regional LogFrame), focus instead on identifying the intended functional role of IMCs, prioritising their role in mainstreaming and coordinating R2R across relevant policies, nd in each PIC identify how this functional role can be achieved through existing planning and coordination mechanisms, strengthening these and building additional mechanisms only where required.

The same conclusion regarding working with existing national planning and coordination mechanisms was drawn in Section 4.2 and a reference to considering IMCs (as above) has been appended under its recommendation 4.

Community to cabinet approaches

Much is made in the Project Document of the importance of the "community-to-cabinet" (and back) approach; although the MTR notes that the concept is not well defined. This is largely based on the experiences of the previous GEF IWRM Project. The MTR notes, however, that it is unclear how community-to-cabinet approaches are integrated into the LogFrame nor what the delivery mechanism is. There is involvement with "communities" in most national demonstration projects but unclear mechanisms for linking information from community to cabinet level. The MTR flags that this point needs to be considered by the project when addressing coordination issues, such as IMCs, and explore how to ensure information flows from one level to another (and back) under a participatory governance framework. Palau may be cited as an exception for demonstrating an organic and integrative process for policy agenda-setting and decision-making across the natural resources, environment, agriculture, fisheries and tourism sectors, which effectively incorporates civil society and community perspectives. This participatory governance framework, however, is not necessarily the result of the IW R2R Project and STAR initiatives per se, or the IWRM before these, but all of these certainly contributed to, and were in turn benefitted by, this level of institutional development.

Other performance of the Executing Agency (SPC-SOPAC, RPCU)

Technical expertise of the RPCU

There is a disconnect between the technical expertise of the RPCU Team (with its bias towards natural sciences) and the scope of the project. For a project essentially dealing with governance, institutional change and influencing policies it is surprising the RPCU does not have specific expertise in environment/natural resources management/governance/institutional change/economics etc. The MTR does not recommend any changes at this stage and recognises the value and opportunity of having a full team now in place that needs to be sustained and having

its confidence and teamwork built. If vacancies occur through natural processes, then this imbalance could be addressed. But the MTR concludes that this technical background is adversely influencing the project approach/strategy. Knowledge gaps need to be addressed through a more targeted use of consultants.

Adaptive management

As noted in Section 4.2, particularly regarding project component 1, there are ample examples of practical and sensible adaptive management at national demonstration project level by national counterparts in all PICs. For example, most national LogFrames have been adjusted, in most cases during national project inception, to cater for changes in project assumptions and risks and the realities of on-the-ground implementation. Only three PICs (Samoa, Vanuatu and Niue) are still implementing their original logframes. Provided that national projects remain within the bounds of the project objectives, components and outcomes (which they do), such is to be welcomed.

There is, however, limited evidence of adaptive management at regional IW R2R project level, that is, by the RPCU. The most compelling example is the absence of an effective inception process that, as noted above, is a root cause of many of the challenges the project now faces. An inception process should explicitly involve a participatory and detailed critical analysis of the projects' Theory of Change and LogFrame, including its assumptions and risks, check mechanisms for delivery of project outcomes and objectives and assess the project's targets and indicators (including identifying mid-term or other time-bound targets or milestones). Project documents and their LogFrames are never perfect and are written on the assumption that an inception process will double-check the practicalities and changes since formulation. This was particularly important for the current project due to its complexity, timeline for preparation (see Section 4.1) and some significant changes in the international (including not least the adoption of the SDGs), regional and national policy landscapes. The inception report (ostensibly combined with the report of the first RSC meeting, October 2016) does not contain any critical analysis of the LogFrame at all (except minor comments on national LogFrames).

A centralised and "top-down" project management approach

There is sufficient evidence for the MTR to conclude that the Executing Agency/RPCU has introduced or inherited a centralised and "top-down" management style. Examples include:

i. feedback from a sufficiently significant number of national project counterparts (and in some case STAR projects as well);

ii. the above mentioned adaptive management to adjust national project LogFrames was, in most cases, achieved despite discouragement from the RPCU;

iii. some of the Islands Diagnostic Assessments have progressed without full national level participation (see Section 4.2) and in at least one case after

feedback from national level indicating it will be redundant due to on-going similar processes (i.e., SOE);

iv. the Project's take on R2R, as translated into its Theory of Change, was not explained to National Project Managers until the third RSC Meeting in 2018; and

v. a "workshop" held in February 2018 to scope the project database development attended only by members of the RPCU.

The MTR notes that capacity building should be the over-arching driving principle of the project even if resulting in compromises in scientific quality and timeliness of delivery of outputs. This requires that relevant national counterpart staff be included in all relevant project technical and management processes and decisions.

> **Recommendation 15:** The project should implement all its activities from a capacity building perspective, even if resulting in compromises on scientific quality and/or timelines.

Support provided by the Implementing Agency and UNDP-GEF Regional Office and national agencies in PICs

It is clear from the minutes of the RSC meetings that the Implementing Agency (UNDP Suva Office) and UNDP-GEF Regional Office (UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser) have taken, and continue to take, an active interest in the programme and project. Both have also attended a number of other programme/project related meetings where enthusiasm and support for the programme/project is self-evident. The MTR team has gained a similar impression through the MTR process. Some suggestions for improving communications and governance of the programme and project were made above.

The MTR Team has been impressed at the quality and support of national level counterparts and agencies. There have been some significant delays in project start-up in most countries, and challenges with staff turn-over in some, but these are not known to be due to a lack of interest in the project. All the PICs have made adjustments in their national LogFrames in the light of national priorities. Discussions were explicitly held with national counterparts and agencies regarding alignment of the project objectives with national priorities and confirmation of coherence received in all cases.

The Regional Scientific and Technical Committee

The Project Document establishes a Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) responsible for ensuring that scientific and technical aspects of the R2R **programme** [emphasis added] meet international standards; although its subsequent description (page 93) refers exclusively to scientific and technical components of the Regional IW R2R Project. It appears to be dominated by the physical/natural sciences and light on social sciences (particularly economics, governance and creating institutional change/institutional development). It apparently also has limited representation from the national PICs' scientific

community (some members are from PICs but not representing them). The MTR acknowledges the capacity challenges among the PICs. This includes the availability of scientific and technical expertise, but such does exist if sought. Nevertheless, the current composition of, and approach to, the RSTC as an "independent" body, is certainly at odds with the concept of capacity building among the PICs and the principle of full and effective participation of national stakeholders in project decision making. Given that the RSTC presumably needs to be maintained at a manageable size, one additional way of achieving these broader capacity building and participation objectives might be for larger and more inclusive scientific and technical meetings (workshops) to be held under the oversight of the RSTC. In addition, there are questions as to how RSTC functions for regional R2R might be sustained after the project finishes.

> **Recommendation 16:** The RPCU and RSC should: (i) re-assess the composition and *modus operandi* of the RSTC in the light of the scientific and technical scope and needs of the project, specifically strengthening its social and economic expertise; (ii) as far as feasible, put more emphasis on opportunities to build scientific and technical capacity among the PICs by providing for improved engagement of national PIC science stakeholders in project/programme science and technology decision making; (iii) explore how the R2R network and platform (component 4.2) might contribute to the sustainability of science and technology support to PICs after the project finishes; and (iv) explore opportunities for expanding inter-active workshops and training on the project's science and technology agenda under RSTC oversight.

5.3.2 Work planning

The project inception report was not produced until October 2016 (if at all, as it was part of the first RSC meeting, see above). This was 14 months after start-up, whereas it is normal to produce it within the first three months. Reasons provided to the MTR mission include waiting for national project managers to be in place. But each PIC had an identified focal point and/or acting project coordinator in place at start up. This delay was unjustified.

There were serious problems with staff recruitment and turn-over at the RPCU that affected project implementation particularly regarding the Regional Programme Coordinator and Science Leader. According to data provided by the RPCU, the original Programme Coordinator was in position from May 2015 but was on sick leave from March to October 2017 and end of contract leave from March 2018. The new (current) Programme Coordinator was not in position until February 2019 (a one year delay in recruitment). The original Science Leader resigned in March 2017 and was not replaced until February 2019 (almost two years). There were acting coordinators in place during these periods of absence or position vacancies but nevertheless these are extended periods of flux in senior management. Consultants were engaged to fill some gaps, particularly for the Science Leader, but this is sub-optimal. The country coordination, monitoring and evaluation adviser was not in post until November 2017. A media and graphics adviser was not appointed until

April 2016, resigned July 2016, a replacement was appointed in January 2017 to December 2017 and the current incumbent was appointed in May 2018. The current Science Officer, Communications and Knowledge Management Officer, Project Accountant and Programme Administrator have however been in position since relatively early in the project. In the absence of a substantive coordinator, and science leader, the remaining RPCU staff members report they were largely working on silos.

Despite this, the RPCU staff made a good effort to try to keep the project moving: for example, its communications strategy, gender mainstreaming strategy, lessons learned, stakeholder engagement strategy, commencement of work on the integrated and simplified multi-focal area results framework, implementation of a multi-year costed work programme and the production of technical backstopping products.

It can be expected that staff challenges can happen during any project's life span. But the SPC is a mature agency and its senior management could reasonably be expected to be able to cater for such needs in a more expeditious and efficient manner.

The staffing constraints at the RPCU and at national level (as above) are now overcome and the project is positioned to accelerate its overall performance.

The project has developed a very useful and influential multi-year costed work plan (MYCWP) approach to work planning. Under this, national project staff has to plan and cost future work that encourages them to focus on their LogFrames and plan accordingly in order to receive advance funding. National projects are reimbursed on the basis of quarterly expenditure reports against agreed activities. This has been instrumental in focusing national project managers on output delivery. One downside of the approach is that it tends to concentrate attention on costed activities, whereas a number of the important project activities involve no, or limited, costs; for example, R2R mainstreaming.

The MYCWP is directly linked to the national project LogFrame. In addition, the project has implemented training on results-based management. There is some confidence, therefore, that, after a slow start, national level activities are moving towards results-based planning.

The above mentioned self-assessment workshop held by the RPCU in December 2018, conducted in the absence of a Regional Programme Coordinator, is commended as an excellent work planning initiative of the team. The MTR notes, and also commends, UNDP-Suva (the country office focal point) for attending and contributing to discussions. However, the MTR notes that senior SPC management, who could resolve many of the challenges identified, was absent due to other commitments. The MTR concludes that, particularly now the RPCU is fully staffed, such meetings should continue and on a regular basis.

5.3.3 Finance and co-finance

The project was subject to a recent audit and the MTR has not assessed project accounting in detail. The accounting and budget administration and procedures appear to be satisfactory, helped considerably by the MYCWP. Some minor comments from national project managers refer to earlier delays in reimbursements or replenishments with some still regarding the procedures as taking too long. However, financial transfers usually go via a USA-based bank and when arriving at national level can then still have to travel through national budget/accounting processes (transfers are not always directly into project accounts). Therefore, the reported up to two-week (even three-week) delay from submission of replenishment requests to projects receiving top-ups is considered to be relatively efficient based on the MTR Team's own experiences.

The RPCU self-assessment points to significant procurement delays at SPC-SOPAC; referring to inconsistent, ambiguous and over bureaucratic procedures that in particular cause excessive delays in appointing staff and that procurement staff tend to question technical aspects of requests rather than focusing on expediting procurement.

The Project Document argues that its approach is cost-effective because:

i. a multi-focal, multi-Trust Fund, multi-Agency Program encompasses an integrated cross sectoral environmental management approach that is ideally suited to the unique scale and climatic challenges of the PICs but also provides the most cost-effective delivery mechanism in a capacity challenged region;

ii. the project will be able to coordinate delivery, reporting and lessons learned to more cost-effectively transfer knowledge inter- and intra- nationally improving project outcomes and reducing environmental stress;

iii. the recently completed GEF Pacific IWRM Project was able to establish functional national inter-ministerial committees, local demonstration project steering committees and project management units that this project can build on to be more cost-effective in its implementation through a more rapid project start and delivery. Another successful strategy of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project was the efficient use of the Annual Regional Steering Committee Meetings to turn ambitions into regional and country strategies and plans;

iv. the unique counterpart support provided through the project will be cost effective due to economies of scale as the SPC based project provides technical services to 14 dispersed PICs and an effective extension and support of a Pacific Ridge to Reef Network. This will provide the foundation for a cost-effective simplified shared system of reporting; and

v. the regional education programme [training programme] will be cost-effective as the contact requirements will be met on the fringes of the regional and sub-regional meetings ensuring that participation becomes a

marginal cost. At the national and local level, vocational training programme cost-effectiveness will be achieved through their sharing across 14 PICs.

The MTR concludes that, in principle, these cost effective measures and approaches remain valid but notes the following:

i. clearly, the cost-effectiveness of the measures depends on the extent to which they are delivered and, so far, delivery/implementation for many outcomes has been significantly off track (see Section 4.2);

ii. the extent to which the current project has actively built upon many of the referred to measures, institutions and outcomes of the previous GEF Pacific IWRM Project it is not yet clear or established; indeed it is not established whether some of these still exist and reference is made to reviewing this point in Section 4.2 (and Recommendation 2) above;

iii. most importantly, Section 4.2 notes that by far the most valuable outcomes of the project are capacity-building and the lessons learned from R2R approaches and investments; it is therefore critical to realising the cost-effectiveness of this project that MTR recommendations on these points are implemented.

Based on feedback from the project's co-financing partners, provided by the RPCU, the MTR co-financing monitoring Table is provided in Annex 8. Based on these figures co-financing expenditure is 1.17% as of June 2019. The project team meets co-financing partners regularly.

5.3.4 Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems (M&E)

Monitoring tools in use potentially provide the required M&E information but they are complex, time consuming and inefficient particularly regarding reporting for national level components. Most national project managers complain at the level of monitoring and reporting required for such a small (IW R2R national component) project noting the requirement is similar to that of the much better resourced STAR projects. However, component 4 outcome 4.1 expressly seeks to streamline M&E for such multi-focal area GEF funded projects (see further comments in Section 4.2). As already noted, M&E is moving towards clearer results-based approaches and the project is providing training on this.

Project M&E is not clearly aligned or mainstreamed into national systems and until simplified it is not clear that it should be. Most national counterparts note that the M&E expectation is a significant burden on national resources and some are concerned that activities under outcome 4.1 are showing signs of increasing that burden and running the risk of duplicating effort or creating parallel mechanisms to national systems. See Section 4.2 (Outcome 4.1) for further discussion and its note that the project's M&E activities should seek to reduce, not increase, national reporting burdens. It will be essential that national counterparts and agencies are fully and effectively involved in outcome 4.1 if it is to be effective.

The project has a clearly identified budget for M&E under its component 4. Resource allocation for this appears to be adequate.

Reporting

Although M&E tools are in place, and the project has a component specifically targeted at improving these, there are significant constraints to actual reporting. As noted in Section 4.2 (component 4), although the project is actively engaged in creating a simplified integrated results reporting framework, together with an internet based platform to enable on-line reporting, the current problem is not the framework or IT/software development but the lack of actual reporting. This applies to national demonstration projects and in particular STAR projects.

Reporting varies widely among the PICs, for example:

i. consistency of reporting through quarterly narrative reports, e.g., Palau has full cover and Vanuatu has almost full cover whereas they are absent for Kiribati, with most PICs having gaps in reporting periods;

ii. all PICs were asked to provide mid-term reports to assist the MTR; oddly, only those PICS actually visited by the MTR mission (plus Niue) provided these, with Palau noting that it did so in case they were not visited (they were); these reports proved to be very useful to the MTR mission which would have benefitted greatly from reports from the other 8 PICs; and

iii. annual reports, by PICs, were not available to the MTR mission.

The project has been subject to two Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) in 2017 and 2018. The first contained no ratings (insufficient data) but the second (2018) was rated by UNDP as unsatisfactory and with substantial overall risks.

GEF reporting requirements are covered also under M&E (above). Component 4 of the project seeks to improve (and simplify) these GEF reporting requirements. Despite multiple requests, the MTR mission was not provided with the completed GEF IW Tracking Tool at MTR.

