

# Terms of Reference

## GEF Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation: (1991-2012)

---

Approved by the GEF Evaluation Office Director on December 11, 2012

### Background and Introduction

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office.<sup>1</sup> By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. CPEs relevance and utility has increased in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country-driven portfolio development.
2. GEF eligible countries are chosen for CPEs based on a selection process and a set of criteria including the size, diversity and maturity of their portfolio of projects.<sup>2</sup> These evaluations usually cover all national projects, and include a selection of the most important regional and global projects in which the country participates. In Fiscal Year 11, the CPE Team conducted a different type of CPE, taking a cluster approach that analyzed the portfolios of six GEF beneficiary countries members of the Organization of the Eastern Caribbean States (OECS). That evaluation, a first of its kind for the CPE team, allowed looking at the relevance, performance and results of regional projects, one of the main support modalities in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The Vanuatu and SPREP<sup>3</sup> Portfolio Evaluation is expected to progress further along this line of analysis, by providing an opportunity to compare regional to national project relevance and performance in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in the South Pacific region.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the portfolios of Vanuatu and SPREP include several ongoing, completed/closed projects with significant emphasis on Biodiversity, Climate Change and Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).
3. The South Pacific region comprises 22 countries scattered over one third of the globe, covering about thirty million sq. km., mostly oceanic. These countries include 20,000 to 30,000 small islands.<sup>5</sup> The South Pacific region represents an enormous diversity in physical geography, culture, languages, social-political organization, size and natural resource endowment. Although containing just 0.1 percent of the world's population, the region contains one third of the world's languages and an enormous cultural diversity encompassing social, political and behavioral complexities. This situation is most pronounced across Melanesia, where 700 languages are spoken in Papua New Guinea alone, and more than 100 each in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.<sup>6</sup> Agriculture, fishing and tourism are the major industries contributing to national economies.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a complete list of countries having undergone CPEs please refer to the GEF Evaluation Office website.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE\\_final\\_country\\_selection\\_note-0910\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE_final_country_selection_note-0910_0.pdf), Website access: 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> South Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

<sup>4</sup> These evaluations include the OECS Cluster CPE, the Cuba CPE and the Jamaica Country Portfolio Study (CPS).

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/bangkok/arm/pac.htm>, Website access: 12<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.population.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/nzpr-vol-33-and-34\\_gerald-haberkorn.pdf](http://www.population.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/nzpr-vol-33-and-34_gerald-haberkorn.pdf), Website access: 12<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

4. Vanuatu, formerly the Anglo-French condominium of the New Hebrides, is an irregular Y-shaped chain of some 80 islands, with a total land area of about 4,710 sq. miles and a total coastline of 1,571 miles. The total population of Vanuatu is estimated to be 240,000 people in 2010 and it has an annual population growth rate of 2.3 percent.<sup>7</sup> In 2010, Vanuatu's gross domestic product (GDP) was approximately \$729 million with a growth rate of 3 percent and per capita income of \$3,042. Agriculture and tourism are the main productive sectors contributing to Vanuatu's economy. Agriculture contributes 21.5 percent of the GDP. Tourism contributes 19 percent of the GDP.<sup>8</sup> Vanuatu ranks 118<sup>th</sup> on the Human Development Index (HDI) and 52<sup>nd</sup> on the Human Poverty Index (HPI). Poverty levels stubbornly remain at about 40% of the population, with about 26% on less than US\$1 per day.

5. SPREP is an intergovernmental organization established in 1982 by the governments and administrations of the Pacific region. SPREP is composed of 25 countries, consisting of all the 21 Pacific island countries and territories, and four developed countries.<sup>9</sup> It is charged with promoting cooperation, supporting protection and improvement of the Pacific islands environment, and ensuring its sustainable development.<sup>10</sup> The key focal areas under SPREP projects are climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management, pollution control, environmental monitoring and governance. Adaptation to climate change and rising sea levels, improvement in natural disaster preparedness, prevention of worsening freshwater shortages, protection of coastal ecosystems and coral reefs from pollution and overfishing, development of solar and renewable energy, managing tourism growth to protect the environment and cultural integrity and biodiversity conservation have been prioritized by SPREP.<sup>11</sup>

6. Pacific countries face a full range of geologic and climatic hazards including increase in population, waste (including solid, nuclear & chemicals) management, climate change and sea level rise, economic and institutional capacity. The Vanuatu islands are located in a seismically and volcanically active region and have high exposure to geologic hazards, including volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis, and landslides.<sup>12</sup> The key drivers of environmental change are a rapidly growing economy, a young population and rapid population growth, urban drift, land speculation, agricultural intensification, deforestation, inadequate fisheries and marine management, industry and trade, tourism, imported energy and transportation needs, extractive industries, and the global rise in greenhouse gas emissions.

