

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Tuvalu Ridge to Reef Project

Team Leader -International Consultant

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full -sized* project titled *Project Title (PIMS #5220)* implemented through the *Department of Environment*. The project started on the *25 August 2016* and is in its 5 year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/eo/SitePages/gef-evaluation-guidelines.aspx>.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`

The objective of the project, “Implementing ‘Ridge to Reef’ approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Tuvalu (Tuvalu R2R Project)” is “to preserve ecosystem services, sustain livelihoods and improve resilience in Tuvalu using a ‘ridge-to-reef’ approach”. To achieve this objective, the project focuses on enhancing and strengthening conservation and protected areas (Component 1); rehabilitating degraded coastal and inland forests and landscapes and supporting the delivery of integrated water resource management (IWRM) and integrated coastal management (ICM) at a national scale whilst piloting hands-on approaches at the island scale (on three selected pilot islands) (Component 2); enhancing governance and institutional capacities at the national, island, and community levels for enhanced inland and coastal natural resource management (Component 3); and improving data and information systems that would enable improve evidence-based planning, decision-making, and management of natural resources in Tuvalu (Component 4).

The Tuvalu R2R Project is executed by Department of Environment within the portfolio of the Ministry of Public Utilities, Environment, Labour, Weather & Disaster. Through a grant of Global Environment Facility (GEF) of USD 3,762,844, the project was initially implemented over a period of 5 years. The total co-financing from partners amounts to USD **15,680,591**.

The project is part of the Pacific R2R program on “*Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities - Integrated Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods*”. It is consistent with three of the GEF-5 focal areas including Biodiversity, International Waters, and Land Degradation, and is designed to advance Tuvalu’s work towards achieving national and international priorities in these key focal areas through a comprehensive Ridge to Reef approach. As such, the project will deliver directly on: the Convention on Biological Diversity

(CBD)'s Programme of Work of Protected Areas (PoWPA) of the Aichi Targets and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2012 – 2016); the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD)'s National Action Programme (NAP); the Sustainable

The whole of Tuvalu is considered within this R2R project. Only Component 2 focusing on integrated land and water management (LD and IW) are limited to one of, or all 3 islands of Funafuti, Nukufetau and Nanumea, whilst other Components include all 9 islands of Tuvalu. The project will directly benefit the 6,194 people living in the urban capital Funafuti (55% of the population) as well as two outer islands of Nanumea (556 inhabitants) and Nukufetau (540 inhabitants) with improved integrated water and land management measures. In addition, the project will indirectly benefit the livelihoods of the entire population of Tuvalu through the long-term impacts of the R2R approach and the enhanced management of inland and coastal resources through the additional/improved LMMA/MPA networks formalized in all 9 islands.

Since the global Covid-19 pandemic has escalated into a global humanitarian and socio-economic crisis in the first quarter of 2020, many countries including Tuvalu responded immediately by implemented strict travel restrictions as a necessary measure to mitigate the spread of the virus. International travel is limited to only necessary travel and those entering the country must have in possession a Quarantine Certificate and a mandatory negative COVID-19 test result. Travellers entering Tuvalu are expected to undergo a 14-day quarantine period (in isolation) before they are allowed to move freely. Initially there was a lockdown period, with national government priorities focused on a Covid 19 response plan. This had a negative impact on the project, resulting in delays to implementation for at least 2 months but with the lifting of restrictions implementation gradually picked up since June. To date, there are no known cases of Covid related deaths in Tuvalu. Government officials continue to monitor the situation and provide regular updates.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project's outcome targets),
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;

- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF)
- assess any cross cutting and gender issues
- examination on the use of funds and value for money

and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(list)*;

Department of Environment, Department of Agriculture, Department of Waste, Department of Local Governments, All Island Councils (Kaupule), Planning and Finance, Department of Fisheries, Department of Lands and Survey, Tuvaluan Association of Non-Governmental Organizations, Tuvalu National Council of Women, consultants, project board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to *(Nanumea an island in the Northern Group, Nukufetau in the Central, Niulakita in the southern and on Funafuti)*, including the following project sites; *(Ifilele pond and Conservation Area of Niulakita, Conservation Area of Funafuti, Nukufetau and Nanumea, Demo Dry Litter Biggery on Funafuti, Mangrove and Coral Plantation sites on Funafuti)*. In case the shipping schedule is not favourable, then the TE team will need to arrange

virtual meetings with Kaupule member using ZOOM. *(Adjust text if a mission will not take place. Describe the virtual tools that will be used. See additional text suggestions below.)*

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

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

Evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.

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

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

Analysis and reporting: Data collated will be analyzed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. Analysis will be provided in matrix, tables to best present findings and key recommendations; Reporting to be conducted in RBM (results-based management) approach.

Presentation of final draft to country office and stakeholders: The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation

❖ *Additional Text to incorporate into this section, as relevant (please adjust as needed):*

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should

develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/eo/SitePages/gef-evaluation-guidelines.aspx>.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks

- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *(project title)*

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating¹ |
| M&E design at entry | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | |
| Overall Quality of M&E | |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight | |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution | |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution | |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance | |

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

| | |
|--|--------|
| Effectiveness | |
| Efficiency | |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources | |
| Socio-political/economic | |
| Institutional framework and governance | |
| Environmental | |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability | |

6. TIMEFRAME

NOTE: Flexibility and delays should be included in the timeframe for the TE, with additional time for implementing the TE virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19. Consideration may be given to a time contingency should the evaluation be delayed in any way due to COVID-19.