There is no clear record or consolidation of how adaptive management changes have been reported to the Project Board (RSC) apart from adjustments to national LogFrames; although as noted above for the Regional IW R2R Project there has been limited adaptive management.

Similarly, lessons learned from the project have so far not been systematically compiled, shared or communicated. As per Recommendation 11, the MTR considers that this should be a priority activity for the RPCU in the remaining period.

5.3.5 Stakeholder engagement

A good deal of stakeholder analysis was incorporated into project design. Most national demonstration projects, dealing with cross-sectoral integration (e.g. catchment management), have undertaken further stakeholder analysis at their project inceptions. The RPCU has provided a good deal technical backstopping and guidance to them on undertaking this including: a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

and tools, training provided to national project managers at the first RSC and during country visits.

National demonstrations overall are country driven activities and national LogFrames have been adapted to reflect this. A high level of national and local support for the project objectives is evident. There are some capacity constraints among national project managers, as identified by the RPCU, notably for project management skills. Some training has been undertaken, and further training planned, to alleviate this problem.

The project's main stakeholders at national and regional level are indicated in the Project Document and summarised in Section 3 (above). National stakeholders (there listed primarily as line agencies) continue a high level of involvement in the project at national level. Many of the regional level stakeholders are invited to annual RSC meetings but the level of engagement of these has not been quantified. As the project starts to focus on lessons learned and mainstreaming R2R (as proposed earlier) then the RPCU will need to ensure it builds effective engagement with this, and a broader, stakeholder community.

As noted above, there is more limited involvement by national level stakeholders in steering the regional level activities and involvement in project decision-making.

5.3.6 Communications

The RPCU has been effective in delivering technical assistance on strategic communications to national projects in a number of ways such as:

i. training NPMs on preparing strategic communication plans related to promoting the national demonstration projects through a hands-on, learning-by-doing approach, and providing specific technical advice related to communications campaigns – e.g., script writing for radio talk shows discussing environmental issues, development of Project Progress Reports and guidance on drafting experiential notes;

ii. Social media training and syndication of updates on national project activities, development of communications material for national project communications and outreach (posters, booklet, product briefs, folders etc.);

iii. Video production (e.g. Vanuatu RapCA 2018, Tuvalu Water Quality Monitoring exercise 2019); and

iv. Media releases

However, the Project does not have a communications strategy for raising awareness on R2R among different audiences: NPMs, local communities, PSC, IMC or its equivalent.

Many of the communication outputs witnessed or reviewed by the MTR refer to individual activities (such as tree planting) that are positioned within a broader R2R framework. The project communications strategy needs to be vigilant that its primary role is to communicate about the project objective which is R2R, and de-

emphasise micro-scale activities (although such can be good communication/promotional opportunities where successful).

The project's RapCA → IDA → SOC → SAF Policy-Interface Model limits and leaves strategic communication towards the tail-end of the process. It narrowly construes the task of strategic communication as document publication and "selling" the end-product to policy-makers for endorsement and adoption. But strategic communication should from the very beginning input into how the assessment and strategy framework could be better aligned with existing priorities and planning processes, to enhance the chances these are adopted as national documents. For example, had communications been considered as a relevant strategic planning tool at the outset it is highly likely the project would have adopted a more ecosystem goods and services perspective from the outset and focussed on supporting mainstreaming into existing mechanisms and frameworks instead of creating new ones.

The lack of communication of project successes and progress was noted in the RPCU self-assessment (December 2018) as a significant factor in the lack of appreciation or awareness of the project by the wider SPC and in the region in general.

The project/programme has a Pacific R2R web-based platform (https://www.pacific-r2r.org). The MTR has not assessed the functionality of this nor its effectiveness (e.g. quantifying hits, visits, downloads etc.). However, recommendation 8 refers to the need for the RPCU to assess its functionality and effectiveness as part of proposals to upgrade this under Section 4.2 Outcome 4.2.

> **Recommendation 17:** Communications should be considered and integrated into project activities (e.g. IDA-SOC/R2R, mainstreaming plans etc.) from their very beginning and be used to identify target audiences, influence the nature of data collected and indicators being used and improve the understanding of how constraints to R2R uptake can be reduced to increase the impact of the project on policy.

5.3.7 Gender and Development (GAD) Mainstreaming Strategy

Taking guidance from the UNDP Gender Mainstreaming Strategy 2014-2017, and in consideration of lessons learned from the GEF Pacific IWRM Project, the IW R2R Project prepared its "Pacific R2R Gender Mainstreaming Strategy" (including a Work Plan) that outlines the entry points for integrating gender equality into its outcomes areas. The strategy quite rightly recognises that a key aspect of successful R2R towards socially-just and inclusive sustainable development, is gender equality and women empowerment. Moreover, it acknowledges that projects, when gender-blind, often contribute to perpetuating and even widening gender gaps, which in the context of most PICs, deprive firstly and mostly women of their rights to access natural resources and undervalue or overlook their contribution in natural resources management, despite widespread recognition that women have always played a critical role in water, land and coastal management. The strategy thus attempts to ensure that the Project takes into consideration the differential needs of its women and men partners at the regional, national, local and community levels

such that they are afforded equal power and access to decision-making, choices and resources. This strategy was presented and discussed in detail during the first RSC meeting.

Gender mainstreaming was to be done through two pathways - gender mainstreaming in programme activities and targeted gender analysis of national demonstration projects. The provision of GAD mainstreaming assistance was at two levels: RPCU staff and National Project Managers (NPM), both supposedly to develop facilitation competencies on mainstreaming a GAD perspective into regional and national component design and management, and into those national and local governance institutions involved in the Project's implementation. Competency development is almost presumed at the level of the RPCU, and at the very least they were expected to take the UNESCO online course on GAD mainstreaming. Indications point to most relevant public stakeholders involved in the Project having had previous related training, and/or having national machineries for women.

The capacity needs identified by NPMs and reported at the 2nd RSC meeting constitute core tasks of GAD mainstreaming: conducting gender assessments of project and other national documents, identifying areas for gender inclusion, updating LogFrames and developing gender action plans to reflect gender inclusion, implementing activities that increase gender equality, monitoring and reporting of gender mainstreaming activities. To address these gaps, the Project commissioned a Gender Consultancy to develop templates for gender assessment and action planning and collection and reporting of sex-disaggregated data across the five project components, develop and deliver training for PICs on implementation of gender action plans and conduct gender assessment and develop coordinated (IW and STAR R2R Projects) gender action plans for four PICs, presumably to serve as model for the other PICs.

Six PICs (FSM, Vanuatu, RMI, Palau, Solomon, Tuvalu) were trained on Gender Mainstreaming, and it is assumed that this came with, or was preceded by a Gender Sensitivity Seminar. The Consultancy Reports, and Gender Action Plan Templates, show a mainly literature-based review of GAD mainstreaming status at the national level (e.g., accession to GAD-related conventions, agreements, platform for action, existence of national machineries for women, women representation in politics, traditions and myths that keep women in subordinated positions, etc.). Two PICs have completed action plans (Palau and Samoa) and Vanuatu and Tuvalu have versions of their "engendered" LogFrames, although it is unclear if these have superseded the original LogFrames. The specific gender assessment and analysis (in fact, periodic gender assessment and analysis) to inform the national demonstration projects was made part of the targeted activities of the Action Plan. However, the prepared templates to guide gender analysis feeding into gender action planning and mainstreaming are not cost-effective investments; they are of the generic, off-the-shelf nature, which cannot be mechanically applied without adequate sensitisation and hands-on guidance of those using them. It is not that the national level gender analyses undertaken were irrelevant, for sure they are useful for informing long-term national policy and structural based reforms, but this is not the

main focus of the project. The targeted gender analysis at the level of the demonstration projects are as important because the demonstration projects are the loci of community participation, which are expected to be sustained and up-scaled beyond the project life. Gender mainstreaming gains at this level can thus be programmatically targeted to contribute to broader development benefits, based on current and localised problem analysis.

The regional LogFrame targets the increased participation of women in activities, consultative fora and decision-making structures. In addition, while the national LogFrames provided to the MTR Team do not clearly and consistently show gender-specific targets, interviews indicate efforts to track women participation in meetings, consultations and activities related to the national demonstration projects and RapCA + IDA activities. Sex-disaggregated data on attendance to activities are reported by PICs in QPRs as required by the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy. However, because targeted gender analysis has not yet been systematically undertaken in most PICs, it is unclear how the attendance of women and men in these activities indicate links to the Project's specific targeted regional and national objectives. It is notable that as early as the second RSC in Tonga in 2017: "women comprise 45% of the participants at stakeholder events across the region with Palau being the country with the highest proportion of women attending events. It must be noted that this is only representative of the countries that have been recruited and begun project activities, are reporting when required and are reporting in the correct format. The true figures may be significantly different" (Gender Mainstreaming Progress Report). Attendance, membership and nominal participation (presence or absence) are foundational data for indicating participation and inclusion but they do not provide much insight on the quality of the participation of both women and men and their effects. It is not only important that the quality of participation is captured, it must be ensured that the quality of participation can be empirically-linked to relevant outcomes matching the embedded problem analysis in the gender analysis.

In fact, the Project's Gender Mainstreaming Strategy identifies examples of indicators of gender-responsiveness beyond attendance (e.g., attendance at stakeholder engagement is at least 30% women, attendance at participatory environmental monitoring is at least 30% women, membership in steering committee/Project Board, membership in project related community groups) that can be plausibly linked to higher level development outcomes. It lists indicators that target women's practical needs (e.g., hours of work – reduced or increased) and strategic needs (increased proportion of women attending decision making events, number of times women's needs and priorities are included in decisions, capacity to participate in decision making at the community level) or both (benefits of the projects, access to relevant information to make meaningful contributions to project activities, amount of resources allocated to address women's needs and priorities, % of increased access of productive resources, proportion of women, increased access or loss of access to natural resources). But again, it is targeted gender analysis that will render them empirically-specific and relevant to the stress reduction and habitat management measures to be, or that are being, undertaken by the PICs.

Targeting increased participation of women in major decision-making structures is always a worthy goal. Related to this, targeting participation of women in the JCU course is seen as a key investment to enhancing the inclusion of women's knowledge and voices in natural resources management planning and decision-making in the PICs. However, the gender composition of IMCs or PSCs are a function of who are the voted and appointed incumbents in the PICs, and currently these are male-dominated. It is within this purview that it is unrealistic to expect this Project to influence increased participation of women public servants in IMCs or PSCs, unless the Project directly targets influencing national and local policy regarding this. Moreover, where an "IMC" functions at a high policy level, it is unrealistic to expect participants from youth and/or vulnerable groups, but representation of their views is required. Where they can directly participate, it must be recognized that there will not be a quick fix for matching their participation with appropriate amounts of authority vis-à-vis the official authority vested in public actors within this Project's lifetime. This can still be targeted but on a programmatic basis, for a succession of related projects to build upon each other's gains.

Most national demonstration projects are in their early stages of implementation or still about to start. The catchment management plans, water management plans, coastal resources management plans, protected area management plans, dry-litter piggery, improved sanitation implementation plans etc. should be gender-analysed (for baseline and periodically to monitor changes) to ensure on-site project management is gender-responsive in specific ways relevant to these plans' objectives and that the identified gender-responsive actions plausibly link to broader development outcomes addressing both practical and strategic needs. Setting-up baseline and periodic gender assessments, analyses and re-planning of the national demonstration projects must be done in collaboration with the national machineries for women or related offices. Likewise, the completed RapCAs and IDAs must be gender-audited before they are incorporated in the SoC, and gender-analysed as necessary (for the same rationale as above), and an EGS perspective will help to better link ecosystem/environmental benefits to socio-economic outcomes. The SoCs and Strategic Action Frameworks themselves must be gender-analysed.

> **Recommendation 18:** The national demonstration plans and activities that are still currently being prepared should be gender-analysed to ensure on-site project management is gender-responsive in specific ways anchored on the objectives of these these plans. The completed RapCAs and IDAs must be gender-audited before they are incorporated in the SoC. The SoCs and Strategic Action Frameworks themselves must be gender-audited.

To have more focused impact on enhancing inclusion of women and other vulnerable groups in high-level decision-making, i.e., in IMCs, the Project may assess how various governance structures at different scales (local to national, community to cabinet) function collectively to deliver effective participation by communities/women/vulnerable groups and deliver effective, equitable and coordinated R2R planning outcomes. This means strengthening of IMCs by including full and effective inputs of communities, women, youth and vulnerable groups

through transparent and participatory dialogue from local through to national levels, rather than targeting in the immediate project lifetime, just their numerical participation in IMCs (etc.). In addition, any R2R communications materials targeting the PSCs and IMCs (or their equivalents) must embed gender-sensitising messages coming from the project's gender-analysis at the national and demonstrationsite levels.

Overall Rating: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	Description
3 Moderately Unsatisfactory	Implementation of some of the seven components (management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications) is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most components requiring remedial action.

5.4 Sustainability of project outcomes

Assumptions are conditions or factors assumed to exist that are necessary for the project outcomes to be achieved or sustained. Risks are in effect the probability of an assumption not being correct or not being met.

There are two broad categories of risks and assumptions associated with the project. First, those that relate to necessary pre-conditions of project success but are outside the direct influence of the project or where a defined outcome is expected to arise from the fulfillment, or continued existence, of an assumption. This is the more common approach to "risks and assumptions" in a project's theory of change or LogFrame. Second, risks to implementation of the project that are under the control of the project and affect project deliverables and therefore sustainability. The project LogFrame risks and assumptions are largely in the latter category.

The risks identified in the Project Document and LogFrame are important but most identified risks are simply the negative restating of assumptions and are issues that clearly can be controlled by the project, both at project design level and/or during execution. Similarly, most refer to barriers to implementing R2R that the project actually seeks to address through its interventions. For example, under activity 1.3.1 - *"Existing tensions between land-owners and government agencies may limit community leader participation"* but an R2R project is, or should, be designed with the specific purpose of reducing those tensions.

The 2017 Project Implementation Review does not give an overall risk rating due to lack of data. It does, however, under Section E (Critical Risk Management) identify the extended leave of the Program Coordinator and retention of the Project and Science Leader as risks and the expansion of scope of a consultant and placement of an OIC as risk management measures. The 2018 Project Implementation Review, however, identifies: (i) the same risks with similar management measures; (ii) lack

of appropriately qualified national staff available to provide adequate secretariat support to IMC work; and (iii) that the RPCU has no formal authority governing the activities of the STAR projects following the programmatic approach and that the RPCG and the RSC were notified about this as a critical coordination issue by the RPCU. Therefore, it appears that the project has some mechanisms in place to identify emerging risks (regarding project execution) but limited ability to resolve them. The 2018 PIR gives an overall risks rating as "substantial". But this probably refers to the risks that the project is off-track in terms of execution and not that underlying risks and assumptions have changed.

As noted earlier, project risks and assumptions should have been tested at project inception. Some recommendations for addressing some risks and assumptions have been included elsewhere (e.g.: re-orienting the project approach towards ecosystem goods and services; aligning IMCs etc. with existing governance structures etc.).

Observations on the overall, general, project risks and assumptions as per the project document (its Section 2.5, table on its page 62) are provided in the table below. Observations on the more detailed list of project risks and assumptions in the LogFrame are provided in Annex 11. Some important general observations include: that a foundational assumption refers to the project building on the institutional arrangements and capacity built by the previous GEF Pacific IWRM Project. It is, therefore, extremely high risk if these arrangements are eroded or no longer exist especially after a long time-lag between the two projects. For this, and other reasons, a recommendation is made in Section 4.2 that the project re-evaluate the current situation regarding sustainability of previous IWRM investments.