7. Since 1991 (Table 1), the GEF has funded a total of US\$13.9 million in Vanuatu with US\$65.3 million co-financing, through 11 national projects. These include 4 climate change projects, 4 projects in biodiversity, 1 in land degradation and 1 multifocal area project. 6 projects have been either closed or completed (5 closed and 1 completed). UNEP has been implementing 5 projects with a total GEF grant of US\$0.94 million and co-financing of US\$0.15 million; UNDP has been implementing 4 projects totaling US\$9.5 million GEF grant with co-financing of US\$33.7 million; the World Bank is implementing 2 projects with US\$3.5 million GEF grant and co-financing of US\$31.4 million.

---

<sup>7</sup>[http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2012/03/26/000356161\\_20120326004949/Rend ered/PDF/E30040EA0P1126020Box367891B00353352.pdf](http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2012/03/26/000356161_20120326004949/Rend ered/PDF/E30040EA0P1126020Box367891B00353352.pdf), Website access: 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2012.

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.wttc.org/site\\_media/uploads/downloads/vanuatu2012.pdf](http://www.wttc.org/site_media/uploads/downloads/vanuatu2012.pdf), Website access: 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2012.

<sup>9</sup> <http://2001-2009.state.gov/g/oes/ocns/rsp/cta/12179.htm>, Website access: 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.sprep.org/About-Us>, Website access: 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.sprep.org/att/IRC/eCOPIES/Countries/Vanuatu/71.pdf> Website access: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

<sup>12</sup> [http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2010/02/25/000333037\\_20100225012651/Rend ered/PDF/532100WP0P1120110VANUATU1ASSESSMENT.pdf](http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2010/02/25/000333037_20100225012651/Rend ered/PDF/532100WP0P1120110VANUATU1ASSESSMENT.pdf) Website access: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

**Table 1: GEF Support to Vanuatu National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency**

Focal Area	Agency	GEF (US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)	Number of Projects
Climate Change	World Bank	3,486,363	31,360,000	34,846,363	2
	UNDP	8,230,000	32,451,217	40,681,217	2
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>11,716,363</b>	<b>63,811,217</b>	<b>75,527,580</b>	<b>4</b>
Biodiversity	UNEP	352,197	72,531	424,728	3
	UNDP	745,910	709,933	1,455,843	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,098,107</b>	<b>782,464</b>	<b>1,880,571</b>	<b>4</b>
Land Degradation	UNDP	500,000	596,200	1,096,200	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>596,200</b>	<b>1,096,200</b>	<b>1</b>
POPs	UNEP	393,000	20,000	413,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>393,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>413,000</b>	<b>1</b>
Multi Focal Area	UNEP	199,500	61,500	261,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>199,500</b>	<b>61,500</b>	<b>261,000</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,906,970</b>	<b>65,271,381</b>	<b>79,178,351</b>	<b>11</b>

Since 1991 (Table 2), the GEF funded a total of US\$62 million with US\$142.3 million co-financing in 11 regional projects executed through SPREP. These include 6 climate change projects, 3 projects in biodiversity, 1 in international waters and 1 in POPs. UNDP has been implementing 7 projects through SPREP with a total US\$44.5 million GEF grant and US\$80.7 million co-financing; UNEP has 2 projects totaling a US\$4.8 million GEF grant with US\$6.5 million co-financing; the World Bank is implementing 1 project with a US\$9.5 million GEF grant and US\$48.9 million co-financing; UNEP and FAO are jointly implementing one project having a US\$3.3 million GEF grant and US\$6 million co-financing. 7 out of the 21 SPREP member countries, namely Cook Island, Vanuatu, Fiji, Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Samoa and Tuvalu are involved in at least 9 SPREP-executed GEF projects.