The total duration of the TE will be approximately (*average 24*) over a time period of *12 of weeks* starting on *1 April*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

NOTE: Adjust the text in this column if a mission will not take place. The stakeholder interviews, if done virtually, may require a longer than usual time period. Please adjust the number of days and completion date to accommodate this.

| Timeframe | Activity |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>1 April</i> | Application closes |
| <i>9 April</i> | Selection of TE team |
| <i>16 April</i> | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| <i>21 April (4 days)</i> | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| <i>23 April</i> | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| <i>23 April – 4 May (10 days)</i> | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| <i>5 May</i> | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| <i>17 May</i> | Preparation and submission of draft TE report |
| <i>18 May- 25 May</i> | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| <i>26 May -2 June</i> | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| <i>3 June</i> | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| <i>4 June</i> | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | By 21 April | TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission: 5 May | TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i>) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 17 May | TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 5 | Final TE Report* + Audit Trail | Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (<i>See template in ToR Annex H</i>) | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 4 June | TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is *the UNDP Pacific Office*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

NOTE: Provide additional details on management structures and implementation if the International Consultant will work with a National Consultant and/or if the International Consultant is to operate remotely. Include a provision for experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The National consultant is expected to work under the supervision of Team Leader will (add details, as appropriate, e.g. assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.)

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: *(Adjust the qualifications as needed and provide a weight to each qualification. In most cases, the qualifications for the team leader and those for the team expert will differ. Therefore, there should be two different lists of qualifications or separate TORs.)*

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Management/Science, Natural Resource Management or equivalent;

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity, Land Degradation and International Waters ;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *Small Island developing States, in particular South Pacific ;*
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity, Land Degradation and International Waters); experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an is essential
- *Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.*

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval of the Commissioning Unit by 23 April
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit by 17 May
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail by 4 June

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).

- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS³

(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁴ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁵);
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of (*project title*)" or by email at the following address ONLY: (*insert email address*) by (*time and date*). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

³ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁴<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁵ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

13. TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

(Insert the project's results framework)

| <p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP/CPD or UNDAF:</p> <p><u>UNDAF Focus Area 1: Environmental Management, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management</u></p> <p><u>Regional UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental risk management.</u></p> <p><u>Tuvalu UNDAF Outcome 1.1: National and local authorities and partners enhance resilience of vulnerable communities and natural ecosystems to threats, shocks, disasters and climate change.</u></p> <p>Output 1.1: Strengthened capacity of national and Falekaupule to develop and mainstream integrated policies on natural resources, environment, climate change, disaster planning and budgetary processes,</p> | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| <p>Country Programme and/or UNDAF Outcome Indicators:</p> <p><u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Percentage of terrestrial and marine areas protected (MDG7) (baseline = 0.2%); Percentage of communities supported with climate change adaptation</p> | | | | |
| <p>UNDP Strategic Plan Indicator: Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access to ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation</p> | | | | |
| <p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment a</p> | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</p> <p>BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems:</p> <p>BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors:</p> <p>LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape:</p> <p>IW-3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem- based management of trans-boundary water systems</p> | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</p> <p>BD-1: Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.</p> <p>BD-2: Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use frameworks.</p> <p>LD-3: Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities.</p> <p>IW-3: Outcome 3.3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/ experience sharing.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>Indicator 1.1(BD-1): <i>Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.</i></p> <p>Indicator 2.1(BD-2): <i>Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations tracking tool.</i></p> <p>Indicator 3.2(LD-3) <i>Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes.</i></p> <p>Indicator 3.3 (IW-3) <i>GEF5 performance improved over GEF4 per data from IW Tracking Tool; capacity surveys.</i></p> | | | | |
| Objectives and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Targets End of Project | Source of verification |
| Project Objective | To preserve ecosystem services, sustain livelihoods and improve resilience in Tuvalu using a 'ridge-to-reef' approach | | | |
| | Expansion area (in ha) over | Existing conservation area has been | Approximately 1,200 ha or 12 | Ground truth surveys |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | existing conservation areas | verified as 76.026 as per PoWPA. 15% of this is 11.4 km ² or approximately 12km ² (rounded up to this figure throughout the Prodoc), | km ² expansion area | to help achieve the O expected target to ex LMMA/MPA network (or more) after year 5 |
| | The integration of new ridge to reef (R2R) knowledge and information into all appropriate national and island wide policy and legislation | Whole island planning (referred to as ISP) remains in its infancy in Tuvalu though it is being initially addressed within NAPA 2, though as of September 2014, no details on the ISP process are available. | 8 ISPs have R2R principles integrated that incorporates ICM, MSP and IWRM | Review of legislation, and ISPs |
| COMPONENT 1 – CONSERVATION OF ISLAND AND MARINE BIODIVERSITY | | | | |
| Outcome 1.1 <i>Improved management effectiveness of system of conservation areas composed of existing and expanded Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs)</i> | Status GIS-based information management system for biodiversity-focused natural resource management. | The current database on biodiversity parameters and natural resource data is available but not organized/accessible. Tuvalu Marine Life (completed by Alofa Tuvalu) plus follow up activities are proposed for 2015 (to be funded by USAID). Existing baseline information is included on the ReefBase Project (http://pacificgis.reefbase.org) database. The fisheries department through their Community Fishing Centre are collecting catch data. Household Income surveys also data regarding fisheries and other natural livelihoods. 5NR is current under implementation | 1 updated/new national environment GIS-based information management system. At least 9 GIS maps for each Tuvalu LMMA/MPA (1 per conservation area) with data and information (including BD hotspots and existing projects), integrated into reports and plans, and distributed and utilised by decisions makers. | National Report (NR) using spatial and bio data gathered through project. Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Isla Review of legislation, and ISPs. |
| Outcome 1.1 Outputs | | | | |
| Output 1.1.1 National biodiversity surveys of terrestrial and marine fauna & flora completed, with specific targets on endemic species to develop the biodiversity component of the GIS-based management information system (as described in | Number of biodiversity surveys of terrestrial and marine fauna and flora completed and updated every 2 yrs. | The fourth National Report (Convention of Biological Diversity) was produced 2009 and published available on CBD webpage. NBSAP was produced 2011 and endorsed in 2013. Specifics for island NBSAP sites are presented through currently not linked closely to R2R principles. The 2014 NBSAP is currently under review and a consultant has been engaged under UNEP. | 9 (1 per Island) surveys of terrestrial and marine fauna and flora completed and updated every 2 yrs. At least 50% of participants engaged in data collection and dissemination are from vulnerable groups of society (women, children, adolescents, | National Report (NR) using spatial and bio data gathered through project. Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Isla |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Output 4.1.1)</p> | <p>Number of species surveyed based on agreed upon biodiversity indicators (including endemic species and other endangered species)</p> <p><i>(Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 1.1 & 2.1 (BD-1 and 2))</i></p> | <p>Previous survey has been conducted under various separate initiatives but not centrally stored and/or data analysis is incomplete.</p> <p>The IBP/ BIORAP has recommended that the implementation of MPAs must be island specific /contextualised i.e. management rules will vary per island depending on circumstances.</p> | <p>and elderly).</p> <p>At least 30* species to be surveyed with agreed upon biodiversity indicators for monitoring</p> <p><i>*to be reviewed during project implementation</i></p> | <p>M&E reports including and annual updates on monitoring results.</p> <p>New information (made held by Dept of Lands and accepted by MFA)</p> <p>Clear and measurable indicators and targets LMMA/MPAs.</p> <p>Effectiveness of the LMMA will be measured through biodiversity surveys conducted within and outside of LMMA/MPAs.</p> |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|

