1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3819	
GEF Agency project ID		609766	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Forestry and protected area management in Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu and Niue	
Country/Countries		Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu, and Niue	
Region		Pacific Islands	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP3- Protected Area Network, SP4 – Policy, SP5 - Market	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment (Fiji), the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Samoa), the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources (Vanuatu), and the Department of Environment (Niue)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		ACIAR (Australia), Birdlife International (Fiji), cChange (Fiji), Wildlife Conservation Society (Fiji), and Women in Business Development Inc (WIBDI)	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 23, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2015	
Actual date of project completion		July 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.22	0
	Co-financing	0.29	0
GEF Project Grant		6.28	5.30
Co-financing	IA own	1.51	1.51
	Government	2.19	2.28
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.95	1.22
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	7.14	7.66
Total GEF funding		6.50	5.30
Total Co-financing		12.08	12.67

Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	18,575,848	17,965,220
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	October 2017	
Author of TE	Anne Woodfine, William Jackson, and Lavinia Monforte	
TER completion date	March 14, 2018	
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula	
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	MS	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU	-	ML
M&E Design		MS	-	S
M&E Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	-	MU
Quality of Execution		S	-	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environment Objective is "to strengthen biodiversity conservation and reduce forest and land degradation" (TE pg 7).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is "to enhance the sustainable livelihoods of local communities living in and around protected areas" (TE pg 7). The project intended to achieve its objective through six components, as follows:

Component 1: Policy, legal and institutional arrangements effectively support biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management;

Component 2: Effective and sustainable in situ biodiversity conservation areas established and/or strengthened;

Component 3: Stakeholders have the capacity to plan, implement and monitor biodiversity conservation and sustainable land and forest management;

Component 4: Sustainable financing of protected areas in place through a mixture of local income-generation, government finance and innovative measures;

Component 5: Marketing of biodiversity goods and services and sustainable land management practices result in improved livelihoods of local communities; and

Component 6: Poor land-use practices and forest and land degradation reduced or reversed in target areas.

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

There were no changes to the objectives or activities during implementation.

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 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The project is relevant to GEF 4 Strategic Priorities 3, 4 &5, to catalyze sustainability of protected area systems, mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes, seascapes and sectors, and upscale sustainable land management (SLM) investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods.

The project is also consistent with country priorities. The strengthening of protected area management is relevant to Fiji's Strategic Development Plan for 2003-2005, and Fiji's National Assessment Plan which sets the guiding principles of environmental sustainability. It is aligned to the government's Strategy for the Development of Samoa, and Vanuatu's National Biodiversity and Action Plan, 1999. The project is also consistent with Niue's Integrated Strategic Plan as well as its priorities towards CBD and UNCCD (CEO Endorsement pg 10).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rated effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory and the TER agrees with the rating as it achieved the intended targets of two components, and moderately achieved the targets outcomes of the remaining three components. The project was able to build capacity in biodiversity conservation and SLM, and ensured adequate awareness for communities on SLM and forest management to reduce pressure on the forests. With some shortcomings, the project also marketed biodiversity goods, consolidated the protected area network, and supported legal and policy reforms. This TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the effectiveness of the project. Below is a detailed analysis per component.

<u>Component 1: Legal, institutional, and policy reform</u>:

This component was moderately successful as it achieved two out of three outputs. The project identified gaps and overlaps in legal and policy frameworks and supported the analysis through a stakeholder consultation. In Fiji, the project undertook reviews of the policy, legal and institutional

arrangements relevant to Protected Areas, and identified the need for a biodiversity protected areas framework. A review by IUCN produced a comprehensive analysis and recommendations that would provide a very useful framework for reform of policy and law. This "'set the scene' for change that recognizes protected areas in law and policy and, perhaps most importantly, focuses on the key role played by customary land owners" (TE pg 31). In Samoa, Vanuatu and Niue, the project activities helped in raising awareness and provided capacity building for implementation of new legislation. For example, in Niue, the project was successful in "building awareness of the need to move ahead on legislative reform, strengthening the capacity of the Department of Environment and encouraging support from other departments and agencies in the country" (TE pg 32). In Samoa and Vanuatu, the project mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management (SLM) in other sectors. In Samoa, Forestry Management Regulations were drafted under the new Forestry Management Act of 2011, which puts in place a legal framework based on the principles of sustainable forest management (TE pg 33). However, some of these legislative reform efforts were over-ambitious, as many of the proposed Bills are yet to be endorsed to become a Laws.