**Table 2: GEF Support to SPREP Executed Regional Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency**

Focal Area	Agency	GEF (US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)	Number of Projects
Climate Change	UNDP	22,490,000	72,597,799	95,087,799	5
	World Bank/IFC	9,480,000	48,985,131	58,465,131	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,970,000</b>	<b>121,582,930</b>	<b>153,552,930</b>	<b>6</b>
Biodiversity	UNEP	4,772,415	6,541,192	11,313,607	2
	UNDP	10,000,000	0	10,000,000	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>14,772,415</b>	<b>6,541,192</b>	<b>21,313,607</b>	<b>3</b>
International Waters	UNDP	12,000,000	8,118,383	20,118,383	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>12,000,000</b>	<b>8,118,383</b>	<b>20,118,383</b>	<b>1</b>
POPs	UNEP/FAO	3,275,000	6,052,290	9,327,290	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3,275,000</b>	<b>6,052,290</b>	<b>9,327,290</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>62,017,415</b>	<b>142,294,795</b>	<b>204,312,210</b>	<b>11</b>

## Objectives of the evaluation

8. The purpose of the Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation is to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of how GEF is implemented in Vanuatu and more broadly in the Pacific region, report on results from projects and assess how these projects are linked to national and regional environmental and sustainable development agendas as well as to the GEF mandate of

generating global environmental benefits within its focal areas. This evaluation has the following objectives:

- i. independently evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency**<sup>13</sup> of the GEF support from several points of view: national and regional environmental frameworks and decision-making processes; the GEF mandate and the achievement of global environmental benefits; and GEF policies and procedures;
- ii. assess the **effectiveness** and **results**<sup>14</sup> of completed projects aggregated at the focal area;
- iii. provide additional evaluative evidence to other evaluations conducted or sponsored by the Office; and
- iv. provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies; (2) the countries on their participation in, or collaboration with the GEF; and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF funded projects and activities.

9. The performance of the GEF national portfolio in Vanuatu and the portfolio of SPREP executed regional projects will be assessed in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and of the contributing factors to this performance. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs do not aim at evaluating or rating the performance of the GEF agencies, partners or national governments.

### Key Evaluation Questions

10. GEF CPEs are guided by a set of key questions that should be answered based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will be guided by the following key questions:

#### *Effectiveness, results and sustainability*

- 1) What are the results (outcomes and impacts) of GEF support at the project level and at the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area? What are the results of GEF support at the regional level?
- 2) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?
- 3) Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?
- 4) Has the GEF support contributed to build adequate institutional capacity to allow direct execution at national level in the Pacific region?

---

<sup>13</sup> **Relevance:** the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; **Efficiency:** the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

<sup>14</sup> **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; **Results:** in GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects; **Sustainability:** the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

- 5) Has the GEF support facilitated the channeling of additional resources for climate financing that up-scales the efforts for achieving global environmental benefits in the Pacific region?
- 6) Has the GEF support been effective in producing tangible concrete results (in terms of outputs, outcomes, and impacts) that go beyond foundational activities?

### ***Relevance***

- 7) Is GEF support relevant to the Vanuatu and other Pacific countries' sustainability development agendas and environmental priorities, in particular for what concerns sustainable land management and land degradation?
- 8) Is the GEF support to Vanuatu and more broadly to the Pacific region relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in biodiversity, greenhouse gases, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- 9) Is GEF support relevant to the Vanuatu and other Pacific countries' development needs and challenges?
- 10) Are the GEF and its agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Vanuatu and more broadly in the Pacific region?
- 11) Are Vanuatu and other Pacific countries supporting the GEF mandate and focal areas programs and strategies with their own resources and/or with the support from other donors?

### ***Efficiency***

- 12) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in the Pacific region?
- 13) What are the roles, and level of coordination and communication, among stakeholders in project development and implementation, particularly national and regional institutions?
- 14) What are the synergies for GEF programming and implementation (including among GEF focal areas) among: GEF agencies, national agencies and regional institutions; GEF projects; and other donor-supported projects and activities in the Pacific region?
- 15) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency?

11. Each of these questions is complemented by a set of indicators, potential sources of information, evaluation tools and methods described in the evaluation matrix presented in Annex 1. The matrix contains a tentative list of indicators or basic data, potential sources of information, and methodology components.