Activities

- 1.1.1 a) Engage communities in defining bio-indicators (incorporating science and traditional knowledge) and community monitoring methods for biodiversity.
- 1.1.1 b) Train R2R Island Officers and other island representatives on island level biodiversity monitoring
- 1.1.1 c) Conduct biodiversity baseline survey (of at least 30 species) with communities in the 9 islands. Endemic coastal vegetation, submerged marine ecosystems (s)
- 1.1.1d) Incorporate all new field survey data into a GIS-based management information system, which is to be updated every year.
- 1.1.1 e) Community monitoring to take place annually. R2R Island Officers to update data every quarter.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Output 1.1.2</p> <p>Existing marine conservation areas in the 9 locations expanded to cover 15% of existing conservation areas (approx 1200 ha or 12 km2) by including more land and sea areas and fish spawning aggregation sites where appropriate, building on completed assessments and additional National Biodiversity Surveys (as described in Output 1.1.1). Repeat assessments supported at midterm and project end to measure management effectiveness. Information incorporated into the GIS-based management information system (as described in Output 4.1.1)</p> | <p>Number of marine conservation techniques piloted</p> <p>Number of people aware and participating in marine conservation management (30 % women, children, elderly and vulnerable groups)</p> <p><i>(Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 1.1 (BD-1))</i></p> | <p>Currently there are 11 marine conservation areas (CA) across 9 islands governed by 8 Kaupules.</p> <p>Funafuti Conservation Area is the only legalized CA. However, no CAs currently have fully endorsed and enforced Management Plans, including FCA.</p> | <p>At least 9 marine conservation techniques piloted (1 per island)</p> <p>30 % of total Island Population aware and/or participating in marine conservation management (at least 50% are women, children, elderly and vulnerable groups)</p> | <p>Mid Term M&E Reports (3) representing a report on biodiversity baseline of designated studied areas at each site.</p> <p>End of project report of community biodiversity coincide with BD DAY of Environment Day) to support monitoring of CA and data collection.</p> <p>Effectiveness of the LMMA will be measured through biodiversity surveys conducted within and outside of the LMMA/MPAs.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | |
| Activities | | | | |
| 1.1.2 a) Review of current extent, status and potential for expansion of 11 Tuvaluan Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) including Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) | | | | |
| 1.1.2 b) Through community consultation and scientific assessments (through Output 1.1.1), identify and agree on specific locations for LMMA/MPA expansion by 15 habitat rehabilitation programs. | | | | |
| 1.1.2 c) Conduct awareness program to educate the R2R Island Officers, kaupule members, and community on LMMAs/MPAs, marine conservation techniques, and adaptations. | | | | |
| 1.1.2 d) Develop/update GIS maps of new LMMAs/MPAs boundaries in partnership with SPC | | | | |
| 1.1.2 e) Through a participatory process, implement, enforce, and monitor the implementation of marine conservation techniques piloted across the 9 islands | | | | |
| Output 1.1.3 | Number of formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas (shared with Outcome Indicator) Number and effectiveness of system in place to monitor/report that R2R communities are fully engaged in the updating and implementation of LMMAs. (Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 2.1 (BD-2)) | Except for Funafuti the other seven islands have established their CA based on a community based approach (LMMA). The management of these areas are done traditionally without formal legal and institutional support from Government directly. The Kaupule the executive arm does not interfere with the management of the LMMA except directed by the Assembly Fale Kaupule. Despite this, The role of different community groups (women, men, teenagers, elderly) are not made clear with regards to sustainable land management and marine biodiversity conservation and their island wide implementation. | 9 formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas with management plans (hotspots, PAs, bio-indicators etc). For all 9 LMMA's including Funafuti, an effective monitoring/reporting and evaluation system is in place by Y2 with evidence on how R2R communities are fully engaged in the updating and implementation processes \ | National Report (NR) using spatial and bio data gathered through project. Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Islands Review of legislation, and ISPs. |
| Activities | | | | |
| 1.1.3 a) Review the current management system and traditional Kaupule conservation area management plans through community consultations to determine the w in 9 sites. | | | | |
| 1.1.3 b) Strengthen, formalise and implement Funafuti MPA Plan and other LMMA/MPA management plans for each of the 9 sites | | | | |
| 1.1.3 c) Community-based monitoring and enforcement system for LMMA/MPA management plans developed and implemented by community members and R2R Islands | | | | |
| 1.1.3 d) Host annual community management and monitoring event | | | | |
| COMPONENT 2 – INTEGRATED LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT | | | | |
| | Number of new sustainable land management (SLM) interventions introduced on Funafuti, Nanumea and Nukufetau that positively | Current adoption / promotion of composting and production of organic fertilizers is seeking to remedy the current challenge of having to promote food security on | Introduction of at least 3 new sustainable land management (SLM) interventions (focusing on improved opportunities for underutilized local crop | Climate resilient SLM guide National Report (NR) |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>contribute to food security development on those islands.</p> <p><i>(Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 3.2 (LD-3))</i></p> | <p>soils that are becoming saline or devoid of nutrients through inappropriate land use (tree planting) or pollution from human land usage. NAPA 1 introduced simple composting techniques with the assistance of the SWAT Department utilizing compost wastes.</p> | <p>species) and agroforestry interventions in Nanumea, Funafuti and Nukufetau that (if improved upon) will positively contribute to food security development on the 3 islands, for over 300 community members (or 30% of island population; 30% or over should be female) by the end of the project.</p> | <p>using spatial and bio data gathered through project.</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Island</p> <p>Review of ISPs</p> |
| Outcome 2.1 Outputs | | | | |
| <p>Output 2.1.1</p> <p>Resource inventory performed, soils characterized and hazards to land and water resources identified and incorporated into GIS area mapping, complementing Output 1.1.1 towards improving decision making in the management of production landscapes and maintenance of ecosystem services</p> | <p>Number of new detailed ground truth soil, geological, topographic and land resource characterisation field surveys completed.</p> <p>(Shared indicator with Outcome 2.1)</p> <p>Number of clear and measurable bio-indicators set to maintain ecosystem services for all pilot islands identified and reported; number of people trained to monitor and update bio-indicators.</p> <p><i>(Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 3.2 (LD-3))</i></p> | <p>Land resources surveys were undertaken by FAO in 1986. SPC under NAPA has completed soil survey in Nukufetau and Funafuti.</p> <p>Soils and terrain have altered since 1986 and new options for agriculture and coastal adaptation are now required.</p> | <p>Up to 3 (1 for each pilot islands) new or updated land and geotechnical surveys undertaken on Nanumea, Nukufetau and Funafuti and information stored within the GIS by the end of Y2.</p> <p>All new resource information (soils etc) collated and stored within GIS (maps etc) and used to inform land use strategies for SLM delivery on Nanumea and Nukufetau by the end of the project.</p> | <p>Geotechnical survey</p> <p>GIS-based information management system incorporates updated information</p> <p>National Report (NR) using spatial and bio data gathered through project.</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Island</p> <p>Review of legislation, and ISPs.</p> |
| Activities | | | | |
| <p>2.1.1 a) In line with bio-indicators developed under 1.1.1, develop resource indicators for land and water through community-based and scientific process.</p> <p>2.1.1 b) Train R2R Island Officers, island leaders and community members on the significance of land and water resource monitoring and management</p> <p>2.1.1c) Through a community-based and scientific approach, carry out an inventory to determine the quality and quantity of natural resources in the 3 selected islands</p> <p>2.1.1d) Building on existing data (produced by FAO and NAPA II project), produce detailed ground truth soil, geological, topographic and land resource characterisation</p> <p>2.1.1e) Incorporate all new soil and land resource characterisation field survey data into a GIS-based management information system.</p> <p>2.1.1 f) Identify information gaps/datasets needed for future surveys to help better deliver NBSAP principles</p> <p>2.1.1 g) Update information on resource-indicators annually within local and national GIS-based management information system.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Output 2.1.2</p> <p>Re-vegetated degraded areas with indigenous hardwood tree species (including mangroves, coconuts and local crop species) in selected sites in 3 islands (Funafuti, Nanumea</p> | <p>Number of new sustainable land management (SLM) interventions introduced on Funafuti, Nanumea and Nukufetau that positively contribute to food security development on those islands.</p> <p>(shared indicator with</p> | <p>From a soft coastal adaptation perspective, there are significant areas of large salt tolerant trees on many of the Tuvaluan islands, though the engineering science surrounding their role in preventing coastal erosion is uncertain.</p> | <p>Introduction of at least 3 new sustainable land management (SLM) (focusing on improved opportunities for underutilized local crop species) and agroforestry interventions in Nanumea, Funafuti and Nukufetau that (if improved upon) will positively contribute</p> | <p>Climate resilient SLM guide</p> <p>National Report (NR) using spatial and bio data gathered through</p> |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>and Nukufetau), towards improving hydrological functions, coastal resilience against climate impacts, and improving livelihoods and securing food production with involvement of Department of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, Kaupule, NGOs and women's organizations (Tuvalu National Council of Women)</p> | <p>Outcome 2.1) (Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 3.2 (LD-3))</p> | <p>New schemes are proposed for Nanumea (pandanus groynes construction to help develop the "green buffer" concept and a novel "spur and groove" reef rehabilitation project to help reduce wave energy impacting on the coast of Savave island are proposed on Nukufetau as part of NAPA1.