Component 2: Extending and consolidating the Protected Area Network:

This component aimed to establish effective and sustainable in situ biodiversity conservation in PAs. The project was successful in raising awareness and undertook consultation with local communities to develop approaches for community-based conservation. "The concept of community-based conservation has gained relevance over the life of the project and this is an important pre-requisite for sustainability beyond the project", however, management plans were not finalized due to various reasons such as natural disaster in Fiji, and in other areas the communities were not convinced of the benefits of conservation (TE pg 37). The project also faced shortcomings in increasing the area under formal/legal protection by 41,559 ha, which is substantially less than planned. The concept of PAs remains highly relevant to all sites, but it was not adequate due to complexity of customary land tenure and in some cases in Fiji there was lack of legal basis for landowners to establish community conserved areas (TE pg 34).

Component 3: Capacity building in biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management:

To build capacity in governments, the project provided information about biodiversity conservation at the national and local levels of project sites, and developed awareness raising campaigns. In Samoa, the project prepared a DVD for TV broadcast and showings to local communities without televisions on the manumea and ecological surveys in the Taga and Gataivai lowland, whereas in Vanuatu, the project supported a wide range of environmental activities at local and national level, including Environment Week (TE pg 40). In Fiji, the project supported development of an education resource kit to support the primary school curriculum for elementary science, and provided Environmental Law enforcement training for Fiji Forest and Environment Officers, and ecotourism training to villagers. However, due to delays in implementation, the project carried out only one baselines survey after the mid-term evaluation and subsequently they were not followed up by repeated surveys, which made it difficult to assess the change over time (TE pg 39).

Component 4: Mechanisms for sustained protected area financing:

The project was not very successful in achieving the targets under this component. The project aimed to strengthen financing for Protected Areas through a mix of local income-generation, government finance and innovative measures. The TE states that in Fiji, "long-term term financing needs for protected area management have not yet been determined, nor have potential new financing mechanisms been explored. Marketing materials to support fundraising initiatives have not yet been developed" (TE pg 43). In Samoa and Vanuatu, no progress was made, but in Niue, a study generated several ideas to support the conservation business plan especially in relation to financing ecotourism. The project also intended to operationalize Sovi Basin Trust Fund, but "the plans for the project to contribute to funds to the Sovi Basin Trust Fund have not been realised due to administrative complications" (TE pg 44). Under this component, the project dropped an output to strengthen local capacity and policy framework for PES in Fiji because of complexity of tasks in the budget and limited time.

Component 5: Marketing of biodiversity goods and services for improved livelihoods of local communities:

This component was moderately satisfactory as there were some improvements in livelihoods of people connected to the project. For example in Fiji, Department of Forest's Park Service helped communities around Tomaniivi with the clearing of the trail to Mt Tomaniivi after it was seriously damaged with windfall and landslides during Tropical Cyclone Winston. As hikers frequently use the trail, the access and guiding fees, and provision of food and accommodation has become a source of income. In Vanuatu, ecotourism assessments studies have been undertaken, and the government has been supporting training for community members and in building bungalows for tourists to spend their nights at Bay Homo Islands (TE pgs 46-47). However, for the output on scaling up and sustaining organically certified food production in Samoa, the project was not successful in creating a positive impact for income of local communities. The linkages to markets of organic produce were not well established, and as the certification process is lengthy, many farmers were skeptical about the likely return on such a high investment of their time to obtain certification (TE pg 45).