### **Scope and Limitations**

12. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the two portfolios under analysis (Vanuatu national and SPREP regional projects) at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all GEF Agencies in all focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the Small Grants Programme (SGP). The evaluation will look at all the Vanuatu national projects and all the SPREP-executed projects, be them full size, medium size or enabling activities, with a view to continue, deepen and enrich the comparative analysis started with the OECS Cluster CPE, by analyzing strengths

and weaknesses of the national (i.e. the Vanuatu national projects portfolio) and the regional (i.e. the SPREP-executed regional projects portfolio) project modalities in SIDS contexts.

13. The stage of the project will determine the expected focus of the analysis (see Table 3).

**Table 3. Focus of evaluation according to stage of project**

Project Status	Focus		On a exploratory basis	
	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Results</i>
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	Not applicable	Not applicable

14. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 the GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking national portfolio formulation exercises on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. These country programming efforts are rather recent, which limits their usefulness in country portfolio evaluations that look back up to the start of GEF operations, i.e. sometimes 20 years back. This is why generally CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the standard CPE evaluation framework described here will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF country portfolio.

15. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, by questions on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

16. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Progress towards impact of a representative sample of mature enough projects (i.e. completed at least since 2 years) will be looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

17. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes another focus of the evaluation. This includes a historic assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF agencies country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

## Methodology

18. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will be conducted by staff of the GEF Evaluation Office and national and international consultants, i.e. the Evaluation Team, led by a Task Manager from the GEF Evaluation Office. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and GEF.

19. The selected firm qualifies under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and its undertaking the evaluation does not raise concerns related to conflict of interest. Operational Focal Points in Vanuatu and in a selection of SPREP member countries will be asked to act as resource persons in facilitating the CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

20. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
- Country and regional levels: national and regional sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency level: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
- Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by the independent evaluation offices of GEF agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF Operational Focal Points and all other relevant government departments, regional organizations, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the countries), GEF agencies, SGP and the national UN conventions' Focal Points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Field visits to selected project sites;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

21. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national and regional priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental benefits) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

22. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the national and regional context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

23. The Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation will include visits to project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

24. Quality assurance will be performed internally by the Office at key stages of the evaluation process. Issues to be covered include: a) adherence of the interim and final evaluation products to these TORs; b) soundness of the evaluation methods and tools used and the processes followed; c) solidity and completeness of the evidence base underpinning the findings and conclusions; and d) concreteness and feasibility of the recommendations formulated in the final report. Possibilities to have the final report externally peer reviewed by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) under its Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Office are being explored.

### Process and Outputs

25. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on an initial GEF Evaluation Office visit to Vanuatu and to SPREP Headquarters in Samoa in October 2012, conducted with the purpose of scoping the evaluation and identifying key issues to be included in the analysis. The mission was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation, while at the same introduce the selected consultants to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the Evaluation Team will complete the following tasks:

- Complete the ongoing **literature review** to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence;
- Prepare specific inputs to the CPE, including:
  - the **GEF Portfolio Database** which describes all GEF support activities in Vanuatu and all the SPREP-executed regional projects, basic information (GEF agency, focal area, implementation status), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
  - **Regional Environmental Legal Framework** which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in the Pacific region. This document will be based on information on national and regional environmental legislation, environmental policies of each government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by Vanuatu and other Pacific countries presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
  - **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment** which provides an assessment of the countries' contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents.
  - **Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI)** field studies of one regional and one national project completed since at least 2 years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff.
- Conduct **field visits** of ongoing national and regional projects, selected in consultation with the Office staff.



- Conduct the evaluation analysis and **triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done internally by the Evaluation Team at the end of the evaluation data gathering and analysis phase. The aim will be to consolidate the evidence gathered so far and fill in any eventual information and analysis gaps before getting to findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations. Conduct a **Final Consultation Workshop** for the Government and national and regional stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the main Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation key preliminary findings, to be included in an **Aid-Mémoire**.<sup>15</sup> The workshop will also be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team;
- Prepare a **Draft Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation** report, which incorporates comments received at the final consultation workshop. The draft report will be sent out to external peer reviewers before circulation to stakeholders;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the **Final Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation** report.<sup>16</sup>

26. As was the case during the scoping mission, the national GEF Operational Focal Points will assist the Evaluation Team and consultants with the identification of key people to be interviewed, communication with relevant government departments, support to organize interviews, field visits and meetings, and identification of main documents. The GEF agencies will be requested to assist the Evaluation Team and the selected consultants regarding their specific GEF-supported projects and activities, including identification of key project and agency staff to be interviewed and provision of project documentation and data.