</p> <p>Current adoption / promotion of composting and production of organic fertilizers is seeking to remedy the current challenge of having to promote food security on soils that are becoming saline or devoid of nutrients through inappropriate land use (tree planting) or pollution from human land usage</p> <p>Plants of Tuvalu book produced in 2012 reference material for the identification of plants, grasses, as it has scientific, common English names and local names.</p> | <p>to food security development on the 3 islands, for over 300 community members (or 30% of island population; 30% of which should be female) by the end of the project.</p> <p>At least 1 knowledge product on climate-resilient SLM techniques developed and 2 suitable awareness programs to educate people (gender sensitive) on "climate resilient" replanting of arable crops (i.e. Happy Garden initiative), benefiting over 200 vulnerable community members (30% at least being female) by the end of the project.</p> <p>Planting of over 500 suitable hardwood (coconut/mahogany etc), fruit tree species and underutilized local crop species over at least two islands by the end of Y4.</p> <p>At least 3 agricultural interventions (1 each in Nanumea and Nukufetau) implemented (with number of beneficiaries (at least 30% women and/or youth) and value of investments recorded).</p> <p>Trainees to visit / learn from the GCCA agroforestry sites in Funafuti.</p> | <p>project.</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Island</p> <p>Review of ISPs</p> |
| <p>Activities</p> | | | | |
| <p>2.1.2a) Building on past and ongoing efforts (i.e. SLM project, etc), develop the "Tuvalu Climate Resilient SLM Techniques Guide" covering agroforestry, agro-biodiversity functions, coastal resilience against climate change, and improve livelihoods and food security in coordination and cooperation with Department of Agriculture</p> <p>2.1.2b) Implement priority SLM interventions in accordance with the Guide (2.1.2a) including the replanting of over 500 suitable hardwood (coconut / mahogany, etc)</p> <p>2.1.2c) Create community training and involvement plans to aid in local engagement (including sponsoring organize community-based tree planting restoration program and maintaining the mangrove and coconut plantation nurseries).</p> <p>2.1.2d) In order to enhance community capacities to manage and sustain SLM interventions, support participation (2 participant per island per year) of island representative Initiative and agroforestry demonstrations of the Department of Agriculture with involvement of Kaupule, NGOs and womens' organizations on Nanumea, Nukufetau</p> | | | | |
| <p>Output 2.1.3 Review of completed algal</p> | <p>Number of actions implemented to understand and enhance water quality of</p> | <p>Water quality in the lagoon has decreased and the amount of floating debris has increased over the years,</p> | <p>At least 1 reports (i.e. report by USP), surveys and data collection programmes</p> | <p>Reports on water quality that provides baseline information and updates</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>bloom assessment in Funafuti; Implement remedial measures to reduce occurrences and severity</p> | <p>Funafuti lagoon. (Shared indicator with Outcome 2.1) <i>(Supports delivery of GEF5 Indicator 3.2 (LD-3))</i></p> | <p>potentially from agriculture, domestic sources, and other development activities in the surrounding lagoon catchment. Pollution within Funafuti Lagoon is deemed as being in a chronic state. Invasive alien species (IAS) <i>Sargassum polycystu</i> are present only near the coasts of Fongafale and the Conservation Area. Its distribution and density is believed to be correlated to the levels of toxins recorded within the water.</p> <p>There is also a high concentration of nitrate in particular this is very high close to the densely populated sites. There is ongoing direct disposal of human and animal feces into the waters of Funafuti lagoon. The resulting high nutrient loading resulted in algal blooms as has been recorded in lagoons in Funafuti.</p> <p>USP and SPC have undertaken studies together with Fisheries Department on the causes and impacts of the issue. People of Funafuti were advised through the Kaupule to harvest the seaweeds and use them manure in their home garden as a short term solution to reduce or decrease sea ground cover.</p> <p>PACCC Project conducted 2 studies with support of SPC on the demand and use of compost toilet on Funafuti in 2009 and then in 2013.</p> | <p>reviewed / updated/ disseminated to determine status of algal blooms in Funafuti Lagoon to better understand causes and appropriate remedial measures.</p> <p>At least 1 remedial measure implemented to reduce point and non-point sources of pollution causing algal bloom in Funafuti Lagoon.</p> <p>Water quality and extent of algal bloom recorded and effectiveness of remedial measures measured at least 3 times (baseline, midterm, and final) during the lifetime of the project.</p> | <p>recommended action take place in intervention and non-intervention assess the effectiveness of intervention)</p> <p>National IWRM policy</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from R2R Isla</p> |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Activities