Component 6: Sustainable land management (SLM) in forest margins/ around protected areas:

The project completed awareness and training programmes on SLM to improve their knowledge and understanding of the local communities, farmers (including youth and women) and extension officers in Fiji, supported the publication of the State of Sustainable Land Management in Samoa, and supported training and developed a range of related published materials aimed at strengthening local capacity in Niue. It also "ensured that communities who live around several of the project's pilot Protected Areas (PAs) have received awareness raising and smaller numbers have been trained in Sustainable forest management (SFM) and SLM to reduce pressure on the forests" (TE pg 49).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project experienced delays in implementation because of series of tropical cyclones that damaged targeted sites, homes and means of communication for beneficiaries. The project had to substantially increase its delivery time from four to six years, but even then it was not able to achieve many of its targets. “Delays in start-up of the project meant that many activities were not commenced until the final years of the project, leaving insufficient time to complete all planned actions” (TE pg 13). In terms of financial efficiency, the TE does not report of any budgetary constraints. The project received higher co-financing at completion and its total financing was equivalent to expected financing. Thus, the TER agrees with the TE’s rating of Moderately Satisfactory because of the success on financial efficiency but shortcomings in time management

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Likely

The project’s socio-political and environmental risks are low, whereas financial and institutional risks are moderately high. The TER gives a Moderately Likely rating due to lack of sustainable financial resources, and low capacity of government departments. Below is a detailed analysis of the sustainability components:

Financial resources: the project was unable to achieve its targets in strengthening financing for protected areas, and thus, could not develop mechanisms for sustainable financing. However, the TE states that “in most countries there are projects that have taken on, or are in the process of taking on, many of the unfinished activities of the project. There is evidence that some of the project partners will continue to finance actions that are relevant to project outcomes” (TE pgs 54-55). Thus, the financial sustainability is Moderately Unlikely.

Socio-political: The project was positively received by local people, and “the emerging interest of Itauki Affairs in Fiji and Taoga Niue in Niue are examples of positive socio-political change and if these government bodies continue their efforts there is good reason to expect future positive change” (TE pg 55). However, too rapid promotion of entry into cash-based economies could lead to problems and benefit sharing efforts should be developed. Additionally, “land remains a contentious issue in all the Forest Protected Area Management project (FPAM) countries and the impacts of this on any similar project should not be underestimated” (TE pg 55). As there are no substantial socio-political risks, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating to sustainability.

Institutional framework and governance: The TE states that the government departments were under-resourced and had low capacity to achieve their mandates. “The capacity of NGOs varies markedly between countries, with Fiji perhaps having the most developed and stable NGO sector. Local institutional capacity (e.g. at village level) remains low, albeit with some improvement because of the project” (TE pg 55). Due to lack of government capacity, the TER rates institutional sustainability as Moderately Unlikely.

Environmental: The project played a key role in raising awareness of sustainable land and forest management, and biodiversity conservation. It also built capacity of local communities through trainings

and campaigns to better manage natural resources. Although, the project activities on SLM help in adaptive and resilience capacities, the increasing extreme weather conditions and variability remain a threat to environmental sustainability.

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 actual co-financing of $12,665,220 was slightly higher than the expected co-financing amount of $12,075,870. The TE states that "co-financing has made a highly satisfactory contribution to project outcomes" (TE pg 8).

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?

The project countries faced natural disasters such as series of tropical cyclones, which damaged some implementation sites and homes of beneficiary communities. Cyclone warnings disrupted project activities as meetings and work at pilot sites were cancelled. These delays affected the project activities and consequently the outcomes.

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:

The project had satisfactory country ownership from the respective country governments and local communities. The government departments helped in executing the projects, and it "established very good and effective working relations with the beneficiary communities. In all the target countries the project teams made concerted efforts to ensure that they consulted with and informed the communities and customary land owners before beginning any work, to ensure they fully understood the background to project ideas and were allowed to reach consensus and make decisions according to their customary systems of decision-making" (TE pg 53).

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: Satisfactory

The TE does not evaluate M&E design at entry, but as per project documents the M&E plan provided for quarterly, semi-annual, and annual progress reports which would monitor and record co-financing contributions. The plan also provided for a baselines survey and included GEF tracking tools, mid-term review and final evaluation of the project. The results framework included SMART indicators and targets with timely activities which allowed for efficient tracking of project progress (TE pg 81). As there are no shortcomings noted in the TE, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating to M&E design.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE states that the "M&E work of the project has been well organized and has prepared all the necessary Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Project Progress Reports PPRs etc. which track project activity" (TE pg 58). As per the M&E plan, a mid-term evaluation was conducted, and a detailed summary of all project training and an online archive of project reports was prepared by the Chief Technical Adviser. However, the baseline for tracking tool was not revised during implementation, and the tracking tools were difficult to use at evaluation as "many of the project sites have had to be changed. The market information in the tracking tool uses unclear categories, all of which were determined as zero at the start of the project and for which the team could find no data during the evaluation" (TE pg 59). Also, the TE states that there were "gaps in quantifying the impacts of project activities. Whilst significant biophysical and socio-economic change would not be expected to have occurred over the project period, the project should have completed surveys on knowledge of biodiversity / conservation / SLM etc. prior to and after capacity building training to better assess the impact of training activities" (TE pg 59). Due to the aforementioned shortcomings, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to 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.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

FAO was the implementing agency and it helped in reviewing the final project design, conducting the mid-term evaluation, and provided co-financing. However, the TE observes that the agency's administrative procedures were complex and slow in relation to recruitment procurement, letters of agreement (LoAs) and the transfer of funds from FAO to country teams. "Some Government officials expressed disquiet that under the FAO GEF project management system, National Project Coordinator (NPCs) and NTAs are recruited by FAO (the Implementing Agency) not the executing department / ministry of the host government, which they felt undermined national ownership of the project, undermined staff supervision and confused channels of communication" (TE pg 60).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project had four executing agencies in the project countries, and it included a Regional Steering Committee and National Project Steering Committees in each of the countries. Although these committees functioned well, none of the countries had "a project technical committee or advisory team, which may have provided an opportunity for a better flow of information between service providers, for example Fiji used numerous service providers working with the beneficiary communities and it may have been beneficial if these providers were more aware of each other's activities so that they together presented a coherent front to local communities" (TE pg 60). The TE states that the executing agencies faced difficulties in implementing some of the activities because of the complexity of the project design, with six major technical components. However, as overall the project was considered to be effective and efficient, and it constantly adapted to changing circumstances in regard to extreme weather variabilities. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

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 project helped in increasing the area under formal/legal protection increased by 41,559 ha in the four target countries, and the project activities were enabled to build adaptive capacity and resilience to climate variabilities.

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.

There were no socio-economic changes reported.

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 project implemented training of biodiversity conservation, protected area management to government officials and local communities in Fiji and Niue.

b) Governance: No changes in governance were reported.

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 report of any unintended impacts.

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.

The project initiatives were not adopted at scale beyond the project.

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 provided the following key lessons (TE pgs 56-57):

1) Implementation of conservation activities in customary tenure situations requires time, patience, and a respectful approach to communities;
2) Legislative, policy and institutional change often takes longer than the time scale of a single project;
3) Livelihood and SLM activities promoted by the project that are meant to achieve conservation need to be linked effectively to the planned conservation outcomes, rather than risk being standalone activities that may have either no, or negative impact on conservation;
4) The Wakatu Fiji campaign provides a valuable lesson on how to engage customary land owners and the general public for similar projects that are seeking to raise awareness and build networks of support across multiple sectors. The campaign is based on a concept well understood by local people and uses state of the art social media tools to reach audiences and engages a wide range of government and non-government actors;
5) The difficulty faced by the project in generating sustainable financing mechanisms for Protected Areas (PAs) deserves further study;
6) The partnership approach adopted by the project, involving government agencies, NGOs, and research and training organizations in the coordinated delivery of project activities was beneficial to achievement of project outcomes;
7) A complex project design (in this case, 6 components) made it challenging to implement, a less complex design (e.g. 2-3 components) may have been easier for the project and partners to implement;
8) Aligning project design to the current and potential capacity of national and local stakeholders helps build confidence for upscaling and sustainability after the project concludes;
9) It would be beneficial if FAO's complex project-related administrative procedures were streamlined and the organisation ensured that project managers / national coordinators and executing agencies (usually government departments) are fully and effectively inducted into FAO procedures and policies; and
10) The potential to improve the effectiveness of projects by enabling them to respond quickly and appropriately to beneficiary communities when faced with natural disasters, for example, through agreed protocols that clearly identify triggers, responses, and decision-making processes for such events, is worth further consideration.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations given in the TE are (TE pgs 63-65):

1) It is recommended that FAO encourages countries and development agencies to better coordinate the large number of biodiversity conservation and SLM projects in South Pacific

countries at national and regional levels (as exists for water and climate change). Inter alia, this will help reduce the current problem of multiple projects simultaneously drawing government staff resources away from the basic tasks of government;

2) It is recommended to GEF and FAO that key project staff be in post before inception workshops are held. Project teams and others should thoroughly review work plans and activities during the Inception period to ensure they are aligned with the current national and local priorities. Consideration should be given to holding two inception workshops in each country – one to revise the project activities / work plans and another to launch the project;
3) It is recommended to FAO that projects seeking to engage customary landowners and local communities should seek to recruit local staff in the pilot areas to provide continuous support to communities involved in the project. Whilst such support does not need to be full time, it should be provided on a regular basis to maximise uptake of planned outcomes and optimise learning and capacity building. For each pilot site, a more thorough understanding of land governance issues should be obtained, ideally during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) period (where pilot sites are already agreed) or early on during implementation (e.g. where pilot sites agreed during inception);
4) It is recommended to GEF and FAO that projects, which include promoting the protection of forested Protected Areas (PAs) and the adoption of SLM technologies, highlight the win-win-win co-benefits that these activities generate, including for climate change adaptation and mitigation. Raising awareness about the linkages between forest conservation and management, SLM and climate change will likely increase uptake of conservation and SLM activities [for example, demonstrating the links between protecting forests and reducing peak / low flows in rivers and SLM technologies such as “climate smart agriculture” systems (FAO, 2013)];
5) It is recommended to GEF and FAO that future projects that are focused on biodiversity conservation and protected area management should more clearly identify sustainable livelihoods and economic benefits that can be clearly linked to the improved conservation of biodiversity. Such approaches should include assessment of baseline, mid-term and end of project livelihood, ecosystem service and biodiversity indicators;
6) It is recommended to GEF and FAO that a greater proportion of project funds for similar projects should be devoted to developing income generating activities including careful assessment of their economics and value chains, to compensate land users who agree to reduce / halt former hunting / collecting etc. activities in Protected Areas (PAs). Work should begin on these as soon as possible after project start-up in order to motivate beneficiary communities and give them a chance to show results by the end of a typical 4-5 year project; and
7) It is recommended that the GEF extends the project in Fiji, on a no cost basis, for a period on 12 months from 30th June 2017. The recommended extension will allow for the completion of a range of activities that had been delayed.

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?	The report was elaborative in its assessment of outcomes, but did not describe the impacts through the project.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and convincing in giving rating according to the evidence presented	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report gave a good analysis of sustainability, but did not provide an exit strategy	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned with evidence are presented well	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the costs and expenditures of the project and informs on actual co-financing used	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not provide analysis of M&E design at entry, but gives an adequate information on implementation	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

No other sources were used in preparation of the TER.