### Evaluation Key Milestones

27. The evaluation commenced in October 2012 and is expected to be completed in May 2013. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

Milestone	Deadline
Finalization and disclosure of the Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation specific TORs/evaluation matrix	December 10, 2012
Finalization and analysis of the GEF portfolio database	December 21, 2012
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	December 22, 2012
Regional Environmental Legal Framework	December 22, 2012
ROtI field studies	February 8, 2013
Data collection/interviews and project review protocols	February 8, 2013
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling	February 20-22, 2012
Final consultation workshop	March 13, 2013
Draft Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation report sent out to stakeholders for comments	April 20, 2013
Incorporation of comments received in a final Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation report	May 30, 2013
Country response to the evaluation	June 20, 2013

<sup>15</sup> It was agreed during the scoping mission to hold the workshop in Vanuatu.

<sup>16</sup> The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

## Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation Report Outline

28. The report will be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

### CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

- Background
- Objectives, Scope and Methodology
- Conclusions
  - Results and effectiveness
  - Relevance
  - Efficiency
- Recommendations

### CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

- Background
- Objectives and Scope
- Methodology
- Limitations

### CHAPTER 3. Context

- Vanuatu and SPREP countries under analysis: general description
- Environmental resources in key GEF support areas
- The environmental legal and policy framework in Vanuatu and Pacific region
- The Global Environment Facility: general description

### CHAPTER 4. The GEF Vanuatu and SPREP portfolio

- Defining the GEF portfolio
- Activities in the GEF portfolio
- Evolution of GEF support by focal area and by GEF agency
- Corporate, regional and global programs

### CHAPTER 5. Results of GEF support

- Global environmental impacts
- Catalytic, up-scaling and replication effects
- Institutional sustainability and capacity building
- Results by GEF focal area

### CHAPTER 6. Relevance of GEF support

- Relevance of GEF Support to the countries' sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities
- Relevance of GEF Support to national and regional development priorities and challenges
- Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits

### CHAPTER 7. Efficiency of GEF support

- Time, effort, and financial resources required for project formulation
- Coordination and synergies
- Monitoring and evaluation for project adaptive management

Roles and responsibilities among different stakeholders in project implementation  
The national GEF Focal Point mechanisms  
Learning

ANNEXES

- A. Country response
- B. Country-specific Terms of Reference
- C. Evaluation matrix
- D. Interviewees
- E. Sites visited
- F. Workshop participants
- G. GEF portfolio in Vanuatu and SPREP
- H. Bibliography

## ANNEX 1

## Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation - Evaluation Matrix

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
<b>Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability</b>			
1. What are the results (outcomes and impacts) of GEF support at the: a. project level b. aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area? c. regional level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project outcomes and impacts</li> <li>- Existing ratings for project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings) of expected vs actual results</li> <li>- Effectiveness of regional approaches vs national projects</li> <li>- Changes in global benefits indexes and other global environmental indicators</li> <li>- Project replication and/or integration into host national agency program</li> <li>- Integration and mainstreaming of measures addressing environmental issues with the national and regional development agenda and policy frameworks</li> <li>- Regional and national contributions to GEF related MEA's</li> <li>- Catalytic effect (i.e. replication and up-scaling)</li> <li>- Adequate accounting in project design for risks specific to Pacific countries and the region as a whole</li> <li>- Effective regional participation in international fora (COP's UN, Forum, Commonwealth Leaders Dialogue, etc)</li> <li>- Regional frameworks for multi-jurisdictional environmental issues (e.g. Oceanscapes, migratory species, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.)</li> <li>- Data from projects financed by other donors and or by the government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- ROI studies</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Literature review</li> <li>- Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</li> <li>- Regional Environmental Legal Framework</li> </ul>
2. Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project design, preparation and implementation have incorporated lessons from previous projects within and outside the GEF</li> <li>- Quality and application of M&amp;E and knowledge management systems and tools</li> <li>- Replication of GEF projects by other donors, organizations or governments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.)</li> <li>- GEF Secretariat</li> <li>- GEF agencies' staff</li> <li>- NGO staff, projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> <li>- Regional organizations' staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- ROI studies</li> </ul>
3. Is GEF support effective in producing results which last in time and continue after project completion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability of financial resources</li> <li>- Availability of technical capacity</li> <li>- Stakeholders' ownership</li> <li>- Existence of an adequate institutional and legal framework</li> <li>- Mainstreaming of projects into national policies and programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.)</li> <li>- GEF agencies' staff</li> <li>- Executing agencies' staff</li> <li>- Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- ROI studies</li> </ul>
4. Has the GEF support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing ability of institutions and organizations to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related documentation (project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: project review</li> </ul>

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
<p>contributed to build adequate institutional capacity to allow direct execution at national level in the Pacific region?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- originate and drive project development process</li> <li>- Increasing ability of government to respond to and effectively manage environmental issues</li> <li>- Increasing ability of government to implement international environmental conventions</li> <li>- Increasing use of local or regional technical capacity, as appropriate</li> <li>- Share of investment focused on local / regional capacity development (individual or institutional)</li> <li>- Level of public awareness and engagement on globally significant environmental issues</li> </ul>	<p>document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GEF agencies' staff</li> <li>- Executing agencies' staff</li> <li>- Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> <li>- Regional organizations' staff</li> </ul>	<p>protocols</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Regional Environmental Legal Framework</li> </ul>
<p>5. Has the GEF support facilitated the channeling of additional resources for climate financing that up-scales the efforts for achieving global environmental benefits in the Pacific region</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate financing mechanisms resulting from GEF initiatives</li> <li>- New climate financing approaches developed within the region and at national level</li> <li>- Input from the region into international fora to develop and access new financing mechanisms for climate work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases</li> <li>- Executing agencies' staff</li> <li>- Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> <li>- Regional organizations' staff</li> <li>- Regional policies, programs and positional statements at international fora</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Literature review</li> </ul>
<p>6. Has the GEF support been effective in producing tangible concrete results (in terms of outputs, outcomes, and impacts) that go beyond foundational activities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project outcomes and impacts</li> <li>- Effectiveness of different GEF modalities</li> <li>- Catalytic effect (i.e. replication and up-scaling)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects' staff, local stakeholders, local and national government officials</li> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- ROI studies</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Literature review</li> </ul>

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
<b>Relevance</b>			
7. Is GEF support relevant to the Vanuatu and Pacific region sustainability development agendas and environmental priorities, in particular for what concerns sustainable land management and land degradation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coherence of GEF support with countries' environmental priorities</li> <li>- Linkage of GEF support to national environmental action plans (NEAP); National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP); national communications to UNFCCC; POPs National Implementation Plans (NIPs); National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA); Sustainable Land Management and Land Degradation as well as relevant regional strategies and action plans, etc.</li> <li>- Coherence of GEF support with regional environmental priorities, regional action plans and policies</li> <li>- Level of GEF funding compared to other ODA in the environment sector</li> <li>- Level of country and/or regional stakeholders ownership in GEF-supported project concept origin, design and implementation</li> <li>- Existence of mechanisms/processes within Vanuatu and SPREP countries and within the region to coordinate GEF support and ensure relevance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relevant literature: country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans</li> <li>- GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN conventions, etc.)</li> <li>- Small Grants Programme country and regional strategies</li> <li>- Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</li> <li>- Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases</li> <li>- Available databases (international and regional as WB, OECD, etc., and national, i.e. dept of statistics, other)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Literature review</li> <li>- Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis</li> <li>- Desk review: project related documentation</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Regional Environmental Legal Framework</li> </ul>
8. Is the GEF support to Vanuatu and Pacific region linked to the different global environmental benefits (i.e. biodiversity, GHG, international waters, POPs, land degradation, etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relation of project outcomes and impacts to RAF / STAR Global Environmental Benefit index (for biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation) and to other global indicators for POPs, land degradation and international waters</li> <li>- Relation of project outcome and impacts to threats identified by non-GEF sources to globally significant environmental resources</li> <li>- Linkage of GEF support to national implementation of conventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National convention action plans, RAF, STAR, BD scorecard, etc.</li> <li>- Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases</li> <li>- Local and national government officials, GEF agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Regional Environmental Legal Framework</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Global Environmental Benefits Assessment</li> </ul>
9. Is GEF support relevant to the Vanuatu and more broadly to the Pacific region development needs and challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National development plans and regional plans</li> <li>- Linkage of GEF support to national implementation of conventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National development plans and regional action plans</li> <li>- National and regional positional statements at international fora</li> <li>- Plans and strategies for support by donors and development partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Literature review</li> <li>- Websites consultation</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultations</li> </ul>
10. Are the GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Vanuatu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National development plans and regional plans</li> <li>- Linkage of GEF support to national implementation of conventions</li> <li>- Relation of project outcome and impacts to threats identified by non-GEF sources to globally significant environmental resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National development plans and regional action plans</li> <li>- National and regional positional statements at international fora</li> <li>- Plans and strategies for support by donors and development partners</li> <li>- National convention action plans, RAF,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Literature review</li> <li>- Websites</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultations: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Regional Environmental Legal</li> </ul>

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
and more broadly in the Pacific region?		STAR, BD scorecard, etc. - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases	Framework
11. Are Vanuatu and other Pacific countries supporting the GEF mandate and focal areas programs and strategies with their own resources and/or with the support from other donors?	- Regional and national actions plans identifying GEF focal areas for implementation - Project outcomes including co-financings from governments and/or support from other donors	- National development plans and regional action plans - National and regional positional statements at international fora - Plans and strategies for support by donors and development partners - National convention action plans, RAF, STAR, BD scorecard, etc. - Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, GEF agencies' project databases	- Literature review - Websites consultation - Stakeholder consultations: individual interviews, focus groups - Desk review: project review protocols - Regional Environmental Legal Framework
<b>Efficiency</b>			
12. How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in the Pacific region?	- Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps) (also linked with timeliness of relevance), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities, etc. - Adequacy of budgets for management, implementation, and follow-up - Level of project oversight from GEF agencies - Adequacy of communication of GEF policies and procedures (and of changes as they occur) - Timeliness of disbursements - Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations - GEF funding vs. co-financing	- Project related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, TE reviews, etc.), PMIS, agencies' project databases - GEF Secretariat - GEF agencies' staff - Executing agencies' staff - Regional organizations' staff - Local and national government officials, donors, NGOs, local stakeholders	- Desk review: GEF portfolio analysis - Desk review: project review protocols - Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits
13. What are the roles, and level of coordination and communication, among stakeholders in project development and implementation, particularly between national and regional institutions?	- Balance between national and regional components and activities of regional projects - Extensiveness of engagement in different steps of the process - Balance of use of external vs. national / regional technical capacity - Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors - Level of participation of relevant stakeholders throughout project cycle - Levels of coordination and communication between GEF projects, including between national and regional projects - Existence and efficiency of a national/regional	- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.) - Project staff, government officials - GEF Secretariat - GEF agencies' staff - Executing agencies' staff - Regional organizations' staff	- Desk review: project review protocols - Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups - Project field visits

Key Question	Indicators / Data	Sources of Information	Methodology
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- coordination mechanism for GEF support</li> <li>- Balance of competing regional interests</li> <li>- Examples of adaptive management / flexibility</li> </ul>		
<p>14. What are the synergies for GEF programming and implementation (including among GEF focal areas) among:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. GEF agencies;</li> <li>b. national agencies and regional institutions; and</li> <li>c. GEF support and other donors' for GEF support in programming and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination and complementarity between projects of different institutions</li> <li>- Effective communication and technical support between national and regional institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.)</li> <li>- Regional, national and local government officials</li> <li>- GEF Secretariat</li> <li>- GEF agencies' staff</li> <li>- Executing agencies' staff</li> <li>- Regional organizations' staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> </ul>
<p>15. What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) play in increasing project adaptive management and overall efficiency?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of M&amp;E information</li> <li>- Quality and level of adaptive management applied to projects and programs</li> <li>- Project compliance with GEF and GEF agency M&amp;E policies</li> <li>- Existence of needs or gaps in M&amp;E coverage for regional approaches</li> <li>- Level of independence, quality and timeliness of external evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project related reviews, (implementation reports, mid-term reviews, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.)</li> <li>- Local and national government</li> <li>- GEF Secretariat staff</li> <li>- GEF agencies' staff</li> <li>- Executing agencies' staff</li> <li>- Regional organizations' staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Desk review: project review protocols</li> <li>- Desk review: meta-analysis of evaluation reports</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultation: individual interviews, focus groups</li> <li>- Project field visits</li> </ul>