- 2.1.3a) Review existing algal bloom assessment by USP PACE-SD to analyze the baseline condition and identify effective remedial measures and indicators for monitoring
- 2.1.3b) With community support and participation, implement remedial measures such as, but not limited to, composting toilets in hot spots, waterless pig waste manure sources for pollution
- 2.1.3 c) Conduct awareness raising efforts regarding the causes and impacts of algal bloom in the Funafuti Lagoon
- 2.1.3d) Monitor water quality of Funafuti Lagoon (baseline, midterm, and final) and assess the effectiveness of remedial measure

COMPONENT 3 – GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONS

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Outcome 3.1 Integrated approaches mainstreamed in policy and regulatory frameworks</p> | <p>Number of revised policies, updated sector plans or reviewed environmental regulations that help towards providing a functional enabling environment for conservation and integrated management of</p> | <p>Currently, there is no established assessment and evaluation framework to integrate land and sea management issues for all atolls. Tuvalu is currently in the process of drafting an Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plan though has no endorsed ICM policy or</p> | <p>Creation of 1 nationally recognized Policy Framework that integrates R2R principles</p> | <p>Report/ toolkit on mainstreaming R2R into national and local planning</p> <p>National Report (NR) using spatial and bio</p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | islands ICM, MSP, IWRM. | planning principles in place. | | data gathered through project. Quarterly and annual reports from PIU Review of legislation, and ISPs. |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|

