

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3101	
GEF Agency project ID		2162	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PACC)	
Country/Countries		Cooks Islands; Federated States of Micronesia; Samoa and Vanuatu; Fiji; Papua New Guinea, Palau and Solomon Islands; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Niue; Tonga; Tokelau; and Tuvalu	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-8	
Executing agencies involved		Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (from Ausaid); International Union for the Conservation of Nature; United Nations Institute for Training and Research; South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission	
Private sector involvement		German Federal Enterprise for International Cooperation (GIZ); University of Hawaii	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 14, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2012	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.35	Not given
	Co-financing	.1	Not given
GEF Project Grant		13.13	13.13
Co-financing	IA own	.1	.08
	Government		.38
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		7.86 <sup>1</sup>
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		13.48	13.13
Total Co-financing		44.28 <sup>2</sup>	24.11 <sup>3</sup>
Total project funding		57.76	37.24

<sup>1</sup> These funds were additional co-financing secured through the PACC+ mechanism. PACC+ was funded through the Australian Government and was intended to support and scale-up PACC activities.

<sup>2</sup> The project document does not provide a clear breakdown of co-financing figures at endorsement.

<sup>3</sup> The TE does not provide a clear breakdown of co-financing figures at completion, except for the implementing agency and government contributions, in addition to PACC+. It is therefore unclear where the remaining \$15.79 million came from.

(GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		
<b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>		
TE completion date	May 2015 <sup>4</sup>	
Author of TE	SHM Fakhruddin; Shin Furuno; and Vincent Lefebvre	
TER completion date	1/27/2016	
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		S	--	MU
M&E Implementation		S	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Execution		S	--	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MU

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Neither the project documents nor the Terminal Evaluation (TE) cite Global Environmental Objectives.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the PACC project was to “enhance the capacity of the participating countries to adapt to climate change, including variability, in selected key development sectors” (PD pg. 88). The original 13 participating countries included: Cooks Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa, Vanuatu, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Niue, Marshall Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu.

### 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

During the 6-month inception phase, modifications were made to the design of the PACC project. Additional activities and outputs were added which focused on capacity building and institutional strengthening (TE pg. 4). The development objective and project outcomes, however, remained the same.

Additionally, in 2011, AusAid and UNDP signed an agreement<sup>4</sup> to scale up project activities through “PACC+.” PACC+ targeted the original 13 countries plus Tokelau. Ultimately, Fiji, the Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, and Palau did not receive support from PACC+ (TE pg. 4).

<sup>4</sup> The TE was completed before the end of the project (PACC+ closed in June 2015).

#### 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses the project outcomes to be relevant for the GEF-4 climate change strategies and country priorities, and this TER concurs. The project sought to reduce vulnerability and increase capacity to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change in the water resources, food security, and coastal management sectors (TE pg. 5). The project was therefore consistent with the GEF-4 strategic objective relating to adaptation, specifically Strategic Objective 8: *to support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change.*

The project was also consistent with the participating countries' national priorities for climate change adaptation across various sectors. In the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Tokelau, Tonga and Tuvalu, initiatives focused on water security (water capture and retention; purification and sanitation; and disaster preparedness) were a priority. In the Cook Islands, Vanuatu, and Samoa, enhancing the resilience of coastal areas to climate change was prioritized. In Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Palau, and Papua New Guinea, adapting agricultural practices to water logging and sea intrusions was prioritized (TE pgs. 27-30). The 13 participating Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are also signatories to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). At the time of the project design, the countries were in the implementation phase of their second national communications for the UNFCCC (PD pg. 60).