MTR Risk Ratings

MTR observations on the Risk ratings and responses in the Project Document (its page 62)

Risk	Rating impact/ probability	Response identified in PRODOC	MTR observation comments
Capacity Limits of PICs institutional and human resources	I=3 P=5	Capacity determines implementation scope and pace. Project design recognizes this and there are several innovative approaches proposed to promote rapid learning whilst doing. This approach was successfully demonstrated in the PacIWRM project and the current proposal progresses the approach still further. A significant lesson learnt in the PacIWRM was the value of a technically strong and supportive regional PCU that is able to assist and mentor national counterparts this lesson has been recognized in the design of the complement of staff in the PCU.	This is not a risk. Lack of capacity is an identified assumption that the project is designed to address through capacity building.
Continued political will and capacity of the PICs at different levels to remain committed / involved in the further integration of water, land and coastal management.	I=3 P=2	The engagement of the regional and sub-regional organizations reduces the risk of a failure to engage at a national level. The PacIWRM has successfully established functional inter-ministerial committees, which can readily be expanded to include a higher level of representation from institutions responsible for Land and Coastal management. In many instances these agencies are already represented but their status needs to be increased. The Project design emphasizes leadership development and	The project is designed to sustain or improve such political will and assumes the project implementation adopts an approach that seeks to integrate its outcomes into existing local/sub-national/state/national governance and management mechanisms and processes.

MTR observations on the Risk ratings and responses in the Project Document (its page 62)

Risk	Rating impact/ probability	Response identified in PRODOC	MTR observation comments
		awareness to drive high-level support.	
R2R is accepted at a National Level as a legitimate coordination framework for a multi focal area approach to demonstrate integrated water, land and coastal management	I=3 P=2	The R2R concept is not entirely new in many of the countries where PacIWRM has watershed based demonstration projects. But R2R is in general not well understood and the project design addresses this through investing significantly in public education and awareness approaches to rapidly develop a fundamental knowledge of the concept and to garner widespread support. This approach has proved successful in the PacIWRM project.	The project is designed to promote and improve such acceptance (as immediately above).
Successful adaptation demonstration not sustained or scaled up due to a lack of financial resources	I=3 P=2	There are many opportunities presented by climate change financing mechanisms to develop sustainable financing arrangement for PICs, In addition appropriately valued coastal environmental service supporting food security, tourism and blue carbon have the potential to yield sustainable financing opportunities	This assumes that the project implementation adopts an approach that values coastal environmental services (= ecosystem goods and services) see Section 4.2 on recommendations that the project adopt such an approach.
ICM is recognized as being multi-sector and involve the whole of community	I=2 P=2	A community to cabinet and back approach will be fostered at all levels of project development and implementation so as to ensure multi-sector and full community participation. This combined with timely and targeted media awareness campaigns will minimize the risk of sector silos developing.	Sector silos already exist. This is the reason for having the project. The project is designed to address the required participation etc. (as above) The MTR would rate this as impact = 5 since without such recognition there is no R2R; but probability is low (1 or 2) as it is already quite well recognised.
Communities and wider stakeholders are willing to participate in Policy development and Demonstration projects;	I=2 P=1	The lesson learnt from PacIWRM is that early engagement with community in diagnostic analysis assists in building local level ownership that is readily maintained into project design and implementation provided effective and genuine collaboration is developed. This project design establishes the same proven approach and therefore the risk is viewed as low.	The issue is not whether R2R is "recognised" but whether it works. The project is designed to encourage stakeholder participation. The MTR would rate this as impact = 5 since in the absence of such willingness there is no R2R; but probability is indeed low.
Civil society is concerned about water, land and coastal management;	I=2 P=1	Civil Society attitudes are important drivers of leadership response. The project design has adopted a push pull approach to achieving change. By targeting leadership at National and Community levels plus the delivery of well resourced public education and awareness campaigns sufficient energy should be created to ensure acceptance of the need to effectively manage water, land and coasts.	The impact of this should be rated 5 because with no civil society concern there is no incentive for R2R. Probability is however very low (or close to nil). Civil society is already very concerned. However, the real issue is whether R2R addresses the concerns.
Effects of Climate Change on water, land and coast and the effectiveness of measures	I=2 P=5	Climate change could substantially affect vulnerable water, land and coasts. The project has as a specific focus improving the management on a R2R basis to enable adaptive strategies that increase resilience to climate change. Attention is being given to promoting ecosystem services for resilience. Climate change will only demonstrate the need for appropriate adaptive responses that strengthen R2R resilience.	UNDP-GEF projects accept climate change science (as per IPCC) and therefore Climate Change is not a risk. It is a certainty. There is no "could" affect vulnerable ... etc. It is "will" affect. The "effectiveness of measures" remains a valid point but the project is designed to identify effective measures.

5.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability

As a result of the lack of detailed verifiable co-financial information, the MTR has observed high uncertainty about the likelihood of financial and economic resources being available once GEF's assistance ends. However, in principle, R2R approaches are to be mainstreamed across government sectors, institutions and policies. In the longer term, R2R should not require additional financial resources but should in fact result in overall financial savings due to improved investment efficiencies. It is not, however, known how long this will take. For this reason the project needs to focus on demonstrating that R2R approaches result in overall improvements in system performance and the efficiency and sustainability of ongoing government investments.

At project start-up, the Executing Agency (SPC) did not receive overhead costs. It has been agreed that a 10% fee for overhead costs is to be applied on direct expenditures incurred by the project from 1 July 2018. PICs have been assured that this will not impact national project budgets. The net impact of this will be that there will be more than 10% reduction in the regional budget. This will have an impact on national level activities because the regional budget is to support PICs. This decision has already been taken (ref. minutes of the third RSC) and is included here for reporting purposes.

5.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

In some cases, a risk is "community fatigue" at project site implementation using community participatory approaches. This was specifically mentioned in the Cook Islands whereby local communities are overwhelmed with project interventions and, in some cases, limited progress to show for it. It is likely this is a problem in some other PICs.

As mentioned in Section 4.3 above, it is unclear how the much lauded "community to cabinet" approach in the Project Document is translated into tangible deliverables and coordination mechanisms through project implementation. Comments on "coordination" in the same section refer further to this.

In some PICs, projects have demonstrated R2R approaches but this is not a useful indicator of R2R success. Far more important is adoption of R2R approaches and/or up-scaling, particularly beyond project sites. See Section 4.2 for further discussion.

The MTR found no evidence about the existence of tools and actions to systematize lessons learned, to document these on a continuous basis and/or for these to be shared or transferred. Discussion in Section 4.2, and recommendation 11, refers.

5.4.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The MTR found no legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes, which can pose risks to, or jeopardize, the sustenance of project benefits. Required

mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are not strongly in place and this can pose risks to, or jeopardize, sustainability of project benefits.

The MTR notes the often wide disconnect between policy and implementation. For example, integrating R2R into major national and regional policy frameworks does not guarantee implementation of R2R. As yet, there is no evidence of R2R being integrated into national legislations, nor indeed the same for ecosystem goods and services as the foundation of planning and impact assessment requirements. It is, however, too early to expect major advances in this area.

5.4.4 Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR has not detected any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes. The project is in fact designed to reduce environmental risks to sustainable development.

5.4.5 Ratings for Sustainability

"Sustainability" of the project outcomes needs to be placed in context. Lack of sustainability of project gains after donor funding ceases is a systemic problem in many PICs, partly due to a relatively high dependency on ODA (Section 3). Moreover, some PICs rely on external donor funding for replicating/up-scaling demonstrated measures. Because R2R involves institutional and societal change it involves a long time horizon to expect it to be achieved comprehensively. The IW R2R project is also "testing" R2R approaches and therefore intended to guide or influence future investments. As already noted (Section 4.2), the two most valuable outcomes of the IW R2R Project and GEF Pacific R2R Programme are capacity building and lessons learned.

Given this context, taking a capacity-building and mainstreaming approach to the delivery/implementation of all the project components and their activities provides the best chance of sustaining Project gains. For this reason, the MTR places the highest emphasis and priority on capacity building and lessons learned in project delivery and its relevant recommendations in these regards.

The following rating takes this context into account and assumes that the MTR recommendations are implemented (including the no-cost extension).

Sustainability Rating

Sustainability Rating	Description
3 Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review

6 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions and Recommendations of the MTR have been integrated into the previous sections. A Recommendations Summary Table has been provided in the Executive Summary.

7 Annexes

1 *Annex 1: List of Stakeholders Met and Interviewed*[5]

2

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
UNDP Suva				
1	**Floyd Robinson**	Program Analyst	UNDP in Pacific Office in Fiji Kadavu House 414 Victoria Parade Suva, Fiji	14 March 2019, Meeting Room, 7th Floor, UNDP Office
2	**Kevin Petrini**	Resilience & Sustainable Development, Team Leader and Climate Change Programme Specialist in the Pacific	UNDP in Pacific Office in Fiji Kadavu House 414 Victoria Parade Suva, Fiji	
3	**Winifereti Nainoca**	Environment Specialist, Dept Team Leader - Resilient Sustainable Development (RSD)	UNDP in Pacific Office in Fiji Kadavu House 414 Victoria Parade Suva, Fiji winifereti.nainoca@undp.org	
4	**Josua Turaganivalu**	Environment Programme Associate, Resilience and Sustainable Development (RSD)	UNDP in Pacific Office in Fiji, Kadavu House 414 Victoria Parade Suva, Fiji josua.turaganivalu@undp.org	
5	**Rusiate Ratuniata**	Program Analyst and UNDP STAR Coordinator for Fiji	UNDP in Pacific Office in Fiji, Kadavu House 414 Victoria Parade Suva, Fiji rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	5 April 2019 Meeting Room, 7th Floor, UNDP Office
SPC				
6	**Andrew Jones**	Director Geoscience, Energy and Maritime	SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	14 March 2019 Director's Office, SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City
7	**Rhonda Robinson**	Deputy Director, DCRP and Acting Project Manager Regional IW R2R (August 2018-January 2019)	SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	

[5] In addition, Mr. Jose Padilla, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, provided a valuable interview and guidance, by phone, to the MTR team prior to the MTR commencing.

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
Regional R2R Project Coordinating Unit				
8	**Peter Cusack**	Ridge to Reef Programme Coordinator	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	14 March 2019 Meeting Room, RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City
9	**Jose Antonio**	Country Coordination, M&E Advisor	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City (+679)7359223 (+679)3249304 josea@spc.int	
10	**Samasoni Sauni**	Science and National Project Leader	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	
11	**Navneet Lal**	Web and Print Graphic Multimedia Assistant	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	
12	**Emma Newland**	Science Officer	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City emman@spc.int	
13	**Fononga Mangisi-Mafileo**	Communications and Knowledge Management Officer	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	
14	**Sarojni Devi**	Project Accountant	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	
15	**Verenaisi Bakani**	Program Administrator	RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City	
RMI National Implementation				
16	**Julius Lucky**	National IW R2R Project Manager	RMI Environmental Protection Authority P.O. Box 1322 Majuro, Marshall Islands, 96960 E-mail: juliuslucky01@gmail.com Tel: +692 625 3035/5203 Mob: +692 455 1924 Skype ID: tupaclolo	19 March Via phone/skype
17	**Jennifer deBrum**	Project Manager	RMI Ridge to Reef Project Office of Environment Planning and Policy Coordination 5th Floor, MI Development Bank (MIDB) Majuro Atoll 96960, MH, Marshall Islands Tel: +692 625 7944 Mob: +692 456 4700	19 March Via phone/skype

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
18	**Fata Eti Malolo**	Principal Watershed Officer, National IW R2R Project Manager	Water Resources Division Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Private Mail Bag, Apia, Samoa E-mail: eti.malolo@mnre.gov.ws Tel: +685 67200 Mob: +685 775 1609	19 March Via phone/skype
Tonga National Implementation				
19	**Silia Leger**	National IW R2R Project Manager	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources P O Box 5, Vuna Road, Nuku'alofa, Tonga Email: silia.leger@gmail.com Tel: +676 25508 Mob: +676 771 1799 Skype ID: Silia Leger	20 March Via phone/skype
20	**Paula Ma'u**	Chief Environment Officer	Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications P.O. Box 917, Nuku'Alofa, Tonga Email: paulm@mic.gov.to Tel: +676 28170	Via email correspondence
FSM National Implementation				
21	**Faith Alexandra Siba**	IW R2R Project Manager	Dept. of Environment & Emergency Management, P.O. Box PS-69, Palikir 96941, Pohnpei E-mail: faithsiba@gmail.com Tel: +691 370 3673 Mob: +691 970 1600 Skype : Faith Siba.	20 March Via phone/skype
22	**Rosalinda Yatilman**	FSM Ridge to Reef Project Manager	Office of Environment & Emergency Management, P.O. Box PS-69, Palikir 96941, Pohnpei, E-mail: ryatilman@gmail.com Skype : yatilman Tel: +691 320 8814/8815 Mob: +691 925 4053	20 March Via phone/skype
Nauru National Implementation				
23	**Phaedora Harris**	National R2R Project Coordinator	Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment, Government Building, Yaren District, Republic of Nauru E-mail: Phaedore.harris@undp.org, msphae07@gmail.com Tel: +674 557 2960	21 March 2019 Via phone/skype

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
			Mob: +674 556 7917	
Solomon Islands National Implementation				
24	**Sammy Airahui**	National IW R2R Project Manager	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology P O Box 21, Honiara, Solomon Islands	21 March 2019 Via phone/skype
Niue National Implementation				
25	**Crispina Konelio**	National GEF IW R2R Project Manager	Ministry of Natural Resources Niue Government Alofi, Niue E-mail: crispina.Konelio@mail.gov.nu Tel: +683 4018 Mob: +683 6635	22 March 2019 Via phone/skype
26	**Josie Tamate**	Director	Ministry of Natural Resources Niue Government Alofi, Niue	
PNG National Implementation				
27	**Senson Mark**	National GEF IW R2R Project Manager	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority P O Box 6601, Boroko, NCD, Papua New Guinea Email: sensonhornbymark@gmail.com Tel: +(675) 301 4500 Mob: +(675) 7186 1101/7671 4588	22 March 2019 Via phone/skype
Cook Islands National Implementation				
28	**Mr. Nga Puna**	Director, NES, GEF Focal Point	Cook Is National Environment Service Rarotonga (682) 70778 (682) 21256	18 - 22 March 2019, Rarotonga
29	**Heimata Louisa Karika**	Manager - Island Futures Division, GEF Operational Focal Point	Cook Is National Environment Service Rarotonga (682) 70778 (682) 21256 louisa.karika@cookislands.gov.ck	
30	**Maria Tuoro**	National STAR R2R Coordinator	Cook Is National Environment Service Rarotonga (682) 51589 (682) 21256 maria.tuoro@cookislands.gov.ck	

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
31	**Jaime Short**	IW R2R Project Coordinator, previous IW R2R Project Manager	Infrastructure Cook Islands Rarotonga (682) 54302 (682) 20321 jaime.short@cookislands.gov.ck	
32	**Diane Charlie-Puna**	Secretary, Cook Islands Infrastructure	Infrastructure Cook Islands Rarotonga (682) 54302 (682) 20321	
33	**Teresa Manarangi-Trott**	National IW R2R Project Manager	Infrastructure Cook Islands Rarotonga (682) 54302 (682) 20321	
34	**Mii Kauvai**	Chairperson	Muri Environment Care (MEC) Rarotonga	
Vanuatu National Implementation				
35	**Ericksen Packett**	IW R2R Project Manager	Dept of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila (678) 537 2122/7803 (678) 25302/33430 erickspackett@gmail.com	26 March 2019 Meeting Room Dept of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila
36	**David Loubser**	Vanuatu PEBACC Project Manager	SPREP MSG Complex 21929 davidl@sprep.org	27 March 2019 Meeting Room Dept of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila
37	**Erie Sami**	Chairperson, Tagabe River Management Committee/ Hydrology Officer	Water Resources Dept Port Vila esami@vanuatu.gov.vu	27 March 2019 Meeting Room Water Resources Dept Port Vila
38	**Nelson Bakokoto**	Area Secretary	Ifira Marine Management (IMM) Port Vila	27 March 2019 *Met during the field visit to the Tagabe Water Catchment Project Site
39	**Tate Hanington**	Project Manager,	Vanuatu STAR Project, FAO Dept of Environmental Protection	27 March 2019 Meeting Room