Outcome 3.1 Outputs

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Output 3.1.1 Kaupule conservation area management plans examined and documented in conjunction with various departments (Environment, Fisheries, Rural Development, and Budget and Planning) and communities, and used to inform national planning and development of regulations and legislation at the national level in support of integrated approaches (ensuring that documents are also translated into local language). | Number of knowledge products and policy instruments developed to facilitate integration of R2R into national policies and Island Strategic Plans (ISP) that adopts (Integrated Coastal Management (ICM), Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) principles to address all land and sea related issues. Percent of ISP budget allocated for kaupule conservation area management plans (with R2R integrated). | Department of Environment has been designated by the Cabinet to implement the NBSAP but no clear provision on financial and other commitments required for plan implementation. Only one legislated CA and that is the Funafuti CA. The other nine CA/ LMMA have no formal legal and institutional arrangement, hence the technical support from relevant sectors is minimal. The nine CA also don't possess proper published management plans. NAPA 2 is also doing an activity on ISPs. In that project activity there is minimal emphasis on Conservation Management Plans. There is a high need for a draftsman or consultation for the implementation of ISP and even other government sectors' legal needs. Other projects like the CLGF under the Commonwealth is also doing similar work. | At least one report/toolkit on on mainstreaming "ridge to reef" principles into national and island planning (ISP) by end of Year 1 which is developed and disseminated to all stakeholders in at least 2 different formats, and translated into local language. 10 percent of ISP budget allocated for Kaupule conservation area management plans (with R2R integrated). | Report/ toolkit on mainstreaming R2R into national and island planning National Report (NR) using spatial and biocultural data gathered through project. Quarterly and annual reports from PIU Review of legislation, and ISPs. |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Activities | | | | |
| 3.1.1a) Coordinating with past and ongoing projects (i.e. NAPA II, EU-GCCA, CLFG and C-CAP (USAID) Project) develop a toolkit to mainstream R2R (ICM and IWRM) in national and island level policies, plans, and budgets | | | | |
| 3.1.1 b) Formalise the integration of R2R principles into the Island Strategic Plans (ISPs) and budgets in close coordination with other relevant projects (i.e. NAPA II, E | | | | |
| 3.1.1 c) Mainstream R2R principles into national legislation, policies, plans, and budgets | | | | |
| 3.1.1 d) Examine, document, and formalize Kaupule conservation area management plans/ agreements/ protocols with relevant national and island level authorities | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Outcome 3.2</p> <p>Capacity on integrated approaches enhanced at the national and community levels</p> | <p>Number of staff in Govt of Tuvalu (GoT) and communities who are able to identify environmental risks and prioritize, plan, and implement effective conservation and integrated measures.</p> | <p>NGOs like TANGO, DoE and DoF are responsible for MPA Management Plans.</p> <p>Concerned departments, ministries, partners and stakeholders have all set up contact points to implement the Planning Framework for ISP (integrating land and sea) and have adopted ecosystem services consideration in key development policies and legislation.</p> | <p>75% of 2014 staffing numbers (30% of which being female or more) are trained to be able to identify environmental risk and help towards implementing the R2R components of the ISP by the end of the project.</p> <p>As a result of the training, at least 50 GoT staff and 200 community members are able to identify environmental risks and prioritize, plan, and implement effective conservation and integrated measures.</p> | <p>Production of Tuvalu awareness raising materials undertake “train the trainer” exercises and work with the Department of Education to include SLM, ICM and other principles (topics) into communication related activities including inclusion with other major media outlets</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from PIU</p> <p>Review of national Tuvalu newsletter, radio program and other major media outlets</p> |
| <p>Outcome 3.2 Outputs</p> | | | | |
| <p>Output 3.2.1</p> <p>Training packages including manuals, guides and modules on LMMAs, MPAs, SLM, ICM and IWRM, to advanced and basic levels, that include biodiversity status and assessments developed and implemented in collaboration with the regional R2R program support project</p> | <p>Number of training materials produced and trainings conducted on R2R (LMMAs, MPAs, SLM, ICM and IWRM) in collaboration with regional R2R program.</p> <p>Number of participants in island specific training events (including schools) and ToT training events held to focus on R2R measures that are island specific (gender disaggregated data)</p> | <p>Some existing training and materials developed related to LMMAs, MPAs, SLM and ICM. However, no training modules or workshops have taken place that addresses these issues holistically as R2R.</p> <p>Ad hoc training events are carried out on various topics linked to environmental protection, though few are integrated to cover a range of inter-disciplined topics that help deliver ISP at an island/atoll scale.</p> <p>Due to staffing constraints, MFATTEL is unable to conduct sufficient training in the outer island. DOE is under capacity/budget etc (to implement the Planning Framework for ISP (integrating land and sea) and has clear provision on financial requirements and other requirements for plan implementation.) MHA is directly involved with the implementations of ISPs as the funds from the FTF is remitted through the Ministry to Kaupule. In a year an island Kaupule receives approximately AUD 200,000 for activities and implementation of ISP.</p> | <p>More than 30 trainers trained by end of project.</p> <p>At least 30% of participants (if possible) are from vulnerable groups of society (women, children, adolescents, elderly).</p> <p>4 national trainings conducted.</p> <p>At least 2 training modules in English and Tuvaluan developed.</p> <p>By the middle of Y3, at least 50% of 3 island schools are involved and over 75% of women’s groups (adolescent groups) involved in all atoll community training events.</p> <p>By the end of the project, 100% of kaupule members of the 3 islands are participating in R2R training events that help to update and provide the actions for future implementation of ISP/R2R</p> | <p>Train the Trainer Manual produced to help ensure R2R Island Officers of all islands have the knowledge and tools to produce their own management plans within one of their future key performance indicators</p> <p>Report/ toolkit on mapping R2R into national and local planning</p> <p>National Report (NR) developed using spatial and biodiversity data gathered through the project.</p> <p>Quarterly and annual reports from PIU</p> <p>Review of legislation, and ISPs.</p> <p>Stakeholder survey developed that island communities engaged in the update and implementation process</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | activities | Mid-term and Final p evaluation reports |
| Activities | | | | |
| 3.2.1a) Develop training manuals and modules on LMMAs, MPAs, climate resilient SLM Technique Guides, and Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) and Integrated information and approaches in coordination with regional R2R project; | | | | |
| 3.2.1b) Organize annual training on 3 islands targeting key Tuvaluan communities and Kaupule Organize on ICM and IWRM principles including “Train the Trainer” ev and IWRM techniques. | | | | |
| 3.2.1c) Implementation of the training using manuals and modules developed in 3.2.1 a) for 10% of the population (including women, children and youth) by trainers | | | | |
| 3.2.1d) Organize capacity building activities (for year 3, 4, and 5) for Tuvaluan development policy makers on R2R (ICM and IWRM) mainstreaming. | | | | |
| 3.2.1e) Support participation of Tuvalu representatives to trainings on the “best practices” from the Regional R2R projects on ICM and IWRM specific topics, including stressors on terrestrial and marine fauna and flora (biodiversity); | | | | |
| 3.2.1f) Develop training materials for community based biodiversity monitoring | | | | |
| COMPONENT 4 – KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT | | | | |
| Outcome 4.1: Improved data and information systems on biodiversity, forests land management adaptation best practice | Number of improved or new data and information system on biodiversity, agroforestry, land management, and adaptation best practices. Number / percentage of men, women, children, youth and vulnerable groups engaged by the R2R project | Development projects currently do not systematically benefit from learning practices and project lessons on community-based biodiversity and land / marine management. | At least 1 improved or new integrated data and information system (fed by components 1, 2, and 3) established and accessed At least 30 percent of project participants are female | Project reports from annual M&E activities R2R Pacific website. GEF TWs Tracking To |