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project produced mixed results across targeted sectors (water resources, coastal management, and food security). Although all participating countries had drafted policies or plans integrating climate change, few were endorsed by the time of the TE, particularly in the coastal management sector. Additionally, adaptation measures at the demonstration sites were implemented

with varying degrees of success, and technical guidelines were produced largely for the water resources projects only. Overall, project outcomes were moderate when compared with expected results.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- **Outcome 1: Policy changes to deliver immediate vulnerability-reduction benefits in the context of emerging climate risks identified in all 13 PACC countries:**

Under this outcome, it was expected that all 13 countries would integrate climate change resilience into their national or sub-national policies in targeted sectors (water resources, coastal management, and food security). Additionally, as part of the PACC+ extension, gender was to be integrated into climate change policies at the national level. At the time of the TE, all participating countries had drafted or endorsed policies or plans integrating climate change. Integration was most successful in countries focused on water resources, such as the Marshall Islands and Nauru, which mainstreamed climate change into numerous national policies and action plans. On the other hand, countries focused on the coastal management sector had not progressed beyond the policy drafting stage, except for the Federated States of Micronesia where mainstreaming at the national level was highly successful. In countries focused on food security, mainstreaming results were mixed. Fiji and the Solomon Islands have endorsed national level climate change policies. In Palau and Papua New Guinea however, climate change policies were a relatively low priority, and as such, have yet to be endorsed (TE pgs. 18-19). In addition, gender was integrated into policies in five participating countries (Cook Islands; Marshall Islands; Niue; Nauru; and Tuvalu).

- **Outcome 2: Demonstration measures to reduce vulnerability in coastal areas and crop production (in Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands) and in water management (in Nauru, Niue, Tonga and Tuvalu) implemented:**

Under this outcome, it was expected that climate change adaptation measures would be demonstrated at each of the pilot sites and that comprehensive sectoral technical guidelines would be developed based on these demonstration projects. By June 2014, 14 types of adaptation measures had been implemented at the pilot sites (2014 PIR pg. 35). Adaptation measures in the water sector included the installation of reservoir tanks, solar water purifiers, rainwater catchment systems, salt-water reticulation systems, and solar water pumps. Targets for these measures were largely achieved, except in Nauru where the water purifiers were not functional and the salt-water reticulation systems were not installed (TE pgs. 20-21). Adaptation measures in the coastal management sector focused on hard structural defenses, such as wharf platforms, seawall extensions, and road culverts. The TE notes that while all countries were increasingly protected against existing risks, only the Federated States of Micronesia integrated climate projections into the design of their demonstration projects (TE pgs. 21-22). Adaptation measures in the food security sector focused on cultivated land area and/or crop diversity, and produced mixed results. Lastly, technical guidelines were published for the majority of water resource projects but not for coastal management or food security projects. In limited cases,

gender was integrated into technical guidelines as a result of PACC+ (i.e. Tuvalu and Tokelau) (TE pg. 36).

- **Outcome 3: Capacity to plan for and respond to changes in climate related risks improved:**  
The expected results under this outcome were not clearly defined, but it appears they included: (1) the development of comprehensive communication strategies at the country level, (2) the dissemination of demonstration project results, and (3) increased awareness of climate change impacts and adaptation measures at the local level. The TE notes that few resources were dedicated to the development of communication strategies and as a result, some plans were fully implemented (i.e. Federated States of Micronesia), some plans were partially implemented (i.e. Tuvalu), and some plans were not developed (i.e. Palau) (TE pgs. vii-ix). Similarly, dissemination and awareness raising activities (brochures, documentaries, newsletters, workshops, etc.) were implemented with varying degrees of success (TE pgs. 24-26).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The project’s administrative procedures were often inefficient, affecting the project’s timeline and implementation of activities. For example, the TE notes that the PACC funding mechanism at project start-up was not flexible enough for efficient resource allocation. This, combined with staffing issues at the management level (knowledge gaps and high turnover), led to substantial delays in implementation (TE pgs. vii-viii). A financial specialist was hired by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in 2013, and as a result, financial procedures were streamlined. The project received two extensions, extending the project completion date from 2012 to 2014. In 2011, the project secured co-financing when AusAID and UNDP signed an agreement for PACC+. PACC+ was also extended until June 2015 in order for the project to complete its activities (TE pg. 4).

At the country level, demonstration projects across sectors often experienced delays due to inadequate designs, revisions, and the poor management of contracts (TE pg. 30). In particular, the TE notes that costs associated with coastal management demonstration projects were often underestimated, resulting in the incompleteness of activities or the need to seek out additional funding (TE pg. ix). Overall, the deficiencies in administrative procedures and project implementation warrant a moderately unsatisfactory rating for project effectiveness.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for project sustainability, and this TER concurs. It should be noted however, that risks to sustainability vary significantly across country contexts.

#### **Financial Resources**

This TER assesses the sustainability of financial resources to be **Moderately Unlikely**. In countries where country ownership over project outcomes was high, continued funding was more likely. For example, the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Niue, all established climate change divisions or offices at the national and/or local government levels, with associated budgets. However, in countries where government support was low, such as Papua New Guinea, financial sustainability was not secure. Additionally, few business plans had been developed at the time of the TE for sustaining the outcomes of the demonstration projects, and therefore additional funding for training (Nauru) and the maintenance of infrastructure (Tonga, Cook Islands, the Solomon Islands, and Palau) was a significant concern (TE pgs. 36-39).

#### **Sociopolitical**

This TER assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**. The majority of stakeholders have expressed support for the long-term objectives of the project, particularly in countries where community engagement has been strong (i.e. Vanuatu, Palau, Niue, and Tuvalu). The TE does note a few examples where social engagement has been low. In Fiji, farmers' support for drainage activities has been low and in Tonga rainwater collection systems have not been well maintained by beneficiaries (TE pg. 37; 39).

#### **Institutional Framework and Governance**

This TER assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Moderately Likely**. As noted above, the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Niue, had established climate change divisions or offices. Additionally, all participating countries had drafted policies or plans for integrating climate change across various sectors. However, endorsement and implementation of these plans was mixed by the time of the TE. Technical know-how for maintaining project activities was also weak in some countries (i.e. Solomon Islands and Samoa) (TE pg. 38; 39).

#### **Environmental**

The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess environmental sustainability across participating countries. The TE does note that environmental sustainability is more likely in countries that utilized local and sustainable raw materials, such as in Niue, where water tanks were built from recyclable materials (TE pg. 37).

## 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Project Document (PD) cited \$44.28 million in expected co-financing across participating countries. The co-financing that materialized over the life of the project was significantly lower (\$24.11 million). The TE notes that some governments did not honor co-financing commitments because their priorities had shifted since the project preparation phase in 2006. The TE notes that lower levels of co-financing did affect the completion of some demonstration projects, including the Nauru salt-water reticulation system (TE pg. 9). It should be noted however, that PACC received an infusion of funding (\$7.86 million) through PACC+, which allowed the project to support and scale up activities in certain countries. For example, PACC+ funds were used to install solar water purifiers in Nauru; underground communal water tanks in Tokelau; and implement backyard farming activities in the Solomon Islands.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

PACC was extended twice due to delays associated with inadequate financial procedures and staffing issues (high turnover and knowledge gaps), shifting the completion date from 2012 to 2014. The TE notes that these delays affected the achievement and potential sustainability of project outcomes. In particular, the TE notes that the repeated delays in implementation affected the number of beneficiaries the project could reach (TE pg. ix). Additionally, some demonstration projects had not been completed by the time of TE, such as the floodgate rehabilitation project in Fiji, and the airstrip infrastructure and shoreline protection measures in Vanuatu. The TE also notes that delays have affected the project's ability to develop a comprehensive exit strategy (TE pg. x).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Ownership has been mixed across participating countries. National ownership was strong in countries such as the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, and Niue. Additionally, ownership at the community level was particularly strong in Vanuatu, Palau, Niue, Tuvalu, and Samoa. The TE notes that in countries where ownership was strong, sustainability was more likely (particularly regarding financial resources). On the other hand, activities had halted in Papua New Guinea at the time of the TE, largely due to weak country ownership.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The results framework outlined in the project document was insufficient for monitoring progress toward achieving project results. As the TE notes, the indicators provided were neither specific nor relevant (TE pg. 8). For example, the only indicator provided at the objective level was “number of references to vulnerability of the coastal, crop production and water sector to climate risks in policies, plans and projects” (PD pg. 88). This indicator is vague, but more importantly it does not capture changes in the capacity of participating countries to adapt to climate change. Baseline and target values are specified for each indicator, but as the indicators themselves are deficient, these values are largely irrelevant. The project document also included a generic M&E plan, including M&E activities (inception workshop, indicator data collection, annual reviews and reports, and a midterm and final evaluation), responsible parties, associated budget and timeframe. The project document provided an overall budget of \$410,000 for M&E, the bulk of which was to go toward the inception workshop, indicator data collection, and UNDP visits to field sites (Project Document pgs. 78-79).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. In 2010, the project design was revised to include new activities and outputs, and a new results framework was produced. However, the Midterm Review conducted in 2012 found that the M&E system was not functional and needed to be completely overhauled. As a result, the regional and country-level results frameworks were revised again. In early 2014 a comprehensive M&E training was provided to national coordinators. The national coordinators reported that the new results frameworks and training enhanced their ability to monitor the progress of the project. However, these changes occurred very late in the project's timeline. It should be noted that the national coordinators had been requesting training in M&E since the beginning of the project. Additionally, the coordinators were expected to oversee M&E activities in addition to covering the technical and administrative aspects of the project. Administrative assistants were hired in the last year of the project which



alleviated some the coordinators' workload, but again, this occurred very late in the project's timeline (TE pg. 12). Due to the fact that the project did not have a functioning M&E system until the last year of implementation, a rating of moderately unsatisfactory is justified for M&E implementation.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for Quality of UNDP Implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. As described above, the original project design was flawed and had to be revised twice, in 2010 and 2012. The TE notes that UNDP employed a "top-down" approach to the project's design, which resulted in asymmetric results across participating countries, as the design was more appropriate in some contexts than others (TE pg. xi). Furthermore, there was a significant time lapse between the project preparation phase and start-up which affected country ownership over the project outcomes. In some countries priorities had shifted by the time the project started and as a result, national governments did not honor their co-financing commitments (TE pg. 9). The project also experienced significant delays during project implementation, largely due to capacity deficits with the national coordinators and the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU). However, the TE does attribute some of the delays to a lack of flexibility in UNDP's financial and reporting procedures, along with repeated changes in reporting formats (TE pg. 16).

On the other hand, UNDP provided significant backstopping to the executing agency, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). As the TE notes, UNDP stepped in and undertook activities that should have been the sole responsibility of SPREP, such as defining multi-year and annual work plans, revising narrative and financial reports, overseeing payment and finance, recruiting experts, etc., when it became clear that SPREP needed significant support. In some cases, UNDP had to provide support directly to participating countries (TE pg. 17). In light of the significant role UNDP had to play in order to see this project through to completion, a rating of moderately satisfactory is justified for quality of project implementation.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
---	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The executing agency for the PACC and PACC+ projects was Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The project was managed by a Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) under the SPREP. As noted above, the RPMU lacked the capacity to effectively oversee project execution. RPMU staff were not dedicated exclusively to the PACC and PACC+ projects, and consultants were only hired on a temporary basis. In many cases, technical assistance was not provided to country staff in a timely manner which affected the interventions. For example, only one of the four countries engaged in coastal management received technical support for integrating climate change adaptation into their demonstration projects (TE pg. 15). As a result, most of the coastal management demonstration projects addressed existing risks but did not incorporate climate change adaptation measures (TE pg. 21). The TE does note that the capacity of the RPMU improved after the Midterm Review, in large part due to the hiring of a financial specialist and other support staff (TE pgs. 15-16).

The project was executed at the country-level by national coordinators, who also lacked the capacity in many cases to manage project activities. The national coordinators were overworked and didn't receive adequate support from the RPMU (TE pg. 10). The TE notes that there was unusually high staff turnover among national coordinators. Only 3 out of 14 coordinators stayed for the duration of the project, and some countries had a new coordinator every year (TE pg. 14).

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any changes in environmental status that occurred by the time of the TE. This is likely because demonstration projects across sectors (water resources, coastal management, and food security) had only recently been completed or were still being implemented by the time of the TE.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that that the project contributed to a reduction in waterborne disease in the Marshall Islands and Tokelau, due to the installation of solar water purifiers and sanitation training, respectively (TE pg. 30; 40). Additionally, in Tokelau, 90% of the targeted community had access to safe water and storage facilities by the time of the TE (TE pg. 31). In the Cook Islands, economic opportunities for exporting fish, agricultural products, and handicrafts have increased as a result of the wharf project. Local fisherman can access the harbor more often and damages to stock have decreased 20-30% (TE pg. 41). In the Federated States of Micronesia, households along the improved road have increased access to ancestral lands and farm lands, in addition to access to electricity, as a result of the project (TE pg. 41). In Palau, 16 crab farms have developed, increasing economic opportunities for residents (TE pg. 42).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE provides limited evidence of changes in awareness of climate change. In the Marshall Islands, the TE notes that 80% of targeted elementary school students improved their understanding of climate change impacts. In Tokelau, WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) programs were implemented and successfully increased community awareness on water and sanitation (TE pg. 24). In Fiji, 18 community members were trained in climate change (TE pg. 26). The TE provides greater evidence of infrastructure development. Adaptation measures in the water sector included the installation of reservoir tanks, solar water purifiers, rainwater catchment systems, salt-water reticulation systems, and solar water pumps. In the coastal management sector, hard structural defenses were built, such as wharf platforms, seawall extensions, and road culverts. In the food security sector, drainage was improved and solar dryers were tested.

b) Governance

At the time of the TE, all participating countries had drafted or endorsed policies or plans integrating climate change. Notable changes include the integration of climate change into state

development policies through the Kosrae State Law; Shoreline Management Plan; and Joint Action Plan on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction in the Federated States of Micronesia (TE pg. 41). Additionally, in Fiji the endorsed National Climate Change Policy is being implemented by the Climate Change Division (TE pg. 41). In the Solomon Islands, climate change has been mainstreamed into the Department of Agriculture Strategies and Corporate Plan 2013-2017 (TE pg. 41). In Nauru, the National Water and Sanitation Policy was endorsed and a Water Unit was established (TE pg. 37). In the Marshall Islands, climate change was integrated into national water resource policies and master plans (TE pg. 18).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the time of the evaluation.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

As mentioned above, the infusion of funds through PACC+ allowed the project to scale up project activities in the original 13 countries, plus Tokelau. For example, PACC+ funds were used to install solar water purifiers in Nauru; underground communal water tanks in Tokelau; and implement backyard farming activities in the Solomon Islands.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE states the following lessons learned (pgs. 43-45):

### Design

- PACC was at the time the first multi-country intervention tackling CC [climate change] through mainstreaming and demonstrating. This approach was new and for the sake of simplicity, a generic approach was adopted not taking into account country specificities (differences in capacity, remoteness, original degree of integration of CC into policies, etc.) This resulted in asymmetric results; some countries fared much better than others because the actual

interventions were more appropriate for certain countries than for others; there is need to recognize the specific political, institutional, managerial conditions of Pacific SIDS [Small Island Developing States] that require differentiated design and implementation approaches; new multi-country interventions should be designed adopting a bottom-up approach where specific country/community needs in relation to climate change, lead to the design of specific national project log frames. These are to be consolidated under a generic project or program, the skeleton structure of which might be agreed upon by all participating countries before national project design starts (with ensuing capacity building including in project design/formulation). [SEP]

- Demonstration projects were for the most part highly successful for evidencing successful climate change adaptation measures. These were largely influenced by the institutional and local context that allowed or not for Governmental and community support and ownership. These must be probed at inception phase using a participative approach for determining the most relevant measures. It would mean that the exact demonstration measures cannot be identified precisely during the formulation phase but at inception phase; this is most important as the original formulation phase and inception phase can be (heavily) time disconnected. [SEP]
- The demonstration projects took into consideration simple measures which provides clarity and efficiency; the project design did not take into account the environment around these demonstration projects that influenced the degree of success of demonstration measures; instead of choosing an issue, it would be more appropriate to adopt the log frame approach at design stage (cause/effect analysis, problem/solution tree) in order to increase the success rate of demonstration measures.
- CC mainstreaming into policies and strategies has been mostly successful. The actual implementation of the CC related elements of sectoral policies into annual government work plans and associated financial resources has been very limited; the ministries of budget or finance need to be included (with relevant financial resources) into new interventions when mainstreaming CC; they have the authority to allocate resources including related to CC in addition to feeding in policy dialogue with demo results (bottom-up).
- Government capacities remained weak in several countries; there is a need to integrate capacity building activities of line ministries staff into project design so that they can accompany project implementation and own project results because they were associated with it since inception and take over when activities are terminated.
- There were few exchanges of experience within countries between communities although these can accelerate divulgation of concepts and increase adoption rates (e.g. functioning water committee, visits of demonstration sites by other communities not initially involved, gender integration approach).

- Project design must allow for exchange of experiences between beneficiaries as a way to increase impact through awareness raising and foster replication.

### Implementation

- Multi-country interventions are complex operations requiring managerial, financial and technical expertise. PACC assumed that SPREP [Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme] supported by UNDP, would be able to provide that expertise. Both partners underestimated this issue which should have led to a project revision to divert more resources for building up the capacity of SPREP; in that sense, the recruitment of a financial officer that bypassed financial bottlenecks impeding the overall project implementation is evidence of the need for high level expertise for complex operations. The situation is similar with technical expertise: the lack of it resulted in poor performance at country level with ensuing delays and quality issues. Management difficulties were evidenced with the large number of changes in procedures and reporting formats. It is important that new multi-country projects take into account the weaknesses of implementing partners and that adequate budget is allocated for building up capacity and ensuring that technical, managerial and financial capacity allows for a smooth implementation; greater resources should be allocated to building the capacity of national management bodies and regional implementing partners. Overall, there should be a thorough analysis of what is the best combination of support suited to each country context and the sectors of interest. This should be based on a frank analysis of comparative advantage among regional agencies and development partners, *vis-à-vis* national implementation. Good regional examples of joint implementation are joint country work plans for CCA [climate change adaptation] and DRR [disaster risk reduction] with national governments and donors and development partners.
- Coordinators do not have sufficient time to undertake financial management and communications responsibilities and executing agencies cannot be expected to have adequate support capacity. The project formulation phase must assess those capacities so that adequate resources can be allocated before the project starts. A minimum of two staff on NPMUs [national project management units] is recommended, one as the project coordinator with finance expertise and the other for technical matter and possibly communication (or at least 2 staff combining the 4 functions). Subject to budget availability, additional communications support should be provided either at the regional level or within NPMUs.
- The PACC project suffered from low profile national coordinators in most if not all countries; the main disadvantages were difficulties into engaging high-level dialogue within line ministries or associated ministries for mainstreaming CC into Government structures as well as with other external stakeholders (donors, NGOs). Very few national coordinators had leverage into raising more funds for added impact. With exceptions, this bottom-up approach mostly did not succeed in PACC. One advantage of low profile coordinators with relevant (managerial and/or technical) expertise is that they were effective in following-up management decision of the implementing

partner and/or resolving on-the-ground technical issues. As most had not both qualities together, national implementation was difficult.

- Future interventions should consider investing additional financial resources into contracting high-profile coordinators with policy engagement and advocacy skills so that they to add value to the project by divulging project information, ‘lobbying’ for CC policy mainstreaming or potentially establishing partnerships for added impact or improving sustainability. Where highly-caliber coordinators are not readily available, implementing agencies should provide additional managerial and advocacy support to up-skill national coordinators. Implementing agencies could also facilitate greater engagement and ownership from national agencies by better securing co-finance and in-kind contributions.

### M&E

- The governance system of PACC (yearly MPR and PB) functioned well: MPRs [multi-partite reviews] were effective platforms for showing demonstration project progress, evidencing challenges and exchanging process information on how best to implement national projects. PBs [project boards] were more formal structures used for decision making. SPREP might have played a more prominent role in it. The implementation issues did not surface quickly enough at MPR or PB levels; many issues were discussed on an ad-hoc basis. Hence, a mechanism to collect and above all share information on operational issues should be set up for future interventions. Multi-country projects should adopt similar governance structures in the future.
- While M&E at the regional level functioned satisfactorily, national and local level oversight was relatively weak. There is therefore a need to increase national capacity for M&E and strengthen national steering committees and coordination mechanisms to encourage cross-government collaboration on adaptation initiatives. Most coordinators interviewed mentioned the need for M&E and log frame training at the beginning of the project. National oversight committees often did not meet – suggesting the need for greater institutional capacity support.

### 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations at the “project level” (TE pg. xiii). For specific recommendations at the country level, please refer to pages 45-53 of the TE.

#### Technical Recommendations

- V&A [vulnerability and adaptation assessment] and CBA [cost-benefit analysis] should be systematic at project design
- There is a need to look beyond adaptation measures and consider non-climate drivers behind exposure, vulnerability and risk
- Adequate documentation should be made available for other countries / stakeholders through dissemination

- Use of local human resources and on-the-job training should be prioritized to enhance ownership and empowerment so that sustainable local maintenance and knowledge transfer mechanisms are put in place
- The 'ridge to reef' concept should be considered more systematically for future project designs.

#### Mainstreaming and Management Recommendations

- Local policy and institutional environment should be carried out prior to implementation so as to identify opportunities for policy mainstreaming
- More proactive cross-agency oversight should be considered to enhance institutional coordination
- Future projects should keep emphasizing specific topics/domains of interventions but allow mechanisms for secondary support through other relevant sectors.

#### Partnership Arrangement Recommendations

- Prior to project formulation, a comprehensive assessment of the comparative advantages of potential stakeholders is necessary so as to enhance potential partnerships
- Projects should be more aligned with national systems and interventions for ownership enhancement, taking into consideration institutional ethos
- Detailed planning and accompanying resources are required at project inception stage prior to implementation
- Communication and knowledge management should be adequately resourced so that efficient (national and regional level) communication strategies are devised
- PMU [Project Management Unit] should focus on the timeliness of project delivery through prioritization of activities, the provision of adequate technical expertise.



## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Project results are presented in a piece-meal, confusing manner. Results are assessed at the outcome level, and then in a separate section, by country. Some results are buried in the sustainability section. The information presented is often redundant.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Ratings not substantiated by evidence provided and are inflated across categories. For example, the TE states that the project's efficiency was "low," however it provides a rating of Satisfactory. The report is also inconsistent at times.	<b>U</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability is adequately addressed, except in terms of environmental risks to project outcomes.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are comprehensive and supported by the analysis presented in the report.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not provide a breakdown of the co-financing figures it presents.	<b>MU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides an accurate description of the project's M&E design and implementation, but this TER largely disagrees with its conclusions.	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).