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
			and Conservation	Dept of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila
40	**Rolenas Baereleo Tavue**	IW R2R (Oversight of IW project Manager)	Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila (678) 777 6000 (678) 25302 rbaereloe@vanuatu.gov.vu	29 March 2019 Meeting Room Dept of Environmental Protection and Conservation Port Vila
Tuvalu National Implementation				
41	**Taualo Penivao**	Chief Operating Officer	Funafuti Kaupule Funafuti Kaupule Office	1 April 2019 Funafuti Kaupule Office Funafuti
42	**Hamoa Holona**	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Home Affairs Government Building, Funafuti, Tuvalu	1 April 2019 Ministry of Home Affairs Office Government Building, Funafuti
43	**Faatasi Maloologa**	Director Land Department	Department of Lands Government Building, Funafuti, Tuvalu	1 April 2019 Department of Lands Office Government Building, Funafuti
44	**Uatea Vave**	Agriculture Officer	Department of Agriculture Government Building, Funafuti, Tuvalu	2 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
45	**Walter Kaua**	Director of	Department of Waste Management Government Building, Funafu45ti, Tuvalu	2 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
46	**Ivy Tumua**	R2R STAR - coordinator		2 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
47	**Pesega Lifuka**	Tuvalu IW R2R Project Manager	Department of Waste Management Government Building, Funafu45ti, Tuvalu tagatafoupe@gmail.com	3 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
48	**Faoliu. Teakau**	Environment Officer	Dept. of Environment, Tuvalu Government Partnership House	3 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
49	**Lanuola Faasiai**	Gender Officer	Gender Department Government Building Funafuti, Tuvalu	3 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
50	**Pisi Afaaso**	Water and Sanitation Supervisor/ Former IWRM Demonstration Project Manager	Public Works Department Tuvalu Government	3 April 2019 IW Office (Vaiaku Fusi) Funafuti
Fiji National Implementation				
51	**Tavenisa Luisa**	IW R2R Project Manager	Ministry of Waterways & Environment, Suva (679) 937 6238 (679) 331 1699 tavenisa.luisa@environment.gov.fj	22 March 2019 Meeting Room, RPCU-SPC 241 Mead Road, Nabua, Suva City
52	**Eleni Tokadua**	7.1	Ministry of Waterways & Environment, Suva Tel: +679-3311699/330680, Fax: +679-3312879 Email: eleni.tokaduadua@govnet.gov.fj	5 April 2019 Conference Room Min. of Local Government, Housing & Environment

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
53	**Beverly Sadole**	National R2R Project Coordinator	Ministry of Waterways & Environment, Suva (679) 711 5008 (679) 331 1699 beverly.sadole@govnet.gov.fj	5 April 2019 Conference Room Min. of Local Government, Housing & Environment 19 McGregor Road, Suva
54	**Semi Tekivili Sauliga**	Conservation Officer	Naitasiri Sub-Office Naitasiri Provincial Office Nausori, Suva	5 April 2019 Naitasiri Provincial Office Nausori, Suva
55	**Semiti Bukiamasa**	Assistant Roko Tui	Naitasiri Sub-Office Naitasiri Provincial Office Nausori, Suva	5 April 2019 Naitasiri Provincial Office Nausori, Suva
56	**Simeli Nakalevu**	Assistant Roko	Lower Naitasiri Naitasiri Provincial Office Nausori, Suva	5 April 2019 Sawani Village Hall Nausori, Suva
57	**Meli Vunakece**	Turaga ni Koro Sawani	Sawani Village Nausori, Suva	5 April 2019 Sawani Village Hall Nausori, Suva
Palau National Implementation				
58	**Leena Mesebeluu**	Project Manager National IW R2R Project in Palau	, Ministry of Natural Resources Environment & Tourism, 2nd Floor, Executive Building Ngerulmud, PW 96940 (680) 767-5435 mullerleena@gmail.com	24 April 2019 Palau Hotel
59	**F. Umiich Sengebau**	Minister	Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism	24 April 2019 Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism Koror, Palau
60	**Umai Basilius**	Policy &	Palau Conservation Society	25 April 2019

	Name	Designation	Office Address/ Contact Details	Date and Venue of Meeting
		Planning Manager	(680) 488 3993 ubasilius@palauconservation.org	Meeting Room Palau Conservation Society Office Koror, Palau
61	**Abolade (Bola) Majekobaje**	Executive Director	Palau Conservation Society P.O. Box 1811 Bai Ra Maibrel Koror Palau 96940 (680) 488 3993	25 April 2019 Meeting Room Palau Conservation Society Office Koror, Palau
62	**King Sam**	Operational Focal Point	Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism (680) 767 3125/5435 esuroi1@gmail.com	25 April 2019 Meeting Room Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism Koror, Palau
63	**Charlene Mersai**	**National** Environment Coordinator and **Secretariat**	National Environmental Protection Council Secretariat Ministry of Finance	25 April 2019 Meeting Room Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism Palau Capitol Melekeok
64	**Gwendalyn Kingtaro Sisior**	National R2R Project Coordinator	Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism Palau Capitol Melekeok (680) 775 4936 (680) 767 5435 gsisior07@gmail.com	25 April 2019 Meeting Room Min. of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism Palau Capitol Melekeok
65	**Joy Antonio**	Conservation Officer	Ngardok Nature Reserve Center Melekeok State, Palau (680) 654-2967	26 April 2019 Ngardok Nature Reserve Visitors' Center
66	**Lomalinda Gabriel**	Conservation Supervisor		
67	**Omar Faustino**	PAN Coordinator		

1
2

Annex 2: Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Review

Consultancy Title: Team Leader: Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) /Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist. Mid Term Evaluation of Regional Ridge to Reef Project.
Project Name: Regional Ridge to Reef Project
Duty Station: Home-based and selected duty station. Team of consultants are expected visit the following islands: Fiji, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Palau. Consultants expected to have briefings with UNDP Pacific Office and Secretariat of the Pacific Community in Suva.
Duration of the Contract: Duration of contract: 34 days within 16 weeks period Starting date: 30 January 2019 Completion date: 10 May 2019 Consultancy Proposal should be sent via email to **etenderbox.pacific@undp.org** no later than **4th January, 2019 (Fiji Time)** clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to procurement.fj@undp.org. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. **Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.**

Objectives:

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries – Regional Ridge to Reef (R2R)* (PIMS#5221) (Atlas#92601) implemented through Pacific Community (SPC) which is to be undertaken in January 2019. The project started on the 31 August *2015* and is in its *third* year of implementation. This ToR follows the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. *(*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf*)*. Refer to Annex H for Project Logframe.

NOTE :

The review team will consist of 2 consultants: a **Team Leader/Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist** and a **Governance and Development Specialist**. The Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist will be the team leader and will be required to work with the Governance and Development Specialist in submitting one combined MTR report. Both consultants will be expected to travel to travel to 3 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) each as agreed between the team members, UNDP and SPC.

Both consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating 'Ridge to Reef' promoting programmatic approach to ecosystem governance, or similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report). The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

1

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Given the close inter-connections between land, water and coastal systems in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the integration of freshwater watershed management with coastal area management is considered essential to foster effective cross-sectoral coordination in the planning and management of land, water and coastal uses. In Pacific SIDS, such integrated approaches to freshwater and coastal area management have been termed 'Ridge to Reef' to emphasize the inter-connections between the natural and social systems from the mountain 'ridges' of volcanic islands, through coastal watersheds and habitats, and across coastal lagoons to the fringing 'reef' environments associated with most Pacific SIDS. Inherent in the approach is the philosophy of cross-sectoral coordination in the planning and management of freshwater use, sanitation, wastewater treatment and pollution control, sustainable land use and forestry practices, balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, hazard risk reduction, and climate variability and change. Similarly, the integration of communities, stakeholders, and national governments within such a cross-sectoral planning framework is described by Pacific SIDS as a 'Community to Cabinet' approach.

To support the ongoing development of 'Ridge to Reef' and 'Community to Cabinet' approaches in Pacific SIDS through the abovementioned multi-focal area R2R Programme, the GEF Council approved the development of an International Waters project entitled "Ridge to Reef: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries". This regional project will be implemented by the United Nations Development Program through the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community in partnership with the 14 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to improve the integration of water, land, forest and coastal management required to fashion sustainable futures for island communities. The project also aims to address the recent high-level recognition and calls for results-based approaches to the management of development assistance programmes and projects, and will provide support in areas of coordination, capacity building, technical assistance, and monitoring and evaluation for the operation of the broader Pacific R2R Programme.

Importantly, the project will build on nascent national processes built in the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each participating island nation through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; and improved consolidation of information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. These processes are being sustained. It is envisaged that this project will also focus much attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures to improve the relevance of investment in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management. This project will also provide coordination functions and linkages with the national GEF STAR multifocal projects and LDCF project and will facilitate dialogue and action planning through national Inter-Ministry Committees on responses to emerging issues and threats in environment and natural resource management. Similarly, it will facilitate coordinated exchanges of experience and results of the GEF portfolio of investments in a broader regional R2R Programme for PICs. Linkages with co-financed activities on water resource and wastewater management, coastal systems and climate adaptation and disaster risk management will ensure more targeted capital investment in coastal infrastructure within an integrated management framework. Similarly, the project will foster solidarity among the PICs, particularly with respect to the political will required to support more integrated approaches to R2R in natural resource management.

The purpose of the project is to test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services. This regional project provides the primary coordination vehicle for the national R2R STAR Projects that are part of the Pacific R2R Programme, by building on nascent national processes from the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each island through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management through on-site demonstrations; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; improved consolidation of results monitoring, and information and data required to inform cross sector R2R planning approaches. This project will also focus attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures to improve the relevance of investment in ICM, including MPAs, from 'community to cabinet'.

Scope of work/Expected Output

OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The modified MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term.

The MTR should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR reviewer will review relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, the project website and any other materials that the reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR reviewer will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Annex 1 list provided; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders and project managers, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR review is expected to conduct field missions to different government agencies in the 3 selected Pacific Island countries currently implementing the project (2 Polynesian countries and 1 Melanesian country). While visiting these countries, the following implementing partners will also be visited national and regional R2R partners on the ground and stakeholders including SPC. Moreover, at least 8 other PICs will be covered by teleconferences. The PICs will be determined jointly by UNDP and SPC.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. Refer to Annex B for guidelines on content of Midterm Review Report.

Between themselves, the team of consultants are expected visit the following islands: Fiji, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Palau.

DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions following the Theory of Change process. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept

---

1 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

2 For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were captured in the project design. Make suggestions for how relevant gender issues can be better incorporated and monitored in the project. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Output Analysis:

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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator[3]	Baseline Level[4]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[5]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[6]	Achievement Rating[7]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

- Indicator Assessment Key

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

3 Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

4 Populate with data from the Project Document

5 If available

6 Colour code this column only

7 Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

iii. By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the Implementing Agency/GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support of the national agencies in PICs in the implementation of agreed national priorities, outputs and activities.

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation? Do stakeholders have appropriate capacity developed to properly manage the project?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

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

Communications:

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

Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR review will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[8]

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR review should make no more than 15 recommendations total. Recommendations should outline corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project and should focus on actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for "Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries"

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

[8] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

- TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately (34) *days* over a time of *approximately 16 weeks* starting *(January 30, 2019),* and shall not exceed five months from when the reviewer is contracted. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	**ACTIVITY**
4 January 2019	Application closure
15 January 2019	Select MTR Team
30 January 2019	Contract signing
1- 11 February 2019	Preparation of the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
12 – 14 February 2019	Inception Meeting with UNDP and SPC via Skype/Teleconference
15 -20 February,2019	Document review and preparing a joint MTR Inception Report
21 – 26 February	Preparation and Submission of joint Inception Report
7 – 23 March 2019	MTR mission (17 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
25-26 March 2019	Presentation of initial findings to UNDP and SPC in Suva, Fiji
10 April 2019	Submission of joint Draft MTR Report
11-21 April 2019	Review of the Draft MTR Report by UNDP and SPC
22 April 2019	Finalization of joint MTR report incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report.
1 May 2019	Submission of joint Final MTR Report
10 May	End of Contract

- MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

•	• Deliverable	• Description	• Timing	• Responsibilities
•	• MTR Inception Report	• MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	• No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission (26 February 2019)	• MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
•	• Presentation	• Initial Findings	• End of MTR mission (23 March 2019)	• MTR reviewer presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
•	• Draft Final Report	• Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	• Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (*10 April 2019)*	• Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
•	• Final Report*	• Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. Includes power presentation of MTR.	• Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (1 May 2019)	• Sent to the Commissioning Unit

Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist and **Development Management and Governance Specialist**. The Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICM) Specialist will be the team leader and will be required to work with the Development Management and Governance Specialist in submitting one combined MTR report. Both consultants will be expected to travel to travel to 3 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) each agreed between the team members, UNDP and SPC.

Both consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating 'Ridge to Reef' promoting programmatic approach to ecosystem governance, or similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report). The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

Resources Provided

- The consultants are expected to provide their own computers

Supervision/Reporting

- The Team Leader will report directly to UNDP Head of Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit and/or her/his representative and UNDP Regional Technical Specialist/Advisor based in Suva, Fiji / Bangkok, Thailand.
- The Team Leader will also provide regular reporting to UNDP and Government Permanent Secretary together with the Project Implementation Unit.
- The Team Leader is expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules.

Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.as

Annex 3: List of documents and databases consulted.

Document name

1. Guidance For Conducting Mid-term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects 2014
2. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019
3. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations in the UN System 2008
4. UNEG Ethical Guidelines 2008
5. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports 2010
6. Regional IW R2R Project document
7. GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme Framework Document
8. Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between UNDP and SPC
9. Pacific Community Strategic Plan
10. STAR Project Documents (All PICs)
11. Terminal Evaluation Tonga STAR Project
12. Pacific Ridge to Reef RBM Manual (draft)
13. Regional IW R2R Project – GEF Tracking Tool 2014 (Regional IW R2R Project – GEF Tracking Tool 2019 not provided)
14. Quarterly Progress Reports for PICs (as available)
15. Progress Implementation Report 2017
16. Progress Implementation Report 2018
17. Regional IW R2R Project – Annual Workplans 2016, 2017, 2018
18. Regional IW R2R Project – Audit Reports
19. Regional IW R2R Accumulated project expenditure reports
20. Regional IW R2R Project – Quarterly Financial Reports
21. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RSC
22. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RSTC
23. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RPCG
24. Highlights/ Minutes of Meetings of the RPCU

25. MOA between SPC and 14 PICs
26. PICs/Country original and revised LogFrames
27. Mid-term reports of Cook Islands, Fiji, Palau, Niue, Tuvalu, Vanuatu (others N/A)
28. Overall Directory of Project Contacts in the 14 PICs
29. Multi Year Costed Workplan (MYCWP) of PICs
30. National IW R2R Booklets
31. Country visits Travel/ Mission Reports
32. ToR Mid-Term Review
33. ToR MTR Team Leader: IWRM/ICM Specialist
34. ToR MTR Member: Governance & Development Specialist
35. ToR RPCU Country Focal Points
36. Baseline Monitoring Guidelines (abridged version)
37. Baseline Assessment/Diagnostic/RapCA Report Template
38. Technical briefs (Revegetation, DLT, PEME, Habitat)
39. Environmental Monitoring Plan, Guide Notes, Workplan and Templates, Compost and Wastewater Monitoring
40. Standard Operating Procedures for Coastal Monitoring, Compost and Wastewater Monitoring.
41. Field proformas
42. Environmental Monitoring Report Template
43. Environmental Monitoring Plans (as available)
44. Concept notes for RapCA and SoC and list of indicators
45. Tuvalu Water Quality Assessment Report
46. Gender Assessment and Action Plans
47. Gender Mainstreaming Strategy
48. Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit
49. Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
50. Stakeholder Assessment Toolkit

51. National Project Stakeholder Analysis (Niue, Palau, PNG, SI, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)
52. IDA Concept Notes
53. Diagnostic Report ToC and Template
54. Diagnostic Workshop Documents
55. Draft IDAs - Cook Islands, PNG, Palau
56. Science to Policy Schema
57. Geospatial Systems Officer ToR
58. Inception reports: Fiji, Palau, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu
59. Post Graduate Certificate with James Cook University
60. Post Graduate Certificate Dashboard
61. James Cook University Reports
62. Concept Note for SoC database and GIS
63. SoC Indicators List
64. SoC Table of Contents
65. Generic IMC ToR
66. Solomon Islands IMC meeting
67. Pacific R2R Programme Dashboard
68. Regional IW R2R Dashboard
69. Communication Strategy
70. Concept note for lessons learned
71. Lessons Learned Journal
72. Networking and Partnerships (guidance)
73. Development of National Communications Plan
74. Pacific R2R Branding; Photography; Checklist
75. Communications and KE Planning
76. R2R Outreach; Youtube; Facebook; Twitter
77. Experience note template
78. Experience notes (Tuvalu, Vanuatu,)

79. IW Learn Trip Report; IWC Morocco Trip Report
80. R2R Website; Status of Website; Online Register; KM Strategy
81. Assessment and Planning Workflows and Assessment Forms
82. R2R Activity Monitoring System
83. R2R Dashboard Prototype
84. RBM Training induction
85. Workflows and Assessment Forms
86. R2R Activity Monitoring System
87. R2R Dashboard Prototype
88. Report Assessment Forms
89. Minutes of Cluster Meetings
90. Project Manager Induction

Annex 4: Mid-Term Review Interview Guide

1. ***PROGRESS V. RESULTS FRAMEWORK (cross-reference to national country results framework)***

    1.1. Is your national results framework as per the original project design (in the project document) or has it been changed? How and Why?

    1.2. Based on your results framework, how are you doing? What progress have you made so far in relation to the end of project targets? What have been your constraints?

    1.3. Given your progress so far, and considering adjustments (if any), do you think you will achieve your end-of-project targets given the remaining time? What would be required to do this?

    1.4. Were you involved in formulating this results framework? To what extent were you involved in the project design formulation? How did you participate and what were your inputs?

2. ***INCLUSIVITY OF THE PROJECT***

    2.1. How inclusive is the Project? Who are the other stakeholders, including those from traditional governing structures, that were considered and/or involved in formulating the Project design? In the various other stages of the Project – implementation, monitoring, evaluation, learning exchange? How are these stakeholders now involved in the project?

3. ***PROJECT IMPACT ON MAINSTREAMING THE R2R APPROACH***

    3.1. What impact has this Project made beyond/outside the National Demonstration or STAR Projects?

    3.2. Can you cite concrete examples of how R2R or IWRM or ICZM is being mainstreamed by local governments, national government, private sector, local communities, other donor-funded Projects, finance agencies (e.g. development banks) (Note: Project targets PICs endorsing a Regional Strategic Framework for R2R and the mainstreaming of R2R into national planning processes)?

    3.3. What is the status of the inter-ministerial committees? What is it they do? Are they being successful in mainstreaming R2R, IWRM, ICZM outside the Project areas? Are there other mechanisms/institutions in your country that achieve the same (or better) purpose or outcomes as the IMCs?

4. ***PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT***

    4.1. RELATIONSHIP WITH STAR PROJECTS

        4.1.1. What is the relationship between the National IW R2R project and its demonstration project and the STAR Projects?

4.1.2. Why is there a need for National IW R2R to coordinate with STAR and vice versa? Do they do it?

4.1.3. How do the STAR steering mechanism, including the decision-making structure and processes, compared with that of the National IW R2R? Do they have separate governance structures? How functional is each?

4.1.4. What are the advantages of having a joint STAR and R2R National Project Steering Committee?

4.1.5. If the whole point of our Project is learning by doing, how much of the lessons learned (technical, management, etc.) from STAR Projects is being documented and fed-back to Regional R2R and vice versa?

4.2. RELATIONSHIP WITH RPCU-SPC

4.2.1. What sorts of support are you getting from SPC?

4.2.2 Have there been any problems regarding these? Any problems with financial arrangements? Reporting requirements?

4.2.3 What do you need from RPCU that you are not currently getting?

4.2.4 What about technical support from SPC, how has this helped you? What other technical support do you need?

4.2.5 How involved is SPC in influencing national Project decision-making?

5. STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

5.1. What is the national level doing to strategically communicate R2R to various stakeholders?

5.2. How is RPCU-SPC helping you here? What support are you getting?

6. ***THE FUTURE***

6.1. When this project ends - do you think what the project is trying to achieve will have been accomplished and support in this area can cease - OR do you think there will be a need to continue to have support to work on R2R related activities (of any sort) in the longer-term <u>after this project finishes</u>?

6.2. Forget the previous history of the IWRM project and the current R2R project - in the area of integrated management of land, water and coasts/reefs - what do you think the next phase of activities should focus on?

6.3. If the project were to be extended for a year - what would you do it that year (applies to R2R IW Project staff only)

Annex 5: The standardised Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
i. Project Strategy ***Relevance* of Project Strategy: To what extent is the Project Strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, internationally-agreed goals and the best route towards expected results?**				
Internationally-agreed goals – sustainable development, environment, climate change adaptation and mitigation (CCAM), disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM)	1- What related international and regional agreements/ conventions does the Project mainstream? With regards to each: - How does the Project relate to these international goals? In what way/s does the Project contribute to the goal/s? - Does the Project adapt the governance and management frameworks (e.g., R2R, IEM, ICZM, IWRM) that are deemed by grounded theory and good practice to be appropriate for its objectives and design? Have the adapted principles, frameworks, and systems been effectively operationalised on the ground so far? In what ways?	- Coherence between the Project's objectives, management framework/s and results with identified internationally-agreed goals/conventions/frameworks - Evidence of contributions to internationally-agreed goals	- Texts of Relevant International Agreements/ Conventions and Integrated Management Frameworks - Project Documents (Progress Reports, Technical Studies)	- Documents Review
UN and GEF system	2- How is the Project supportive of the relevant country, sectoral and programme objectives of the UNDP? UNEP? FAO? 3- How is the Project supportive of GEF? 4- How has the Project been leveraging the gains from previous (e.g., GEF IWRM) and existing GEF projects in the region and in the PICs (e.g., Regional R2R Programme, STAR Projects)? - For instance, how has the Project been intentionally building on the nascent national processes established in the previous GEF-	- Coherence between the Project's objectives and design and - Country, Sectoral, Corporate and Programme Objectives of UNDP/UNEP/FAO - GEF Tracked Outcomes (in GEF Tracking Tools) - Regional R2R Programme Focal Area Outcomes - STAR Multi-Focal Project Outcomes - Contributions to the objectives of	- Interview Results - UNDP/UNEP/FAO/GEF Documents (Strategic, Programme and Project Documents, UNDAFs) - STAR Documents - Project Documents including sub-project LogFrames of 14	- Documents Review - Interviews with: - reps of UNDP, UNEP, FAO in Suva and PICs - Regional Technical Adviser (BKK) - R2R Focal Points and

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	IWRM project? - How has it improved the linkages and coordination of the multi-focal STAR and Regional R2R country sub-projects within an R2R context?	UNDP, UNEP, FAO, GEF, Regional R2R Programme, STARs?	PICs	STAR reps - National Project Managers
PICs' national policies and priorities	5- Provide the historical context for each PIC's involvement in the Project. In the Project design stage: - How did each PIC get involved and why? Which institutions and stakeholder groups were consulted? - What were the specific inputs/contributions of the various country stakeholders to the Project design? - How and to what extent are the Project design and objectives aligned with the country's own development and environmental, CCAM and DRRM policies, priorities and needs? - Has the Project in its design taken cognizance of the specific risks and assumptions present within the country? - How was the national implementing partner chosen? Other partners?	- Congruence/Responsiveness of the Project's theory of change (ToC)/design/interventions to the results of national, sectoral and local situation analyses (e.g., status of governance preparedness, levels of absorptive capacity, state of ecosystems, vulnerability and risks) - Coherence of Project objectives with the national, sectoral and local goals of the PICs - Expressed concrete inputs of national implementing partner and other stakeholders into the Project Design - Extent Piloted and/or Upscaled ICM, IWRM, CCAM and DRRM innovations and investments are based on national diagnostic analyses, SOCA, RapCA - Appropriateness of the scale of the Project's interventions, (e.g., R2R, river basin, district, region or district, landscape) vis-à-vis the requirements of targeted outcomes (e.g., sustainable ecosystems provisioning, securing sustainable livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and climate resilience, disaster risk reduction)	-Interview Results -Project Documents -Texts of Country Policies, National Framework Strategies, Physical and Development Plans, Sectoral Plans, Land Use Plans	- Documents Review - Participant Observation - Interviews with: - RPCU-SPC and reps from UNDP - R2R Focal Points and STAR reps - Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners reps sitting in inter-ministerial committees - National Project Managers
	In Project management: - How and to what extent is the Project implementation country-owned and country-driven? - To what extent is there awareness and/or acceptance of R2R as an approach to the sustainable development and management of the country's ecosystems and resources			

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	by key public decision-makers, planners and implementers? - Did the Project correctly assess the country's governance preparedness related to adapting R2R as an approach? Has the Project been correctly targeting these areas of capacity development, involving the right people, and focusing on the needed policy, institutional and systems reforms? - What have the Project results so far contributed to the relevant national, local and sectoral goals of the PIC? How does the Project synergize with other related Projects in the PIC to contribute shared impact to the country's national, sectoral and local goals?	- Ways the coordination/cooperation infrastructure is designed around the specific political/cultural and other realities on the ground in each PIC - Expressions of acceptance and appreciation of Project value-added and contributions supported by concrete empirical examples - Extent of involvement of relevant institutions and personalities in Project management; Evidence of their involvement and resource contributions consistent with organizational mandates - Expressions of dissatisfaction over any aspect of the Project/Extent of (non) familiarity with or (non) support of the Project supported by empirical instantiation - Extent the Project objectives, processes and mechanisms are shared by national implementing partners and mainstreamed into their management systems - Degree of ownership of Project results as well as accountability over delivered and non-delivered results - Suggestions about how the Project could have been designed more appropriately in consideration of the specific context of each country - Relevant coverage of capacity development provided (based on		

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		national capacity needs assessment); - Extent capacity development targeted gender parity		
Partner Communities, Partner-Beneficiaries and other Local Partners	6- How inclusive is the Project? - In terms of its decision-making processes and mechanisms? - Are the Project's objectives, design and interventions responsive to the needs, demands, issues and problems of local communities and partner-beneficiaries? - How have the Project's interventions considered the specific contexts and needs of those most-affected by the issues and problems (including women) they attempt to address? - Are its approaches, strategies, and tools substantively participatory, multi-stakeholder and inclusive, rather than tokenist or participatory mainly in rhetoric and form? 7- How has the Project harnessed local support in the various stages of management? - How did the Project involve traditional community leadership, local communities and partner-beneficiaries, the academia, other relevant civil society organizations and the private sector in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation? - How and to what extent have local stakeholders contributed resources to the Project? What resources have local stakeholders invested in the project and why?	- Relative to subsidiarity, extent and how the Project's management and decision-making mechanisms and processes accommodated and engaged relevant stakeholders (relevantly-mandated government institutions, other sustainable development organisations, academia, research institutions and scientists, local communities in all Project management stages and functions - Extent partner-beneficiaries and other involved stakeholders were enabled to articulate their demands and positions, provide feedback and inputs, partake in decisions, and productively participate in activities. - Empirical evidence, accounts and claims of how substantive participation added distinct value towards the efficient and effective generation of relevant Project results - In relation to coverage, proportion, and how, those vulnerable, at-risk and most affected including women, were targeted and accommodated in intervention design - Level of awareness of/Buy-in to and popular support of the Project by partner-beneficiaries and other local	- Results of interviews, FGDs, group interviews - Project Documents including most-significant-change (MSC) stories, minutes of meetings of decision-making bodies	- Interviews, Group Interviews, FGDs of partner-beneficiary groups and other stakeholders - Documents Review

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		stakeholders		
ii. Progress towards results ***Effectiveness* or Progress Towards Results and Emerging Outcomes: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the Project been achieved thus far?**				
Realisation of Phased Targets and Milestones	8- Have the Project's key outputs been established in the targeted quantities, quality and timing such that uptake and use by relevant stakeholders are ongoing and up to standard, and thus facilitating progress towards the achievement of end-of-project outcomes? (e.g., Landscape/ Ecosystem/National Diagnostics Analysis, SOCA, RapCA, WQM protocols, CC and DR vulnerability and risk assessment processes and tools, integrated R2R or spatial and development planning processes and tools at landscape, local and national levels, Regional Strategic R2R Framework, Policy Regime and Institutional Framework, Capacity Development Assessment and Plan, Training Modules, stress reduction and sustainable livelihoods pilots, software and hardware for GIS use, WQM, rainfall monitoring, etc.) 9- Given temporal standards/requirements for the generation of these Project outputs/outcomes, based on considerations of science, technology, absorptive capacities as well as other local realities - social, cultural, political dynamics (monitored risks and assumptions), what are the chances the	- Reported and Observed Variance in Progress vis-à-vis targets and milestones, and explanations of variance pointing out attribution links to Project management and how risks and assumptions were managed to strengthen achievability - Completeness and truthfulness of risk and assumption analysis - Quality and Timeliness of National/Ecosystem Diagnosis, State of Resources Assessments, Risk and Vulnerability Assessments vis-à-vis standards in grounded theory and good practice, including how assessments mainstream an R2R perspective; Also, extent and how attendant processes, systems and tools operationalized standards in good practice and grounded theory - Evidence of use of extensive knowledge sources (science, local knowledge, existing knowledge about fast cycle measurables, results of risks and assumptions monitoring) to inform logical phasing and sequencing of	- Results of Interviews, FGDs, group interviews - Project and PIC sub-project Documents (Framework Documents, LogFrames , Quarterly, Annual and Mid-Term reports, Technical studies, KPs, Assessment Tools and their results, Prepared Plans, Policy Instruments, Partnership MOAs, Financial Reports, minutes and decisions)	- Documents Review with Content Analysis of Generated Document Outputs - Participant Observation - Field Inspection - Interviews with: - RPCU-SPC and reps from UNDP - R2R Focal Points and STAR reps - Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners - reps sitting in inter-ministerial

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	targeted outputs and outcomes will still be realized in the remaining Project life? 10- In general, what are the factors that facilitated effective implementation of the Project components in your country? Hindering factors? How can the hindering factors be overcome to improve the chances that Project outputs and outcomes may still be achieved at Project-end?	activities, as well as the doability of work packages - Stated and field-verified claims about existence and strength of implementation facilitating and hindering factors (including perceptions re effect of vacancy in the Project Management position to level of Project accomplishment) - Clarity and Feasibility of Project's ToC within its time frame; Continuing plausibility of the Project's ToC, or validity of the Project design, given current level of accomplishment and remaining Project life		committees - National Project Managers - FGDs/Group Interviews of Beneficiaries and other Project stakeholders (traditional community leaders, private business, academia, involved NGOs)
Emerging Outcomes	11- In what concrete ways has the Project improved your capacity for environmental governance (including ENR management, CCAM and DRRM) within an R2R approach? Why or why not? 12- Has the Project facilitated links, mutual access, cooperation and learning exchanges between the relevant national, sectoral and local public agencies and: - Credible (Regional/National/Local) sources of knowledge and expertise (technical assistance, advisory services, research, continuous training) to assist in diagnostics exercises, preparation of SOC reports, RapCAs, field research, vulnerability and risk assessments, sustainable livelihoods development, planning, monitoring and	- Evidence of changes in the targeted capacity areas (knowledge, attitudes skills of relevant individuals; policy, institutional structural, management systems and procedural reforms) in terms of decisions and actions taken and documentary outputs that the PIC: - Has bought into R2R as a local, landscape-wide, national and regional approach to managing the environment/ ecosystems and natural resources for sustainable development - can and has participated in the formulation of a Regional Strategic Framework for R2R - can and has undertaken analysis of the		

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	evaluating stress reduction and improved catchment measures within an R2R approach? - Sources of financial and other resources including potential private sector investors, for ENR, CCAM and DRRM within an integrated R2R approach? 13- Is the Project realising gains from synergies/ complementarities with other UNDP/UNEP/FAO and GEF programmes and projects in the PICs and vice versa? Can these gains be attributed to the Project's coordination? Why or why not and how?	relevant policy regime, identified areas of complementarity and conflict and recommended policy actions; can and has enacted (or amended) legislation to support an integrated R2R approach to national, sectoral and local physical (land use) and development planning? - can and has (re)organized governance structures that allow cross-sectoral and cross-level environment/ ecosystem/natural resources management without substantial political and administrative jurisdictional barriers - has mobilised the relevant public agencies with the personnel complement (with secure tenure) able to use the management tools the Project trained them on (e.g., GIS-based mapping and planning, diagnostics tool, RapCAs, SOCA, project management); - has put in place an incentive structure and credentialing system to retain those assisted by the Project in their advanced studies related to R2R approach - has invested in the attendant software and hardware requirements for ENR under an R2R approach - can and has initiated, catalyzed and encouraged convergent and		

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		collaborative work of various sector agencies and the GEF R2R STAR projects, between governments, communities, and civil society and the private sector - can and has replicated, upscaled and led full-cycle ENR management, including diagnostics and assessments, planning management strategies within an R2R framework involving relevant stakeholders (local communities including traditional governance structures, the poorest, women and other minorities, NGOs, business), coordinating implementation, monitoring, evaluating and linking for learning - better target and involve the most-affected, most at-risk, and most vulnerable groups in ENR programming and management - can prepare and implement targeted communication strategies and use these to mobilise multi-stakeholder support for the various concerns of ENR management, CCAM and DRRM within an R2R framework? - Evidence that the stress reduction measures and sustainable livelihoods components are working and generating the expected results - Expressed claims of attribution of specific value-added results to		

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		complementarities/synergies from coordinating with other projects in the PICs - Expressed claims of attribution of specific value-added results to the adoption of an R2R approach compared to previous more spatially/sectorally-delimited projects		
ii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management ***Efficiency* of Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the Project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting and project communications supporting the Project's implementation?**				
Project Management and Cooperation Infrastructure for Adaptive Management	14- Are the regional and national Project management and advisory support structures in place? - Are Project management bodies at regional and national levels adequately and correctly staffed, and functional? - Are the national PSCs now set up to jointly steer the Project and STAR? How do the PSCs deal with Project issues in general? How accurate and effective are the feedback links between PSC and RPCU? How timely are the response cycles? What are the effects on implementation? For instance, how was the vacancy in Project Management taken by PSC, the delays in implementation, the under-utilisation of funds? - To what level of detail and how often are the National Environment Councils informed	- Consistency between Project objectives, design and management requirements (approaches, strategies, tools) and the organizational mandates, resources and capacity of the national implementing and other partners - The extent the organisational-structural attributes (authority, decision, communication, coordination and work systems and processes) of the various implementing partners are compatible with each other; clarity of terms of partnership and collaborative/coordination mechanisms - Quality, adequacy, sequencing and timeliness of the provision of inputs (technical, financial, etc.) by the	- Interview Results - Project Documents (Partnership MOAs, PIRs, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions)	- Documents Review with Content Analysis - Participant Observation - Interviews with: - RPCU-SPC - UNDP - R2R Focal Points and STAR reps - Officials and key staff from National Implementing Partners - reps sitting in

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	about Project progress (or lack of)? To what extent do they participate in Project decision-making? - Do Project information and decisions ever reach the country's Cabinet-level Ministers? What has been the value/advantages of involving high-level officials in Project decision-making? - Are the inter-ministerial committees functional? How are the networks of national R2R inter-ministerial committees involved in the Project? How have they improved management of components of the Project, coordination of GEF Projects nationally and regionally? - Has the UNDP and RPCU provided adequate timely technical, coordinative, financial and other assistance as needed? - To what extent are traditional and local governance structures involved in the Project? How has their participation enhanced the design, management and progress/performance of the Project?	responsible Project actors (e.g., UNDP, RPCU, PIC management structures, traditional governance structures in PICs, consultants, etc.) and how (in)efficient delivery affected effectiveness - Quality, feasibility and timeliness of Project decisions and choices given the Project's changing context		inter-ministerial committees - National Project Managers - other Project stakeholders (traditional community leaders, private business, academia, involved NGOs)
Knowledge-Managing Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for Adaptive Management	15- Are framework documents (Project and sub-project documents and LogFrames, MEL Plan, PIRs, key decisions) shared among the relevant Project stakeholders intended to directly contribute to the realization of outputs and outcomes? Do these documents provide a good basis for alignment of activities of all involved towards shared impact? 16- Is there a good balance between MEL	- Transparent sharing of LogFrames and their use as a management tool (implementation guide, basis for M&E); - Existence and use of a shared M&E Plan for adaptive management, learning and defining accountability, linked to the M&E systems of involved institutional partners; SMART-ness of M&E indicators; allocation of funding for M&E and learning activities	- Interview Results - Project Documents (LogFrames, M&E Plan, PIRs, KPs, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions)	- Documents Review with Content Analysis - Participant Observation - Interviews with: - RPCU-SPC - Key (M&E) staff from

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	and on-the-ground implementation activities? Does the MEL support adaptive management for effective implementation? - How much time, at the regional, national and local levels, are spent for – - Annual planning and budgeting - Quarterly and annual progress reporting, including on the ground monitoring - Semestral Project Steering Committee Meetings? - Do you think this amount of time is reasonable to enable learning and adaptive management? Do administrative tasks take anything away from direct productive activities on-the-ground, or vice-versa, relative to targeted milestones? 17- Is the Project's M&E system coherently linked with the M&E systems of partner-institutions? Is it transparent and accessible to all concerned stakeholders? 18- Are progress reports instructive for decision-making? Have qualitative and temporal standards been set for work packages based on science, institutional framework, political, social and cultural contextual dynamics (risks and assumptions) unique to the country/locality? Do targets and milestones reflect these standards such that they are useful guides for phasing/pacing implementation? Are decisions and adjustments routinely and timely made based on the content of monitoring reports? Are decisions systematically documented and	- Quality, timeliness and truthfulness of Progress Implementation Reports, usefulness for decision-making with focus on results; Responsiveness of management to implementation problems; Extent follow-up actions and implementation adjustments were timely made as instigated by monitoring results - Completeness and realism of risk and assumption analysis and their regular/systematic monitoring - Proportion of time spent for implementing productive activities and administrative support tasks - Relevance of knowledge products to the needs of implementation; Quality and Appropriateness of knowledge products to targeted users; Evidence of practical use of knowledge products in managing the interventions		National Implementing Partners - National Project Managers - Reps from other implementing partners

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	shared? 19- Are risks and assumptions being systematically monitored and managed? How and what have been the effect on implementation? 20- Are knowledge products generated to facilitate learning at various levels - locally, nationally, regionally, inter-sectorally, among relevant publics? Do learnings immediately feedback to Project implementation, to related programming, to policy?			
Financial Management and other Administrative Systems in support of Adaptive Management	21- In general, does the Project budget support the LogFrame? How does the Project define efficiency and cost-effectiveness as applied to both administrative and direct implementation costs? 22- Have partners provided counterparts as committed in a timely fashion? Why or why not? What were the effects on implementation? 23- Has the Project instituted a financial management system that is not in conflict with the financial management systems of other stakeholders contributing resources? Are the necessary sub-systems in place and functioning? Is the system transparent? Has the system ever been a reason for implementation delays? How, why and to what effect?	- Timely deployment of resources for intended purposes; spending levels and variance between forecasts and expenditures - Costs and benefits of the actions; Value (for money) of investments - Spending cognisant of cost standards, value-for money considerations, cost-effectiveness standards - Soundness of financial management policies, systems and practices (decision-making, treasury, bookkeeping and audit, including bidding, canvassing and procurement); extent financial management systems of implementing partners are compatible with each other - Financial feasibility (financial, material, human, technological resource requirements) of the interventions given scale, approach, and funding	- Interview Results - Project Documents (LogFrames, Budget, Financial (Financial Books, Statements, Audit Reports and Progress Reports, Financial Management Policies and Manual, Minutes of Meetings, Documents communicating decisions)	- Documents Review Documents Review - Interviews with financial officers of: - RPCU - PICs - Other institutional partners with financial counterparts

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		environment - Transparency of financial transactions - Compliance of reporting with quality and timeliness requirements - Soundness of management response to Audit and other finance-related findings		
iv. Sustainability **Indications of *Sustainability*: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term Project results?**				
Political, Technical, Social, Environmental and Financial Sustainability	13- Are the Project investments in stress reduction and catchment improvement measures, and reforms in governance institutions, mechanisms, processes and management systems, now backed by policy promulgations/legislation? 14- Are the Project-prepared plans mainstreamed into public physical and development public plans at various levels and sectors? Is R2R adopted as a planning approach by the national and local governments? 15- Have the management tools and systems developed by the Project been mainstreamed into the systems of involved government agencies at various levels? Are the Project investments, products, resources, tools and systems lodged with the appropriate institutions for their use and maintenance?	- Presence of Supportive Policy Context for R2R and the Project's various components; Policy promulgations by national implementing partners mainstreaming Project interventions into their regular mandate - Endorsement of Regional Strategic Framework for R2R by the relevant high-level officials in PICs - Adoption of R2R in the PICs' mandated physical and development planning processes - Concrete demonstration of Project components and activities being taken over by national implementing partners and other implementing partner-institutions - Replicated and upscaled activities - Expressions and Evidence of commitments (financial, human,	- Interview Results - Visited sites and offices - Project Documents - Pronouncements by PICs	- Documents Review - Participant Observation - Interviews with: - RPCU-SPC - Officials and Key staff from National Implementing Partners - National Project Managers - Reps from other implementing partners - Reps from (potential)

Evaluation Criteria & Focus	Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	16- Is there intentional effort to build and use in-situ/local expertise, on related technical areas of policy and programming post-project? Are there indications of commitment from those taking higher studies in R2R to serve their countries? Have incentive structures and credentialing systems for the R2R positions been put in place, especially in public agencies? 17- Has the Project created widespread support and buy-in for R2R and other Project advocacies among the relevant stakeholders? Has the Project produced champions for the Project's advocacies across levels and sectors of governance, and among civil society and private sector actors? 18- Are there indications the Project components and gains will be built upon by national and local stakeholders beyond the Project life? Replicated? Upscaled? Will financing by public agencies, private sector and local communities for the investments started through the Project be sustained? 19- What are the key constraints and challenges to Project components and gains being sustained beyond the Project life?	equipment, knowledge, etc.) from national implementing partners and other stakeholders (international donors, local communities, private sector) to support the various components after Project end - Presence of Pro-activeness of Champions in lobby and advocacy activities related to the Project - Extent Project fostered solidarity among the PICs particularly with respect to the political will required to support more integrated approaches to R2R in NRM.		donors - FGDs/Group Interviews of beneficiary groups

Annex 6: Recommended adjustments to the targets and indicators in the Project LogFrame. Deletions are marked as ~~strikethrough~~ text, additions are marked as underlined and *italicised* text.

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	**Original project target/Revised project target**	**Explanation**
1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed	No change
1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators * Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) * Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) * Area of restored habitat (ha) * Area of conserved/protected wetland * Area of catchment under improved management (ha) *Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods * Status of mechanisms for PM&E * Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans ** Number of people (or general societal) benefiting from defined, quantified and verified improvements in ecosystem condition*	1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in: * Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites) * Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites) * 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) * 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7 sites) * 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities * Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites) * 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results * Direct national pilot project beneficiaries equitably shared	For targets - as underlined - To be revised in accordance with revised and PSC/RSC-approved national project LogFrames These targets/indicators are a mixture of process (e.g. "areas under improved management") and outcome (e.g. nitrogen pollution reduction). It can take quite some time before some stress reduction measures deliver improvements in the environment. For example, catchment rehabilitation takes time, in some cases several years, before water quality improves. For some of these targets/indicators there are technical issues with measurements. For example in Tuvalu there are several sources of nitrogen pollution in addition to pig waste so it can be challenging to link any improvements in pig waste management to changes in Nitrogen loads. Despite these issues the targets/indicators should be maintained to keep focus on environmental outcomes. For indicators: the purpose of reducing stressors is to improve the ability of ecosystems to deliver benefits (ecosystem services). Currently the indicators refer to processes that reduce stressors, or environmental parameters, without identifying improvements in benefits. Addition of the new indicator will encourage the project to monitor and interpret stress reduction as improvements in benefits.
1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	1.2.1 *Up to* 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs	For target - see Section 4.2. Diagnostic analyses that are done should comply with the criteria for continuing or starting an analysis as per the recommendations of the MTR on the process/strategy for conducting diagnostic analyses.
1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for	1.2.2 *Up to* 14 ICMIWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project.	See Section 4.2.

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	Original project target/Revised project target	Explanation
the prioritization of investment sites		
1.3.1 ~~Number of national, local leaders and local governments engagement/participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks~~ *Level of satisfaction of local communities in their influence on policies.*	1.3.1 ~~Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks~~ *Effective participation of communities in national government policy making strengthened.*	See Annex 7.
1.3.2 ~~Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development~~ *Number of investment planning forums held that explicitly discuss opportunities for R2R investments in PIC sustainable development*	1.3.2 ~~Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions~~ *At least 14 National private-sector and 14 donor partnership forums (one in each PIC respectively) for investment planning reflect due consideration of priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions*	Forums need not be "new". Much better to mainstream R2R into existing discussion forums (where being held). The purpose (indicator) is to promote R2R opportunities (previously missing). See also Annex 7.
2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management. *Data will be gender disaggregated	2.1.1 At least 10 people with postgraduate training in R2R management. *At least 5 people will be women, At least ~~3~~ *1* innovative post-graduate training program~~s~~ for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring programme with results documented	Project document refers to only one programme. But it is understood that a "programme" will include several topics/modules (three of which are already delivered and one recently commenced with JCU).
2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders *groups* (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. *Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented	No change (except editorial on indicator).
2.2.1 ~~Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed~~ Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/	2.2.1 ~~Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed.~~ At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented.	The target bears limited relationship to the outcome that refers to "incentive structures" whereas the target refers to personnel. "up to" is ambiguous and not a defined quantified target. (See annex 7). The MTR does not understand what is meant by an "R2R personnel" and proposes its deletion - also because it also maintains that R2R

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	Original project target/Revised project target	Explanation
tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented		capacity needs mainstreaming into existing personnel.
~~2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels~~	~~2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.~~	See Annex 7. Proposed deletion of the target and indicator because achieving this is beyond the ability of the project (see section 4.2). In addition - the MTR notes that the project's objective is to mainstream R2R and therefore build R2R capacity across all government levels and not to centralise such capacity in individual "R2R practitioners".
3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance frameworks harmonised and strengthened *through incorporation of R2R* into national and regional development frameworks	3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks	Indicator: needs to be explicit that the harmonisation and strengthening relates to incorporating R2R.
~~3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action frameworks for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans~~ 3.1.2 *Integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building and national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans integrated into inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action frameworks for 14 PICs.*	~~3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders~~ *3.1.2 At least one relevant agreement and/or strategic action framework that incorporates R2R endorsed by leaders in each of the 14 PICs*	See section 4.2. The priority should be to integrate R2R into existing inter-ministerial agreements and/or strategic action plans.
3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports *or information* in national and regional action	3.1.3 *Up to 14* National 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports completed*, or uptake of related information into parallel or related report mechanisms,* ~~and launched to Pacific Leaders during National Coastal Summits (Yr 3)~~ in coordination with national R2R projects and demonstrated as *a* national development	See section 4.2.

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	Original project target/Revised project target	Explanation
planning for R2R investment	planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal areas	
3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees *strengthened or* formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	3.2.~~114 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and programme levels~~ *14 inter-ministry committees (one in each PIC) strengthened or formed, building on existing structures, including IWRM committees where feasible, that contribute to a common results framework for R2R at the project, programme and national levels.*	See Annex 7. Note comments in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees and its recommendations on how they should be implemented. Revision of this target/indicator should be pending further clarification and consideration of IMCs as recommended in section 4.3. The indicator should be re-assessed and re-aligned to the outcomes of this process.
3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs.
3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits	See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs.
3.2.4 ~~Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the *14* pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender~~ *Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 14 pilot PICs and those that have changed their perception on R2R as a result of the project *Data to be disaggregated by gender.*	3.2.4 At least 20 ~~ICM~~ MC members *in* total from the *14* pilot PICs (sub-regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) *engage* ~~gauged~~ in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques. *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	Editorial corrections. See comments above (target/indicator 3.2.1), in Annex 7 and in section 4.3 on inter-ministerial committees. Target/indicator should be revised subsequent to proposed consultation among PICs. See annex 7 for change to indicator. As noted in Annex 7. The target refers to change in perception. So should the indicator.
4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme	4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs	No change.
4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking	4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its	No change

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	Original project target/Revised project target	Explanation
approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	agencies and participating countries	
4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 *On demand*, Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	Activity/target should respond only where there is national level demand.
4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations	4.2.1 Regional 'ridge to reef' communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project, including, ~~at least 10~~ *as relevant*, partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations	The media landscape has changed since project conception. Partnerships with national and regional media and educational organisations should be promoted but a numerical target on this depends on the practicalities and feasibility of the communications strategy on a case-by-case basis.
4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published A second indicator should be added: *Percentage allocation of GEF grant expended on participation in IW:LEARN and partnerships*	4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant	No change to target (However, the MTR regards this target as unambitious and the project should aim for a lot more) Additional indicator added (from Annex 7).
4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users ~~registered~~, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc.	"Registered" removed because number can be tracked electronically from downloads etc. The RPCU has suggested changing this to 38 (from 100) users based on a calculation of the number of programme staff currently actively involved (UNDP/FAO/UNEP/GEF, STAR and IW). But the MTR concludes this facility should go well beyond this limited scope of users and notes that the "100" is unambitious in this regard.
5.1.1 Programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained	5.1.1 overall R2R programme coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1)	No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination"
5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit	5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall programme goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively.	No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination"
5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information	5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting	No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination"

Original Indicator/Revised indicator	Original project target/Revised project target	Explanation
sharing	and online information sharing.	
5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories	5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices	No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination"
5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network	No change but see sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding "coordination"

Annex 7: Analysis of original project targets as S.M.A.R.T. and the appropriateness of original indicators

(S = Specific: must use clear language, describing a specific future condition; M = Measureable: must have measureable aspects making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not; A = Achievable: must be within the capacity of partners to achieve; R = Relevant: must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework; T = Time-bound: never open-ended; there should be an expected date of accomplishment).

Note: these adjustments arise from the analysis of targets/indicators as per original project design. Further adjustments to targets and indicators arise as a result of the review of progress towards results. Recommended adjustments to targets and indicators from both sources are reflected in Annex 6.

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability							
Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]							
1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed	1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	Since baseline environmental data are required before interventions start the "T" for this target should be early in the project (year 1).
1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in: * Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites) * Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites) * 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) * 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7	1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators * Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) * Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) * Area of restored habitat (ha) * Area of conserved/protected wetland * Area of catchment under improved management (ha) Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods * Status of mechanisms for PM&E * Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
sites) * 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities * Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites) * 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results * Direct national pilot project beneficiary							
Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments							
1.2.1 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs	1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
1.2.2 Up to 14 ICM-IWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project	1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM							
1.3.1 Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national "Ridge to Reef" Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS	1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks	x	x	✔	x	✔	The term "institutional relationships" is vague and difficult to define and therefore problematic to measure. The outcome refers to "established" but as noted in the text such "roundtable networks" already exist in many PICs. An additional indicator might be: *Level of satisfaction of local communities in their influence on policies.*
1.3.2 Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions	1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development	x	✔	✔	✔	✔	The target should reflect that it would be more effective and efficient to mainstream R2R into on-going and future PPP arrangements/forums. "Up to" is also ambiguous. It could be better stated as: *At least 14 National private-sector and 14 donor partnership forums (one in each PIC respectively) for investment planning reflect due consideration of priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions* The current indicator is neither S nor R as it does not refer to R2R - only to PIC sustainable development. It would be better

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
							as: *Number of investment planning forums held that explicitly discuss opportunities for R2R investments in PIC sustainable development*
Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation							
Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation							
2.1.1 At least 10 people with postgraduate training in R2R management. *At least 5 people will be women At least 3 innovative post-graduate training programs for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring programme with results documented	2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management.*Data will be gender disaggregated	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. *Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented	2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	An editorial point - the indicator (and target) should be: Number of community stakeholder~~s~~ groups(~~i.e.~~ e.g. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities
Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated							
2.2.1 Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented.	2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented.	x	✔	✔	x	✔	The target bears limited relationship to the outcome that refers to "incentive structures" whereas the target refers to personnel. "up to" is ambiguous and not a defined quantified target.
2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R	2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels	✔	✔	x	✔	✔	The intention of the target (to improve sustainability of project results through improved capacity retention) is important. But it is unrealistic for such a small project (on its own) to be able to have much influence on incentive structures.

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
(ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.							
Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks							
Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally							
3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks	3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders	3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
	3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs							
3.2.1Up to14 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and programme levels	3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	x	✔	✔	x	✔	The target refers to "forming" IMCs whereas in most cases these (or equivalent) already exist. Also use of "up to" is ambiguous. It is also unclear what "national networks" means. According to the ProDoc "IMCs" are to function at a higher level than site based committees and serve primarily to promote uptake of R2R at national/regional policy level. But the status and function of IMCs has varied interpretations across the project. See further discussion in section 4.3.1 which also recommends that the project re-assess its approach to IMCs. The target might be better as: *14 inter-ministry committees (one in each PIC) strengthened or formed, building on existing structures, including IWRM committees where feasible, that contribute to a common results framework for R2R at the*

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
							project, programme and national levels. But the project should re-assess how it is interpreting and implementing IMCs.
3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	x	x	✔	x	✔	See the points raised above (target 3.2.2) regarding the status and interpretation of "IMCs). Without clarity on what an IMC is and the level at which it functions this target/indicator is problematic to assess. An improved approach would be to re-assess decision/consultation mechanisms at different scales (site, local, national) and have a clearer terminology for governance structures at each level instead of using "IMCs" for all cases. Where an "IMC" functions at a high policy level then it is unrealistic to expect participants from youth and/or vulnerable groups, but representation of their views is required. It is also unclear whether the effectiveness of meetings bears a relationship to the number of people present. What is actually required is to assess how various governance structures at different scales (local to national, community to cabinet) function collectively to deliver effective participation by communities/women/vulnerable groups and deliver effective, equitable and coordinated R2R planning outcomes. The project should re-assess its interpretation and strategy for IMCs (see section 4.3.1). Based on an interpretation that an IMC functions at a higher national policy level the target might be better as: *National decision making on R2R strengthened in each PIC through the strengthening or establishment of IMCs that include full and effective inputs of communities, women, youth and vulnerable groups through transparent and participatory dialogue from local through to national levels.* Improved indicators might be: (1) *shifts in policy decision making mechanisms towards more inclusive approaches, from local through to national scales, and towards an R2R approach*; (2) *satisfaction of communities, women, youth and vulnerable*

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
							groups with their full and effective participation in decision making.
3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits	3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	x	x	✔	x	✔	See comments above (targets 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) on "IMCs". It is not clear what "network" means. The logical interpretation is that it refers to linkages from site through local to national level in participation and information flow to enable better, more inclusive, decision-making and R2R policy outcomes. As such the target/indicator would be better if it reflected this. The proposals for target 3.2.2 (above) attempt to capture this aspect and if adopted would enable this target to be deleted. "Community exchange visits" are a good idea and should be maintained but refer to capacity building and should be moved to under component 2.
3.2.4 At least 20 ICM members total from the 4 pilot PICs (sub- regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) gauge in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques. *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	3.2.4 Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 14 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	The target is SMART as written but note comments above on the status and nature of IMCs. The indicator is neither S nor R specifically from the perspective of measuring "change in perception" referred to in the target (it only measures those participating in change in perception activities). A better indicator would be: *Number of inter- ministry committee members meeting within the 14 pilot PICs and those that have changed their perception on R2R as a result of the project *Data to be disaggregated by gender*. This would need to be measured through a pre- and post-training/activity assessment (probably through structured questionnaires).
Component 4 Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management							
Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects							
4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs	4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
4.1.3 Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	x	✔	✔	✔	✔	"Up to" is not specific. The target should be: *14 national planning exercises (one in each PIC) conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting*
Outcome 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established							
4.2.1 Regional 'ridge to reef' communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project including at least 10 partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations	4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant	4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	A second indicator could be added: *Percentage allocation of GEF grant expended on participation in IW:LEARN and partnerships*
4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc.	4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination							
Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects							
5.1.1 overall R2R programme coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1)	5.1.1 Programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall programme goals. At least 14 requests	5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	

Target	Indicator	Targets SMART ?					Notes
		S	M	A	R	T	
per year are met effectively.							
5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing.	5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices	5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network	5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	

Annex 8: Co-financing of the project as of the time of the MTR.

Based figures provided by the RPCU June 2019.

Sources of co-financing	Name of co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at CEO endorsement (US$)	Actual amount contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount.
UNDP Trust Fund	UNDP	In kind	8,300,000		
Core budget and related projects/programmes	SPC/AGTD	In kind	31,481,555	425,872	1.35%
Consolidated revenue					
	Cook Islands	In kind	1,675,736	7,724.30	0.46%
	Fiji	In kind	3,674,640	35,040	0.95%
	FSM	In kind	560,474	300	0.054%
	Kiribati	In kind	7,321,797	213	0.003%
	Nauru	In kind	1,448,275	-	-
	Niue	In kind	1,887,967	1,500	0.08%
	Palau	In kind	1,110,000	40,909	3.69%
	PNG	In kind	3,000,000	100,000	3.33%
	RMI	In kind	3,060,925	-	-
	Samoa	In kind	3,200,000	189,153	5.9%
	Solomon Islands	In kind	5,353,042	17,443.54	0.33%
	Tonga	In kind	3,500,000	202,142.03	5.8%
	Tuvalu	In kind	2,900,094	2,330.40	0.08%
	Vanuatu	In Kind	9,233,655	4,734.28	0.05%
Sub-Total (national)			47,926,605	601,489.55	1.26%
		Totals:	**87,708,160**	**1,027,361.44**	**1.17%**

Annex 9: Performance ratings and their descriptions

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)

#6 Highly Satisfactory (HS). Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".

#5 Satisfactory (S). Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

#4 Moderately Satisfactory (MS). Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

#3 Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU). Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.

#2 Unsatisfactory (U). Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

#1 Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability:

#4 Likely (L). Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future

#3 Moderately Likely (ML). Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review

#2 Moderately Unlikely (MU). Significant risk that key outcomes will not continue after project closure, although some outputs and activities should continue

#1 Unlikely (U). Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Annex 10: Main stakeholders and their role (from the Project Document)

Stakeholder (identified at project start-up)	**Project Implementation Roles**
A. National Government Agencies • Cook Islands: Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning • FS Micronesia: Kosrae Island ResourceManagement Authority • Fiji: Land and Water Resource Management Division of the Ministry of Primary Industry • Kiribati: Ministry of Public Works and Utilities • Marshall Islands: The Republic of the Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Authority (RMIEPA) • Nauru: Ministry of Commerce, Industries and Resources (CIR) • Niue: Department of Environment • Palau: Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC) • Papua New Guinea: Department of Environment and Conservation • Samoa: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment • Solomon Islands: Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Meteorology • Tonga: Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and Environment • Tuvalu: Department of Environment - Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment • Vanuatu: Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management	National Implementing Partners of National Activities and Pilot Projects
B. NGOs	
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	National level programme partner and member of the Regional Science and Technology Committee
Pacific Islands News Association	Regional organisation representing the interests of media professionals in the Pacific region. It links radio, television, newspapers, magazines, online services, national associations and journalism schools in 23 Pacific Island will assist Project in coordination of R2R

Stakeholder (identified at project start-up)	Project Implementation Roles
	messaging at national level
Live and Learn	National Level Environmental Education and Awareness
Pacific Water & Wastes Association (PWA)	The membership comprises Pacific Island water and wastewater utilities as well as international water authorities, private sector equipment and services supply companies, contractors and consultants assisting the project in coordinating
Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO)	National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects
Pan Pacific and Southeast Asia Women's Association (PPSEAWA)	Regional network of National NGO focal points based in 22 Pacific Island countries and territories assisting the project in coordinating National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects
Pacific Foundation for the Advancement of Women (PACFAW)	Will assist the project to promote cooperation among thewomen of the pacific region. Regional organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of activities for the advancement of women in the Pacific.
Pacific Youth Council	Regional non-governmental youth organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of National Youth Councils across the Pacific region
D. Academic organizations: • University of the South Pacific (USP) • University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) • University of Guam • University of Hawaii • International Water Center (IWC)	Partners in projects capacity building component and resource for scientific and technical support.
E. GEF Agencies in the R2R Programme:	
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Project Implementing Agency and IA for National STAR R2R Projects for FSM, Tuvalu, Samoa, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Nauru, PNG, Fiji.
Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)	IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Tonga
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Palau and Marshall Islands
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	Groundwater associated activities at a National Level
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) F. Multilateral organizations	National level partner in WASH associated Activities
Asian Development Bank	IA for the Coral Triangle and National Level Infrastructure developments invited participant at

Stakeholder (identified at project start-up)	Project Implementation Roles
	Annual RSC
World Bank	IA for several regional Disaster Risk Management and Building Climate Change Resilience will continue cooperative partnership established in the IWRM Project
European Union (EU)	Development partner for National Level Infrastructure developments invited participant at Annual RSC.
G. Pacific Regional Organisations Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Cooperative partner in the joint Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change strategy. Invited participant at Annual RSC

Annex 11: MTR assessment of the status of risks and assumptions in the project LogFrame.

Indicator	Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame	MTR observation/comments
Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability		
Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]		
1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	1.1.1 Data and information required to conduct diagnostic analyses may not be shared by local government agencies	Shared with "whom"? If this outcome is nationally-driven, then the sharing would be within national/local agencies and could be reasonably assumed to take place. The risk as stated is more likely if diagnostics are produced remotely - which is not compatible with capacity building.
1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators * Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) * Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) * Area of restored habitat (ha) * Area of conserved/protected wetland * Area of catchment under improved management (ha) Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods * Status of mechanisms for PM&E * Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans	1.1.2(a) Development pressures may result in adoption or revision of land-use policies by national or local governments which are incompatible with activities at pilot sites 1.1.2 (b) Challenges and costs associated with demonstrating environmental stress reduction benefits of technologies and management measures may constrain replication and upscaling 1.1.2 (c) Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address gender issues and promote mainstreaming.	1.1.2 (a) activities at pilot sites should be factoring in current and future development pressures. 1.1.2 (b) implies that the project must develop low cost stress reduction measures. 1.1.2 (c) implies that the project must have at least targeted activities on the gender sensitisation of Pacific leaders and the development of gender Champions among them.
Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments		
1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	1.2.1 Data and information required to conduct site characterizations of coastal areas may not be shared by relevant sectoral agencies or other institutions	Shared with "whom"? If this outcome is nationally-driven, then the sharing would be within national/local agencies and could be reasonably assumed to take place. The risk as stated is more likely if diagnostics are produced remotely - which is not compatible with capacity building.
1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the	1.2.2 Engaging appropriate expertise to facilitate consensus on the selection of physical, biological	This is under the influence of the project.

Indicator	Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame	MTR observation/comments
prioritization of investment sites	and social variables to be used in characterization of PIC coastal areas	
Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM		
1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks	1.3.1 Existing tensions between land-owners and government agencies may limit community leader participation	This is high risk in the PICs. The project needs to establish measures to reduce tensions where feasible - e.g. applying conflict resolution, trade-off analysis and incentive measures tools.
1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development	1.3.2 Limited private sector presence, or alignment of donor investment strategies with proposed actions, at priority R2R locations	To some extent this is under the influence of the project.
Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation		
Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation		
2.1.1 Number of PIC based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management. *Data will be gender disaggregated	2.1.1 Internationally recognized institute (or consortium) able to deliver a cost effective postgraduate training course which is both accredited and regionally appropriate	No comment.
2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	2.1.2 Adequate resourcing from national STAR projects available to support STAR project stakeholder participation in training and capacity building activities	The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects.
Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated		
2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed; Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation; Number of capacity building support secured with results documented	2.2.1 Securing advice and support from human resource specialist familiar with systems of government and barriers to sustainable development in PIC contexts	No comment.
2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels	2.2.2 Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address human resourcing issues for natural resource and environmental management	Beyond the ability of the project - recommended deletion (see Section 4.2).
Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks		
Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally		
3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks	3.1.1 Government agencies may be unwilling to participate in processes for the harmonization of	To a large extent this is under the influence of the project.

Indicator	Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame	MTR observation/comments
	policy and legislation	
3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans	3.1.2 Consultative processes will not elicit adequate stakeholder input and commitment of support from national networks to proposed priority strategic actions	To a large extent this is under the influence of the project and particular as it promotes and supports IMCs which are specifically targeted in the LogFrame to support institutional development.
3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment	3.1.3 Strong and high-level government commitment is generated, sustained and willing to use 'State of Islands' reporting as an instrument for change	The assumption here is that a "State of the Islands" is required to promote change. The risk is that focusing on the SOI output distracts the project from identifying immediate opportunities for mainstreaming.
Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs		
3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	3.2.1 Provincial and local governments may perceive IMC approach as being driven by central government	See discussion on IMCs in Section 4.3
3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.2 Appropriately qualified national staff available to provide adequate Secretariat support to IMC work	No comment
3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	3.2.3 Adequate cooperation is fostered among IW pilot project and national STAR project staff to build stakeholder confidence in benefits of integration	The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects.
3.2.4 Number of inter-ministry committee members meeting within the 4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.4 R2R is accepted at the national level as a legitimate framework for a multi focal area approach to GEF investment for PIC sustainable development	This is already agreed since PICs have endorsed the Pacific R2R Programme which intends to do exactly as stated. The actual risk is that R2R will not be taken up as a framework for future GEF investment.
Component 4 Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management		
Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects		
4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R programme	4.1.1 (a) Design of national STAR projects include targets and related indicators aimed at achievement of R2R programme goals and outcomes; (b) legal agreements between national lead agencies and GEF	The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects. This leaves the question of how will "legal agreements" be enforced?

Indicator	Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame	MTR observation/comments
	implementing agencies for STAR projects include explicit requirement for project management units to meet R2R programme reporting requirements	See Section 4.3 on coordination.
4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	4.1.2 Sustained commitment of senior government officials with oversight of IW and STAR projects to develop and test a harmonized results approach for GEF investment in PICs	The important risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects.
4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 National planning and finance ministry staff are sufficiently well engaged in national planning exercises	The actual assumption here is that the R2R results framework is compatible with and supports national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting. To some extent this is under the control of the project.
4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations	4.2.1 (a) Willingness of regional and national media outlets prepared to partner with R2R programme implementation; and (b) adequate resourcing from national STAR projects to the development of media products required to effectively communicate the benefit of integrated R2R approaches	A risk here is that the IW R2R project does not have influence over the STAR projects.
4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published	4.2.2 Retention of national and regional level staff required to resource the documentation of experiences and lessons learned as IW:LEARN experience notes	No comment.
4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Interconnectivity in national and regional project offices is adequate to support the efficient online compilation and sharing of information and data	To some extent this is under the influence of the project since design of IT support should take into account such adequacy and the "sharing of information and data" should be kept within the limits of outcome 4.2 (see Section 4.2).
Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination		
Outcome 5.1 Effective programme coordination of national and regional R2R projects		
5.1.1 Programme coordination unit recruited and staff retained	5.1.1 Regional executing agency ability to recruit and retain appropriately qualified staff for programme coordination unit	There is an assumption that the range of technical expertise of the RPCU is appropriate to that required to execute the project. See 4.3 particularly sub-section on *Other performance of the Executing Agency (RPCU) Technical expertise of the RPCU*
5.1.2 Number of requests for regional level support to national project delivery and management met by programme coordination unit	5.1.2 Adequate resourcing available to programme coordination unit to meet support requests of national STAR projects	The project is designed so that it has adequate resourcing. Its RPCU already has such support in its ToR and it is assumed that the budget reflects this.
5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results	5.1.3 IW pilot and STAR project [staff] are retained to	It is assumed that this refers to - within the time duration

Indicator	Risks and assumptions as per the project LogFrame	MTR observation/comments
reporting and online information sharing	enable the longer-term development and local exchange of national project management and reporting capacity	of the project. Thereafter there will be no project staff.
5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by programme stakeholders to online repositories	5.1.4 Internet connectivity in national and regional offices of programme/project stakeholders adequate to support use of online training tools	To some extent this is under the influence of the project because the IT system developed by the project should take into account internet connectivity etc.
5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	5.1.5 National and regional organisations assign sufficient importance to engagement with planning and coordination initiatives of the project	To some extent this is under the influence of the project.

Annex 12: Milestones for national level implementation of the project. The official start date of the project was August 2015.

Initial hiring of the Project Manager refers to the date of appointment of the first Project Manager (in some cases project managers resigned and have been replaced).

PIC	Timeline of Milestones			Length of delay from project start
Cook Is	MOA signing		Sep 15, 2016	1 year
	First Fund Tranche		Sep 28, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Sep 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year
	Initial Hiring of PM		Feb 27, 2017	1 year 6 months
	Demo Project		Management of Muri Lagoon - waste management, PPP, knowledge and capacity on stress reduction measures	
Fiji	MOA signing		Mar 10, 2017	1 year 7 months
	First Fund Tranche		Oct 6, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Oct 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year 2 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Oct 29, 2018.	3 year 2 month
	Demo Project		Catchment Management (Waimanu) including preparation of catchment management plan	
FSM	MOA signing		Dec 28, 2016	1 year 4 months
	First Fund Tranche		Oct 6, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Feb 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year 6 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Nov 27, 2017	2 year 3 months
	Demo Project		Dry Litter Piggery demonstration in Lelu to control e coli contamination of water catchment and Terracing/SALT farming technology to control sediments in Tofol, Kosrae. Preparation of Community Water Resources Management to be integrated into an overall state level Freshwater Management Plan for Kosrae.	
Kiribati	MOA signing		Mar 10, 2017	1 year 7 months
	First Fund Tranche		Sep 5, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Feb 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 6 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		N/A	N/A
	Demo Project		N/A	N/A
Nauru	MOA signing		May 26, 2016	8 months

	First Fund Tranche		Aug 5, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Feb 2017 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	6 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Jun 13, 2016.	10 months
	Demo Project		Dry Litter Piggery (Interview) Coastal re-vegetation with SALT and drought tolerant species at 10 critical sites (Interview)	
Niue	MOA signing		Feb 7, 2017	1 year 6 months
	First Fund Tranche		Mar 16, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Sep 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 years
	Initial Hiring of PM		Feb 20, 2017	1 year 6 months
	Demo Project		Reduction of municipal waste and reduction of pollution to aquifers	
Palau	MOA signing		June 13, 2016	10 months
	First Fund Tranche		Jun 20, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Oct 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 2 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Oct 9, 2016	1 year 2 months
	Demo Project		Support to Belau Watershed Action Planning and Implementation PME Planning and Implementation for Ngardok Nature Reserve Public-private partnerships for ecotourism compliant with national guidelines for IW and Coastal Land Management	
PNG	MOA signing		Jan 9, 2017	1 year 5 months
	First Fund Tranche		Mar 2, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		May 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 9 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Nov 9, 2017	2 year 3 months
	Demo Project		Habitat Restoration - MPA Declaration of Tuna Bay of Port Moresby CBD Area including MPA Management Planning	
RMI	MOA signing		Jun 13, 2016	10 months
	First Fund Tranche		Jun 20, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Mar 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year 8 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Jun 27, 2017	1 year 10 months
	Demo Project		Reduction of pollution of coastal water and groundwater in Laura and Maujuro thru Dry Litter Piggery technology, including formulation of Integrated Coastal Management	

			Plan for Laura informed by a State of the Coast assessment	
Samoa	MOA signing		Mar 10, 2017	1 year 8 months
	First Fund Tranche		Sep 27, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Nov 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year 3 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Sep 11, 2017	2 year 1 month
	Demo Project		Improved catchment management, including revegetation of mangroves and formulation of Watershed Management Plan for Letongo Fagali'l Catchment	
Solomon	MOA signing		Sep 1, 2016	1 year 1 month
	First Fund Tranche		Fund released on Jan 10, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Jan 2017 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 5 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Feb 1, 2017	1 year 6 months
	Demo Project		Management of wetland habitat (Mataniko River which is a major river in Kovi/Kongulai Catchment.), including formulation of Mataniko Catchment Management Plan for 100has Water quality monitoring Formulation of ecotourism development plan (Interview)	
Tonga	MOA signing		Sep 1, 2016	1 year 1 month
	First Fund Tranche		Sep 13, 2017	
	Inception Meeting		Feb 2018 per Q12018 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	2 year 6 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Aug 1, 2017	2 year
	Demo Project		Reduction of municipal waste and reduction of pollution to aquifers through ECOSAN Water Quality Monitoring Conservation/protection of fish habitat through MPA/refuge establishment	
Tuvalu	MOA signing		Jun 1, 2016	10 months
	First Fund Tranche		Nov 2, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Dec 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 4 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Aug 1, 2016	1 year
	Demo Project		Dry Litter Piggery demonstration to reduce pollution to aquifers (Interview)	

	Formulation of MYCWP		Updated on Jul 30. 2018 (Per file copy shared by RPCU to the MTR Team)	
Vanuatu	MOA signing		Jun 1, 2016	10 months
	First Fund Tranche		Jul 12, 2016	
	Inception Meeting		Dec 2016 per Q32017 GEF Pacific R2R Progress Report	1 year 4 months
	Initial Hiring of PM		Sep 6, 2018	3 years
	Demo Project		Improved catchment management including formulation of the Tagabe Catchment Management Plan, capacity building for participatory monitoring and evaluation and revegetation of buffer areas Water Quality Monitoring	

Annex 13: Tasks identified to be undertaken in preparation for, and issues to be considered by, the next Regional Steering Committee Meeting.

Task	Who
Necessary prior to the RSC:	
Check and where necessary update each national project LogFrame including targets. Check status of approval by RSC (in writing/official records)	RPCU and National Project Managers
Compile relevant national LogFrames for approval (if necessary) at next RSC	RPCU
Map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities. Identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks. Identify approaches to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks.	RPCU and national project counterparts (and where feasible national PSCs)
Compile and synthesise results of the above mapping (etc.) into a coherent strategy for mainstreaming R2R and present to the RSC	RPCU
Consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministry committees" (IMC) as per the Project Document fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed.	RPCU and national counterparts (and where feasible national PSCs)
Compile national situations and proposal regarding IMCs vis-a-vis project requirements and present to the RSC	RPCU
Assess the current situation, needs and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC vis-a-vis other on-going efforts (e.g. SoE) and with regards to the timing of information needs for other processes.	RPCU, national counterparts and national PSCs.
Compile the strategy for IDAs and SoCs and present to the RSC	RPCU
Identify the strategy for delivering outcome 4.2 at national level and present to the RSC	RPCU
Optional - time and resources permitting. (1) Organise training on Ecosystem Goods and Services approaches and valuation at a regional workshop at the RSC (2) Organise training workshop at the RSC on mapping the potential contributions of the project to the SDGs, identifying relevant linkages and interdependencies and investigating common or relevant indicators in use by both the project and the SDGs.	RPCU
Topics to be considered by the RSC:	
Consider and approve current national LogFrames (as necessary).	RSC
Consider and approve the mapping of existing national (and	RSC

Task	Who
regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities, immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks and approaches to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks.	
Consider and approve strategies and proposals to deliver IMC functions by the project.	RSC
Consider and approve the revised IDA/SoC strategy	RSC
Consider and approve the strategy to deliver outcome 4.2 at national level.	RSC
Discuss and agree on: what is required from the RPCU regarding programme coordination; identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies; the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.	RSC, RPCG and RPCU

Annex 14: The MTR Mission Schedule

Mission member	Location	Dates
Coates + Lucero	Arrive Fiji	13 March 2019
Coates	Mission Fiji	14 - 15 March 2019
Coates	Mission Cook Islands	16 - 23 March 2019
Lucero	Mission Fiji	14 - 23 March 2019
Coates + Lucero	Mission Vanuatu	24 - 30 March 2019
Coates + Lucero	Mission Tuvalu	31 March - 04 April 2019
Coates + Lucero	Mission Fiji	05 - 09 April 2019
Coates + Lucero	Progress update Fiji	(08 April 2019)
Coates + Lucero	Home travel	10 April 2019
Lucero	Mission Palau	23 - 27 April 2019

Annex 15: Brief BIOS of the MTR Team

David Coates

David Coates is an independent consultant on environment and sustainable development with 30+ years of broad experience. He has been Project Manager and/or Chief Technical Adviser of numerous natural resources management projects (for FAO, UNDP, GEF-World Bank and Mekong River Commission). Has 25+ years experience working in developing countries (Africa, South Asia, South-East Asia, Pacific). 25 + years experience in project design, implementation and review (for UNDP, FAO, Mekong River Commission, DANIDA) including results based management. Recently he spent 13 years at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity where he was: thematic leader for water, food and energy; focal point for the FAO and Ramsar Convention; representative on UN-Water; Chair of the Partnership on Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction; mainstreaming biodiversity/ecosystem services into the elaboration of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs; building capacity for developing country Parties. He is author or co-author of extensive publications including recently on: the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity; nature-based solutions for water security; biodiversity and water resources management; food systems and sustainable agriculture; ecosystem services and disaster risk reduction; inland fisheries and fisheries management. He has a BSc (First Class Honours) Zoology; MSc (Tropical Marine Ecology); and PhD (Applied Freshwater Biology).

Ma. Susan (Bebot) J. Lucera

Ma. Susan J Lucero is an independent development practitioner whose body of work spans almost 30 years. In these 30 years, she has practiced in the capacity of educator, researcher and policy analyst, managerial and technical advisor/consultant, project appraiser, monitor, evaluator, and manager-implementer. Most of Ms. Lucero's development practice has been devoted to promoting good environmental governance and institution development. She has worked extensively in the sectors of Sustainable Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation, Environment, Natural Resources, Agriculture and Agrarian Reform, Integrated Conservation and Development/Protected Area Management, Climate Change Resiliency and Disaster Risk Reduction and Management, and Community-Based Livelihood Development. She is also a Gender and Participatory Development expert, with extensive experience in all stages of education and training curriculum development and delivery through formal, non-formal and informal modes. Ms. Lucero has worked with donors, government agencies, and civil society organisations based mostly in the Philippines and in some countries abroad (Netherlands, Pakistan, Afghanistan, India and Bangladesh). Parallel to her development practice, Prof. Lucero has also been an active academician. She has taught at the graduate programmes on Development Management and Public Affairs Management of the University of the Philippines at Los Baños and is currently, Assistant Professor and Research Associate at the De La Salle College of St. Benilde - School of Diplomacy and Governance. Ms. Lucero is a PhD Candidate in Public Administration, has completed doctoral coursework in Political Science, has a Master's Degree in Development Management, and a Bachelor's Degree in Agricultural Economics.

Annex 16: MTR Consultant Agreement Forms

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: David Coates

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): —

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

Signed at Rockcliffe, Scotland *(Place)* on 09 May 2019 *(Date)*

Signature: David Coates

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: MA. SUSAN J. LUCERO

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT

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

Signed at DASMARINAS CITY, PHILIPPINES *(Place)* on 07 MAY 2019 *(Date)*

Signature: _____