| Outcome 4.1 Outputs | | | | |
| Output 4.1.1 Improved GIS-based management information system installed for biodiversity, forests and climate change, land & coastal management and best practices that includes an electronic library to access past knowledge, including reports, data etc. in parallel with ongoing projects, e.g., NAPA 2 project. Years 1 & 2 focus on collection of information and assessments with years 3 & 4 to focus more on applications. | Creation of a suitable and implementable digital metadata platform to accommodate new biodiversity, agroforestry, land management, water management and climate change datasets with appropriately trained staff to Dept of Lands and Survey. Effective and consistent use of the “multi- donor project” electronic library at national level (to produce necessary information for a “National Report to CBD” bi-annual report) or local community level. | Tuvalu currently lacks the resources and capacity to fully develop a biodiversity component within the existing national GIS system that resides at the Department of Lands and Survey. The current database on biodiversity parameters and natural resource data in general is very much lacking. There is current work being undertaken by a knowledge management specialist on information management (work sponsored by GIZ) which needs to be built on regarding any future knowledge management system underway in Tuvalu. | A GIS-based information management system/portal is established and managed within a host that participates within a regionally sustainable network plus in a way that uses the Tuvaluan language where possible By the end of Y4, production and at least 2 GIS maps (i.e: community mapping or database update etc) for all 9 islands and are tailored to the capacity and hardware / software capabilities of the island. Local counterparts from the DoLS are trained to enhance | GIS-based information management system established and housed at Tuvalu National Library Project reports from annual M&E activities R2R Pacific website. GEF TWs Tracking To |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | their capacity on data management and to support the R2R process on data collection and management. | |
| Activities | | | | |
| 4.1.1a) Establish/enhance integrated GIS information management system and database that includes all terrestrial, coastal and marine biodiversity data captured through projects | | | | |
| 4.1.1 b) Host a multi-stakeholder/ donor forum to gather information and agree upon an effective data management system that can be effective and sustained | | | | |
| 4.1.1c) Support and coordinate with ongoing efforts to develop an electronic library where past and ongoing data, knowledge, and information, including reports, data, and information is stored at the Tuvalu National Library | | | | |
| 4.1.1d) Support from regional agencies such as SPC /SPC –SOPAC (capacities in GIS mapping) to train local counterparts such as Department of Lands and Survey to ensure that data management systems will be maintained | | | | |
| 4.1.1 e) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) on knowledge management developed and disseminated to ensure that data management systems will be maintained | | | | |
| Output 4.1.2 | Number of brochures, media releases, video documentary in local dialect, feature press article, and website produced, and percent of population who have received/consumed R2R knowledge products | Limited formal communication materials in existence on ISP and ICM/IWRM for each Pilot Island. There is a need to involve stakeholder groups in all stages of the R2R process. Limited channels to educate people on benefits of improving biodiversity and wider environmental conditions. | 50% of all Tuvaluans (30% of which are women, youth, and/or vulnerable groups) have received R2R knowledge projects by the end of the project By end of the project, at least 5 separate types of innovative and effective awareness and communication materials developed and disseminated 50% of reporters/media in Tuvalu trained on R2R related issues. At least 30% of trained communication officers are female | Publication of an array of knowledge techniques in English and Tuvalu to disseminate the ICM and R2R approaches adopted through the R2R programme on all islands. Reports from project M&E activities. GEF TWs Tracking Tool Technical awareness and communication materials (video documentaries and products) produced and disseminated. |
| | Number of reporters/ media trained on R2R related issues. Number of male and female officers trained. | | | |
| Activities | | | | |
| 4.1.2a) Develop and disseminate an array of knowledge techniques that disseminate the R2R (ICM and IWRM) approaches | | | | |
| 4.1.2b) Establish, update and improve web based products | | | | |
| 4.1.2c) Create innovative public awareness and education campaigns | | | | |
| 4.1.2d) Support from regional agencies such as USP/SPC/SPREP/SOPAC (capacities in video documentary) to train key stakeholders in Tuvalu on innovative communication | | | | |
| 4.1.2e) Training of local reporters/radio station on R2R related issues | | | | |
| Output 4.1.3: | Number of inputs provided by staff and government towards the design of a regional/ international agency donor conference to help solicit R2R lessons learned. | No formal mechanisms in place to relay or disseminate best practice information or shared knowledge on R2R related topics. | At least 5 delegates from Tuvalu participate and provide inputs to the design of a regional/international agency donor conference for R2R lessons learned (at least 2 female candidates) by the end | Initiation and implementation of a major agency-donor conference to discuss and solicit support for implementation and "lessons learnt" at regional level |
| | Systematic monitoring system established, with data sharing and joint training and survey activities for terrestrial and marine areas and integrated | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|
| approaches; monitoring and evaluation results are fed to the R2R program through the regional program support project to facilitate lessons sharing and cross-country fertilization | | | of the project. | Reports from project M&E activities. GEF TWs Tracking To |
| Activities | | | | |
| 4.1.3a) Initiate and implement a major agency-donor meetings to discuss proposals from unfunded priorities identified in the project and solicit support for impleme | | | | |
| 4.1.3b) Participation, knowledge sharing, and application of information and tools from the Regional R2R program to enhance cross-country fertilization of R2R effor | | | | |

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
|----|--|
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | |
|----|--|
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
| | <i>Add documents, as required</i> |

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change

4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁶)
- 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 4.2 Project Results
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender
 - Other Cross-cutting Issues
 - Social and Environmental Standards
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country Ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed

⁶ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Summary of field visits
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.

| Evaluative Criteria Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|--|--|---|---|
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| <i>(include evaluative questions)</i> | <i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i> | <i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i> | <i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i> |
| | | | |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| | | | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| | | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| | | | |
| Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment? | | | |
| | | | |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| <i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i> | | | |

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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 _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance | Sustainability ratings: |
|--|--|
| <p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p> | <p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p> |

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Terminal Evaluation Report for <i>(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)</i> Reviewed and Cleared By: | |
| Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point) | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy) | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

| Institution/ Organization | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report | TE team response and actions taken |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |