# CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT IN NIUE

# TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

March, 2013

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| CCSDP | Community Centered Sustainable Development Programme |
| CDR | Combined delivery report |
| CO | Country Office, UNDP |
| CSO | Civil Society Organizations |
| DAFF | Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries |
| DJLS | Department of Justice, Lands and Survey |
| DOE | Department of Environment |
| DPSU | Department of Economic Planning, Development and Statistics |
| DSAP | Department of Sustainable Agriculture Project |
| EPDSU | Economic Planning, Development and Statistics Unit |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FFS | Farmer Field School |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GON | Government of Niue |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IFS | Integrated Financing Strategy |
| IW | Inception Workshop |
| IWRM | Integrated Water Resources Management |
| LIS | Land Use Information System |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MTR | Mid Term Review |
| NAP | National Action Plan |
| NCSA | National Capacity Needs Self Assessment |
| NEX | National Execution |
| NIOFA | Niue Island Organic Farmers Association |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| NZ | New Zealand |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| PRODOC | Project Document |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing States |
| SLM | Sustainable Land Management |
| SOPAC | South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission |
| TNA | Training Needs Analysis |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNESCO | United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Acknowledgment and deepest thanks to the support of UNDP Multi Country Office, UNDP RCB Bangkok, and the Government of Niue for the conduct of this evaluation. Particular appreciation to the guidance provided by Ms. Nileema Noble, Ms. Marta Moneo and Mr. Doley Tshering of UNDP, on strategic concerns and evaluation protocols; and Mr. Brendon Passi and Mr. Poi Okesene of DAFF on strategic concerns of GON as well as relevant literature. Also, Ms. Sara Ferrandi, Ms. Frances Brown, Ms. Rosainna Siitia, kindly provided key references.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project envisions capacities for sustainable land management are built in appropriate government and Civil Society Organizations (CSO) institutions /user groups and mainstreamed to government processes and national development plans. Four key outcomes deal with a) human resources /institutional capacities; b) knowledge development; c) resource mobilization; and d) mainstreaming SLM.

Under outcome 1, Government of Niue (GON) through the Project, developed "a commercial scale sustainable agriculture unit integrating and demonstrating SLM principles relevant to Atoll Agriculture. This was designed to be run as a business venture of a progressive village. The government helped set it up, introduced a wide range of good SLM oriented technical innovations and provided facilities and services to assure the farm products of markets (including local and overseas organic agriculture markets). Partner investors in the Pacific are also being sought. At the height of the project, the unit became the venue of some trainings and a source of planting materials but not at a scale that was envisioned. A key challenge has been the declining interest on the part of the host community. Accordingly, a declining and aging farm population has overwhelmed them. The DAFF continues to proactively look for solutions even after the project.

While the Project developed this unit, it also collaborated with two Projects (one was UNDP assisted) to conduct village extension activities to promote SLM. One village included SLM in their formal Village Development Plan. Several farmers have adopted some of the recommended SLM technologies and a few of them are adopting it on a semi-commercial scale. Thus under Outcome 1, a two pronged approach was followed with one of them requiring a longer gestation period to fully take off. The village level extension work on the other hand produced more immediate results.

On hindsight, it might have helped if the commercial demonstration unit concept was subjected to rigorous feasibility study before implementation so that risks are identified and managed carefully. One of the questions that the feasibility study would have checked was the feasibility of developing "agribusiness" managers over a short time frame (3 year project) to run the unit.

Under Outcome 2, Project personnel were able to identify good practices (local and regional) that have potential application in the country. But the monitoring of actual performance and adaptability of the practices was not adequately done. The Project, in collaboration with SOPAC together with the Australian Government, provided training opportunities for Geographic Information System (GIS) towards the strengthening of a land use information system (LIS). The LIS is now in place; new hardware requirements have been identified. Some new information has also been incorporated in the system.

Under Outcome 3, no strategic investment program was developed. However SLM is reflected under the Multi Year Agriculture Corporate Plan. At least two joint proposals were developed with FAO that would promote SLM as an organic strategy towards climate change adaptation.

Under Outcome 4, the Project team helped incorporate SLM in the National Development Strategy and in sector plans for forestry and water. The prospects of organic agriculture were

also studied as input to policy formulation. SLM also became a key part of the work program of the DAFF. The Project could have done more given the level of receptiveness.

To produce the above accomplishments, the DAFF which was the key implementing agency, assigned its own senior staff to run the project. While this meant that there were times when full time attention to the project was affected, the advantage was that SLM concepts and practices became organic parts of the DAFF annual work program and monitoring efforts. The NSC provided hands on leadership particularly for the development of the demonstration unit. Active working partnerships were also maintained closely so that the Project could accomplish its targets given the limited staff. Some of the partnerships dealt with technologies (as with the EU assisted DSAP) or with social technologies (as with the UNDP assisted CSSDP).

The key challenges encountered by the Project revolved around manpower or the lack of it considering the reality of a small national population (1,500 people) and increasing outmigration to New Zealand. At the village level, this appeared to constrain the enthusiastic participation of farmer entrepreneurs in the planned commercial unit. Addressing the village participation issue consumed a lot of time of the NSC and DAFF to the point that other components were almost forgotten at some point. Another key challenge was the insufficient orientation for Project staff particularly on financial management. Delayed arrival of funds was also a challenge.

**Conclusions.** Overall performance ratings using GEF guidelines are indicated in Section 7 and a few key points are shared in this summary. Achievements under all Outcomes/components are deemed RELEVANT but only MINIMAL IMPACT is being achieved either because some started rather late while others were not given full attention to achieve their potential (e.g. village level extension). In terms of effectiveness, Outputs for Outcome 1, 2, and 4 may be considered MODERATELY SATISFACTORY while efficiency would vary from MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY TO MODERATELY SATISFACTORY. The quality of M& E is moderately unsatisfactory. Sustainability of the practice of and advocacy for SLM is LIKELY SUSTAINABLE.

**Recommendations.** The following is a summary of the recommendations**. (**1) DAFF has instituted good practices that incorporate SLM in its regular programs and standard operating procedures. An example is the regular visit of the MAF team to villages. This move needs to be complemented with staff better trained on SLM. A post project Training Needs Analysis (TNA) may be done to determine the new training needs and training support sought from other partners. (2) Provide follow up to the village that incorporated SLM in its village plan so that this can be a demonstration for others. (3) In the next 3 year phase out period, GON may proactively invite an investor to partner with the host village for the commercial demonstration unit. (4) Monitor the performance of SLM technologies that showed potential and use this as basis for making a more intensified extension effort. (5) Consider updating the NAP and use this process also to increasingly promote SLM as a key strategy for climate change adaptation in the agriculture sector. (6) Accelerate dialogue with UNCCD for the latter to support the preparation of the Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) that will help identify specific strategies for mobilizing resources. 8) Ensure that relevant M& E systems are fully enforced in future projects to support learning as well as effective adaptive management

**Lessons learned.** The NSC is currently discussing the lessons that it has identified. This is shared in this report with annotations from the external evaluator. The following are key lessons being studied. (1) Priority attention should be given to equipping available limited staff with training including UNDP training on financial management. (2) Project outputs that depend on inputs of other agencies require emphatic understanding of that agencies' own needs. (3)

Championship by senior officials can help push concepts but they may not be sustainable. Combine championship with due diligence study to make sure that political support can lead to effective outputs. (4) Risk management planning should not be ignored. (5) Systematic documentation of good processes and practices is essential for effective monitoring and planning and also for disseminating good practices.

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

The Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Niue or the Niue SLM Project is a joint project of the Government of Niue, UNDP and GEF. It addresses the issues of land degradation and opportunities of sustainable land management in Niue in line with the National Development Plan. While signed in, February, 2007, the Project started in the 1st Quarter of 2007. It was supposed to end in December 2009. It was extended up to June 2012.

A mid-term review was conducted on September 2009 and the Project was evaluated in December 2012. This evaluation aimed to assess the levels of project accomplishments and outcomes and synthesize lessons that may inform future plans for SLM in Niue. It can also help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF projects. This is the report of the external evaluation.

## 2.0 THE PROJECT

### 2.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

Long term goal: The sustainable management of Niue's unique natural terrestrial resources while at the same time promoting sustainable production systems contributing to the social well-being of the country of its present and future generations.

Objectives: Capacities for sustainable land management are built in appropriate government and CSO institutions /user groups and mainstreamed to government processes and national development plans.

### 2.2. EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

Outcome 1: Human resources /institutional capacities are adequately trained in SLM.
Outcome 2: Capacities for knowledge development and management for SLM are developed.
Outcome 3: Resources are mobilized for the implementation of Niue's completed NAP.
Outcome 4: SLM principles are maintained into national policies, plans and legislation.

## 2.3. OUTPUTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (LEAD AGENCIES)

| OUTCOME | OUTPUTS | DAFF | DJLS | DPSU | DOE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 1: Human Resource/Institutional Capacities are adequately trained in SLM | Output 1.1 Improve institutional, systemic and individual capacities for full scale integration of SLM principles into agricultural and agro forestry practices | | | | |
| | Output 1.2 Enhanced national capacities for land rehabilitation and restoration of ecosystem functionality via a practical participatory approach | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Capacities for Knowledge Development and Management for SLM are developed | Output 2.1 Participatory assessments of the sustainability of land use systems and functionality of ecosystem services | | | | |
| | Output 2.2 Knowledge sharing, information resources and access to these improved | | | | |
| | Output 2.3 Enhanced institutional/stakeholder capacities in the use of integrated land information systems/GIS/remote sensing for SLM and enhancement/maintenance of ecosystem functionality | | | | |
| | Output 2.4 Land Information Systems for SLM developed and operational | | | | |
| | Output 2.5 Monitoring and evaluation systems for SLM developed and operational | | | | |
| Outcome 3: Resources are mobilized for the implementation of Niue's completed NAP | Output 3.1 Project concepts and ideas for financing are developed | | | | |
| | Output 3.2 Strategic Investment Programmes are developed | | | | |
| | Output 3.3 Bilateral and multilateral discussions with donors on resource mobilization for NAP implementation are completed | | | | |
| | Output 3.4 Identification of | | | | |

| OUTCOME | OUTPUTS | DAFF | DJLS | DPSU | DOE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | innovative sustainable financing mechanisms | | | | |
| Outcome 4: SLM principles are mainstreamed into National Policies, Plans and Legislation | Output 4.1 Undertake assessment of capacity gaps and barriers in existing policies and regulations to support integration of SLM principles and practices at the national level | | | | |
| | Output 4.2 Protocols/guidelines for the integration of SLM into national policy and planning frameworks are developed | | | | |
| | Output 4.3 SLM principles reflected and incorporated into current and future National Integrated Strategic Plans | | | | |

## 3.0 THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

### 3.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation is part of the life cycle of the GEF supported SLM Project. Following the global guidance provided by GEF, the purposes of the external evaluation are:

- assess extent of achievements of projects outputs and results including extent of implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations;
- examine current level of impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to institutional strengthening, biodiversity conservation and conservation friendly livelihood promotion, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals;
- identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the project and also to provide evidences to improve design and implementation of similar projects in the near future;
- identify an exit strategy for the project by linking its products to other ongoing initiatives.

### 3.2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

An external evaluator was engaged to conduct the evaluation of both Samoa and Niue SLM Projects for the period November 30 to December 30, 2012. The external evaluator visited Niue

from December 8 to 14 and interacted with Project holders and stakeholders. Specifically, the following evaluation methods were utilized.

- Review of project documents and other relevant literature
- Interviews and follow up interviews (average of 30 to 45 minutes each)
- Visit to the Mutalau demonstration farm and key farmers fieldtrip in Tuapa

Preliminary findings were presented on December 13 to the NSC. Additional interviews and information gathering was made after the presentation. The Final Report was prepared in Manila with guidance from intermittent communication between the Evaluator, PMU and UNDP CO.

### 3.3. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

The following is a summary of stakeholders who were consulted. The number of interviews is indicated and the number of persons involved is indicated below.

| Stakeholder | Number of Interviews | Number of Persons |
|---|---|---|
| Government Secretary | 1 | 1 |
| NSC | 1 | 5 |
| DAFF leadership | 3 | 5 |
| Forestry Division | 1 | 1 |
| Environment Dept. | 1 | 1 |
| Water Division - PWD. | 1 | 1 |
| Economic Planning | 1 | 1 |
| Community Relations | 1 | 1 |
| Organic Farmers Association | 1 | 1 |
| Farmers ( including one young famer ) | 4 | 4 |
| Former member of Parliament /advocate of Mutalau Farm | 1 | 1 |
| UNDP | 3 | 4 |

## 4.0 FINDINGS ON PROJECT FORMULATION

### 4.1. OVERALL PROJECT CONCEPT

The Niue SLM project design reflects both the needs of the island based economic development and the recommended minimum components under the UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio approach for SLM capacity building among Small Island Developing States (SIDS). SLM is particularly relevant for the country's food security aspirations, sustainably sound agriculture is also vital to protect the country's sensitive underground water resources.

Human resources capacity building is rightfully given the highest allocation. There is a problem of outmigration and aging farming populations in the agriculture sector. Mainstreaming actions

as well as preparation of the medium term investment plan and project concepts are equally important for sustainability.

The indicator for Outcome 1 ("One commercial scale sustainable agriculture unit integrating demonstrating SLM principles relevant to Atoll Agriculture") has been considered a central target of intervention, receiving the largest share of the budget. This was designed to be run as a business venture of a progressive village. The government would help set it up, introduce the best technical innovations; train the village community and village council leadership on how to run it and turn it over at some point.

Based on the major problems (including the mixed feelings of the village about its capacity) that surfaced during implementation, one would tend to recall the observations in the MTR report which cites possible gaps in the consultation process based on an interview with some farmers. Consequently, the concept could have benefited from a more rigorous, feasibility analysis including social/institutional analysis. The PRODOC is silent about this type of exercise in its section on baseline activities.

The analysis might have asked the following questions. First, could there be alternative ways to achieve the purpose of Outcome 1 other than constructing the relatively large commercial demonstration unit? For instance, would it have helped if an integrated support was given instead to a network of individual private entrepreneurs that are running farms of lesser size but are still or have the high potential to be on a commercial mode?

Second, if the project was meant to "demonstrate" a commercial scale SLM operation, was it the intention of the national agricultural development strategy to transform the current agricultural practices into this type of operation by showing its results? Or was this type of farm meant to be a category of its own for the next many years, co-existing with the other smaller scale farm operations?

Third, while the concept of a village corporate enterprise or public - private sector partnership was contemplated, can this type of ideal arrangement be realistically forged within the village over a short 3-4 year project period? Was there sufficient local experience of relevant experience in the Pacific region that could serve as model?

One element of Outcome 2 (i.e. 2.5) involves the development of land use changes in general and soil fertility in particular. While the aim is laudable, this is an unrealistic target over a three (3) year period given the low level baseline investment in capacity building for LIS. The MTR also states that it would normally take long periods to establish. Outcome 3.4 on the other hand has assumed that there is already a broad private sector base upon which agreements can already be forged over a three (3) year period. Under Outcome 4, the concern for developing certain policies and programs are appropriate but the timeframe appears to be ambitious.

### 4.2. ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

The log frame rightfully identified important assumptions such as continuing political support as well as support for integrated approaches. In the case of establishing the commercial unit under Outcome 1 however, the following assumption might have been added:

> "The scale of scope and scale of commercial operations is appropriate to the actual capacities of intended holders/stakeholders;" or

"There would be interested investors who will enter into partnerships with the community hosting the commercial demonstration unit."

This possible additional assumption could be significant due to declining manpower as well as aging manpower in the agriculture sector. This may also be significant because of the lack of local (and perhaps regional?) track record for this type of large operation (commercial SLM operation to be run by a progressive village in partnership with the private sector).

### 4.3. LESSONS FROM OTHER PROJECTS

The PRODOC cites helpful sources of information for the design of capacity building initiatives (e.g. results of climate change and biodiversity planning, NCSA, etc.) as well as lessons learned. However, it did not say much about the experience on commercially run operations for SLM which could have helped stakeholders visualize the concept being promoted under Outcome 1. Perhaps, the design time should have exerted effort to identify and describe successful ongoing experience in other South Pacific countries and Australia/ New Zealand.

### 4.4. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

The PRODOC cites the importance of the participation of government agencies, citing specific mandates in relation to the tasks contemplated by the Project. The role of civil society sectors and business are also acknowledged. It is not clear however, if a thorough stakeholder analysis was done among village groups, non-government organizations and business sectors during the design process.

The stakeholder analysis could have been helpful since the PRODOC envisioned that *"community groups through the establishment of the demonstration unit incorporating SLM practices will take ownership of the project and become the driving force in promoting SLM practices within Niue* "(PRODOC Part 11 Paragraph 115). The stakeholder analysis could have also indicated the wide range of opportunities that could be tapped in order to achieve the intentions of the Project, especially Outcome 1, including the setting up of a commercial scale demonstration unit.

In the case of the Mutalau village, a further social analysis may have also been helpful especially when it was realized that the community interest continued to be ambivalent for some time in spite of the various support interventions offered. As a backgrounder, the Inception report indicates that the village was adequately consulted during the preparation stage. The village leadership currently acknowledges the support of the National Government.

The village leadership is however apprehensive of the scale of the project because of the lack of manpower and the opportunity costs if they were to be involved in a major way in running the operations. Another perspective surfaced by sectors outside of the village indicate that there may be other social considerations within the village that are not fully understood. These observations demonstrate the need for a grounded social analysis of the situation.

## 4.5. REPLICATION APPROACH

The concept of replication in the project context appears to refer to the replication of specific on-farm and off-farm practices in SLM; it does not refer to the replication of the concept of the commercial demonstration unit. One unit may be sufficient for many years to come.

No discrete replication approach was articulated. The implied concept however was that SLM technical innovations would be demonstrated in the demonstration farm unit. Farmers in the host village as well as from other villages would be trained in the said farm. They would then bring these to their respective communities. Best practices from the technical innovations being tried in the farm as well as from existing farms (part of Outcome 2). A framework for monitoring best practices was also contemplated (Outcome 2, Output 2.5). The development of projects (Outcome 3) and their eventual execution would provide the enabling environment for replication.

## 4.6. UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

The UNDP was a natural ally of the NIUE Government to implement this GEF assisted SLM Project. This was because of UNDP's hands-on experience with GEF support for climate change and biodiversity initiatives. UNDP's leadership of the NCSA also allowed it to help the GON better understand the nature and scope of gaps in SLM capacity.

Niue needs a strong technical partner for SLM because of the challenging physical landscape associated with its agriculture sector. It may be possible that the FAO could also have been an equally qualified GEF partner or co-partner of UNDP. FAO is more focused on agricultural issues on which the SLM Project was allocating most of its project resources.

In the end however, UNDPs proactive stance to promote climate change adaptation would make it an ideal partner because SLM can be better appreciated these days if marketed as an important adaptation strategy in the farming sector. UNDP maintains for instance a global online portal on good practices in climate change adaptation.

## 4.7. LINKS WITH OTHER INTERVENTIONS

The PRODOC envisioned close collaboration with other on-going projects that w ere supportive of agricultural development initiatives in general and sustainable agriculture in particular. These included the key ongoing projects such as the NZ assisted projects on Young Farmers Training, and Organic Agriculture as well as the EU assisted Development of Sustainable Agriculture Project or DSAP. The project also aimed to work with the EU assisted SOPAC project to support capacity building for land management through geographic information system (GIS).

### 4.8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The PRODOC provides for the designation of the UNCCD Steering committee as the de facto Project Steering Committee to provide directions. The DAFF Director would be designated as Project Manager while a project Coordinator would be recruited, together with a Project Assistant. The Project Manager, Project Coordinator and counterparts from the agencies as well as consultants to be recruited would comprise the Project Team. Embedding the project at the DAFF ensured institutional ownership, synergy with other GON and DAFF–assisted projects; and sustainability.

The PRODOC also envisioned that the GON will be able to avail of UN Volunteers in implementation planning and provision of technical support on SLM technical innovations. The mechanisms for inter-agency collaboration were not specified even though four major outcomes would depend on the technical leadership role to be provided by different agencies. This coordination function was to be addressed solely by the decision making processes of the NSC. Based on the performance of the other components, it is clear that the coordination mechanism could have been better planned, risks identified and managed closely.

## 5.0 FINDINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

### 5.1. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

**Inception Workshop (IW).** The Project was able to conduct an inception workshop. The IW actually consisted of a series of small workshops and big workshop over an 8 week period capped by the presence of the Premier to chair the launching ceremonies. The inception activities included an orientation of the project and its technical and administrative requirements. It identified complementary initiatives and clarified the role of the PMU. Three sets of concerns were accordingly identified: lack of manpower at farm level, b) access to land security (in the case of the demo-farm) and the government wide 10% decrease in budgets for staff hiring.

**Good adaptation practices.** The NSC and project management has demonstrated capacity for adaptive management in several occasions. To deal with staff turnover, it deployed a senior staff to take over as Coordinator. Responding to MTR findings, it appointed the Deputy DAFF Director as New full time project Manager to ensure top strategic leadership was provided as the Director was already too stretched out. The Project engaged one of the champions of the project during the design stage, as a national project advisor to provide technical guidance. Unfortunately the said consultant had to leave for New Zealand due to personal reasons.

The NSC also proactively worked on the problems of the Mutalau demonstration. One very good adaptation strategy that was proposed was to help the community come up with a village plan using the methods developed by the UNDP assisted CCSDP (Community Centered Sustainable Development Programme). Unfortunately the village declined this offer.

To deal with financial management issues, the Project invited the Treasury Department to NSC meetings to better understand the situation. It also negotiated with the Treasury Department to advance part of the budgetary requirements whenever the UNDP finances were delayed.

**Where adaptive management should have also been applied.** Under Outcome 1, the Mutalau demonstration farm met problems that took more time than expected to be resolved. NSC meetings and reports indicate that this activity absorbed practically most of the attention of the leadership for the most part of the project.

The resolute passion to resolve the issues of the demo farm may have inadvertently left the NSC with little time to consider other lateral options to achieve (at least partly) the intentions of the Mutalau demonstration farm. Project staff for instance participated in village level planning and village level consultations to introduce SLM concepts and practices. This extension modality done in collaboration with the DSAP project, NIOFA and Vanilla Project was able to encourage several farmers to practice some SLM technologies.

For instance, in Tuapa where village level planning was done, a progressive farmer grows perennial crops robustly and on a semi - commercial scale. He uses Mucuna as live mulch to restore and maintain fertility. The project actually helped the farmer in this activity by helping in the village planning process (in collaboration with CCSDP) and providing seeds (in collaboration with DSAP). But the SLM Project did not appear to consider this as a major achievement (it was very focused on the Mutalau Demo farm) and in fact did not highlight it in its reports. It is possible that if this extension modality was nurtured further, it could have also produced early recognizable results contributing to Outcome 1.

## 5.2. PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

Most of the partnership arrangements envisioned in the PRODOC actually materialized. This was particularly true with the NZ assisted projects for young farmers and support to organic agriculture. There was also good collaboration with the EU assisted DSAP project particularly in promoting soil fertility amelioration and bucket drip irrigation technologies. An equally important partnership was forged with the UNDP assisted CCSDP which piloted the concept of village level development planning. SLM concepts and advocacies were incorporated into the process in at least one village. The Justice, Lands and Survey Department (DJLS) with the assistance of SOPAC contributed substantially to the design and execution of the GIS training.

## 5.3. PROJECT FINANCE

The Project total cost is USD 1,479,884 of which GEF provided USD 474,545. The balance would be provided by the GON (USD 254,063), and other co-financing (USD 766,276). Co-financing would be provided by the FAO, EU, SOPAC, and UNESCO AND SPC.

Of the four outcomes, more than 70% of combined project funds would go to Outcome 2 – Capacity Building while 20% would go to Adaptive Management and Lessons learned.

The combined CDRs from 2006 to 2012 indicate that the actual expenditures of USD 480,691 of grant funds which exceeded the GEF grant of USD 474,545. The important conclusion is that Grant funds were 100% disbursed. Thirty percent of the costs were expended in the 1st year and each succeeding year expended approximately 10 to 20% of total costs.

There is no consolidated report made available of expenditures by Project outcome. What is available is the consolidated expenditure by type of activity. There is also no report on government counterpart and of co-financing counterpart that was made available to the external evaluation process. However, the technical reports indicate active collaboration with several organizations who earlier committed to provide counterpart funding in kind. These include the EU (DSAP); UNDP (CCSDP), SOPAC (GIS training); FAO Forest Legislation, NZAID Vanilla Project; Niue Island Organic Farmers Association (NIOFA). The timely support of these organizations helped the Project achieve their outputs.

The Project leadership indicated challenges in problems in the implementation of UNDP financial management /accounting rules as it related with the system of GON. The procedures took much of the time of Project staff, partly because of the lack of orientation on the UNDP financial management system. This also meant major delays in fund releases. The GON-Treasury Department fortunately agreed to advance part of the costs whenever fund releases from UNDP were delayed.

The audit report of 2011 articulates the problem of reconciliation of financial reports prepared by GON and the Project due to timing of posting. Delayed releases of funds were also noted. The Audit report recommended corrective actions particularly related to improve budgetary planning and internal controls.

### 5.4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Most M&E instruments as well as planning instruments as envisioned by the PRODOC were generally utilized. Information on actual status is provided below:

- **Inception Report**. Documentation indicates that this was done relatively well. The premier attended the orientation. The nature and scope was identified and potential implementation issues also anticipated.

- **Annual and Quarterly Plans.** This would be proposed by the PMU for approval by the NSC and subsequently by the UNDP.

- **National MSP Annual Project Review Form**. This is a joint UNDP-GEF requirement to be filled up by the PMU. This was done for all the years covered.

- **Annual Tripartite Review.** This was done once in 2008.

- **Terminal Tripartite Review.** This was not done.

- **Technical reports.** These were shared with the NSC.

- Mid Term Review. This was done in September 2009.

**Quality of M&E design.** No customized M&E plan was made for the Project. All monitoring protocols and instruments used are based on the recommendations of UNDP and GEF. No additional GON-based instrument was used on top of the standard instruments agreed upon between GON and UNDP.

**Quality of M&E implementation.** One interesting characteristic in the APRs for 2009, 2010 and 2011 is the sole focus on the accomplishments of one planned output: the demonstration Unit in Mutalau. The UNDP portion of the report also did not adequately comment on the other components.

The DAFF based coordinator closely managed and monitored the developments at the demonstration unit. On the ground agronomic problems generally received timely corrective attention (the legal land issues took a longer time though). The NSC also monitored these developments very closely and resolutely discussed solutions to the issues identified. The representatives of departments with roles for the other outcomes (i.e. Outcome 2 to 4) participated actively in the discussions on Outcome 1.

While the substantial attention to one of the outputs of outcome 1 was justified because of the large resources devoted for this activity and its iconic value to the project, this focus seem to have also taken its toll on the work of other outcomes and outputs. The original outlook of the project land area was 144 acres in total, and was scaled back to only 15 acres. This could have been a contributing factor why some key activities did not take off or why certain promising work (e.g. work on village level planning and village consultations on SLM) did not reach higher potential.

### 5.5. UNDP and IMPLEMENTING PARTNER IMPLEMENTATION, EXECUTION COORDINATION AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The status of accomplishment of each output and activity is described in Section 6. The information provided takes into account the recommendations from the MTR.

To achieve the above status what implementation processes actually transpired? Implementation by GON was partly affected by the limited orientation of Project staff on UNDP's project management expectations as reported by the DAFF leadership. The lack of orientation and training took a toll on the amount of time devoted to financial management, among others. At the DAFF, staff turnover resulted in some gaps in effective implementation. The DAFF, however, consistently deployed its senior regular staff to coordinate the project under the direction of the DAFF Director.

The issues at the demonstration unit demanded a lot of attention from the top leadership. The GON through DAFF has proactively addressed most of the technical and market related issues. The issue on village "ownership" however, remain a challenge. The latter is the subject matter of new round of national – village dialogue after the SLM project.

The attention given to the demo farm unit tended to take a toll on the other outcomes which received less attention. Agencies other than DAFF had difficulty implementing their roles in Outcomes 2 to 4. The main reason cited was competing priorities and lack of manpower. DAFF itself lost several of its personnel during the reorganization process.

To achieve its targets for Outcome 4 'Mainstreaming", the DAFF based SLM staff adapted to the situation by actively participating in planning sessions for major national plans.

UDNP was not able to participate in most NSC meetings but monitored the minutes as well as the regular reports. UNDP was also closely involved helping the Project implement the recommendations of the MTR. The major concerns raised with respect to UNDP have been the limited occasion for interaction between the project and UNDP. UNDP staff visits were short and far in between. This is partly explained by the turn-over of staff at UNDP. Another major concern was delay in fund releases. The latest request for instance was made in the early 2012 was received only in October 2012.

## 6.0 DOCUMENTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT OUTPUT AND ACTIVITY LEVEL - NIUE SLM PROJECT

**Outcome 1: Human resources /institutional capacities are adequately trained in SLM.**

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishment based on LFW, Inception Report and MTR |
|---|---|---|
| Output 1.1 Improve institutional, systemic and individual capacities for full scale integration of SLM principles into agricultural and agroforestry practices. | 1.1.1 Development of a full-scale pilot demonstration unit integrating applicable SLM practices relevant to Niue.<br><br>Demonstration unit = land preparation, plant nursery, composting/mulching facilities, implement shed and training facility. | **RE: DEMONSTRATION FACILITY IN MUTALAU VILLAGE**<br><br>• A demonstration farm facility was established in Mutalau Village. Several technological innovations were introduced; improved organic production of Noni plants; perennial crops introduction; understory cropping of taro under coconut, mucuna as live mulch, plantain growing, citrus-oranges/limes, passion fruit (fruit tree production), vegetable demo block and drip irrigation, among others. These innovations were made possible through collaboration with other relevant projects. However, the effects of the technical innovations introduced, while known to DAFF staff, have not been formally documented for future planning purposes. |
| | 1.1.2 Procurement of tools, machinery, equipment and planting materials for the establishment and running of the full scale demonstration unit. | • Activities in the farm in the initial phase formed part of a practicum for eight (8) members of a Young Farmers Network in collaboration with an NZAID project. Only two (2) have stayed behind in Niue (beyond Project Control) and one is practicing some SLM measures. The SLM demonstration also hosted orientation visits by high school students and Parliamentarians among others.<br><br>One MP has adopted a green mulch system learned from the demo farm and attests its soil fertility enhancing value two (2) years since application. Two other famer practitioners have attested to its effectiveness.<br>• The DAFF was not able to prepare a work plan for trainings to be conducted as recommended by the MTR. Current plantings have been maintained but not yet expanded to fully use the land area. This is attributed to the long drought and the rather long decision |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1.1.3 Conduct practical participatory training on sustainable agriculture particularly integrated cropping management practices, restocking of soil organic matter and machinery safety. | making process of the village council on their role in the demo farm.<br><br>• The Mutalau farm is actively maintained by DAFF. There is newly forged agreement among contributing landowners to secure tenure in the area. Linkages for marketing and intermediate processing of farm products have also been arranged (see also description in Output 2.5) together with arrangements to securing bio security (planting of plantain) and organic certification.<br><br>**RE: EXTENSION WORK OUTSIDE OF THE MUTALAU FACILITY**<br>• Most of the SLM awareness building and trainings were done not at the demo farm but at the village level halls notably in Mutalau and Tuapa, the latter as part of a village level planning process (a collaborative undertaking with the UNDP CCSDP Project).<br><br>• SLM practices (proper pest management, use of cover crops, etc.) were also advocated in the DAFFs' on site consultation programs for 14 villages in 2011 and 2012.<br><br>• In collaboration with a New Zealand assisted project, the Project through DAFF supported the further formation of the Niue Organic Farmers Association (NIOFA) and facilitated a certification of Vanilla growers association as organic producers. DAFF also worked with a New Zealand based partner to firm up bio-security measures for banana plantain production that would benefit farmer practicing SLM.<br><br>• Interview with four (4) farmers indicate some familiarity with SLM concepts and partners. Two of the four are practicing mucuna live mulch. Application of technologies is perceived to be affected by aging farmer population and lack of interest among the young to pursue farming. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *See also discussion on business objectives (innovative financing) under Output 3*. |
| Output 1.2 Enhanced national capacities for land rehabilitation and restoration of ecosystem functionality via a practical participatory approach. | 1.2.1 Practical participatory training in the introduction of indigenous tree species on demonstration unit pending suitability and the overall purpose. e.g. shelter, support, ground cover (legumes). | The SLM leadership of DAFF participated in the planning for forest inventory, and subsequent forest management planning, ensuring that SLM in the agriculture sector are reconciled with forest protection and rehabilitation. Plans include the conservation of indigenous species.<br><br>Some initial attempts to introduce indigenous tree species in the demonstration farm but this have not been expanded. To support land rehabilitation work, the demo farm became a source of planting materials for mucuna which has been adopted by several farmers. However, mucuna plantings in at least one key farm are thriving well and appreciated by the farmer.<br><br>The Mutalau Demo farm is designed to be a joint project with the Village Development Council of Mutalau. The GON provided the enabling environment (ensuring legal status of the land, technical planning and demonstration facilities, trade networks, etc.); however the Village Council leadership have capacity concerns about the project and has not yet proactively supported it for a variety of reasons due to the lack of and aging manpower. The DAFF is proactively pursuing dialogue with key village council leaders to identify solutions, banking on a three (3) year phase out strategy set by GON starting in 2011. The DAFF has prepared a Transition Strategy that essentially sustains the dialogue with the village council and support from DAFF. A contingency plan is contemplated where facilities and equipment are turned over to the nearby research station and the SLM innovations are incorporated more intensely in the village visit program. |
| | 1.2.2 Development of cost effective strategies for land rehabilitation and restoration through participatory research trials at the demonstration unit and Vaipapahi Research Farm. | |

**Outcome 2: Capacities for Knowledge Development and Management for SLM are developed.**

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|---|---|
| Output 2.1 Participatory assessments of the sustainability of land use systems and functionality of ecosystem services. | 2.1.1 Develop synthesis of lessons learned, best practices, knowledge gaps and research needs.<br><br>2.1.2 Identification of mitigation options for land degradation problems. | Sites demonstrating best practices have been identified, and listed and are generally known to DAFF personnel. But they are not yet fully described, documented for use as an extension tool.<br><br>Mitigation options for land degradation have been identified, demonstrated in the SLM demo unit but not documented. A promising innovation is the use of live mulch (Mucuna) has been identified. Multi story cropping of taro under coconut has been tried but not successful so far. |
| Output 2.2 Knowledge sharing, information resources and access improved. | 2.2.1 Develop and implement training modules for sustainable agricultural practices e.g. composting/mulching modules, nutrient input module.<br><br>2.2.2 Develop policy briefs on SLM for decision makers. | PowerPoint presentations of SLM practices have been prepared and used for village level awareness programs. Other types of customized materials (pamphlets) have not been prepared. Instead, extension materials by other projects were utilized.<br><br>A working paper on the prospects of promoting organic farming through an Organic Agriculture bill was prepared. However, the discussions started on this topic have not been sustained. The Project leadership also participated in the dialogue leading to development of working papers for policies on forest management, Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and food security. |
| Output 2.3 Enhanced institutional/stakeholder capacities in the use of integrated land information systems/GIS/remote sensing for SLM and enhancement/maintenance of ecosystem functionality. | 2.3.1 Conduct practical participatory training in the development of a land functionality map for the site proposed for the demonstration unit.<br><br>2.3.2 Practical participatory training of staff to update/upgrade Niue's LIS from satellite imagery and incorporates additional data | A GIS training session was conducted for GON staff in collaboration with SOPAC- SPREP. The GIS training included dealing with variables related to land management. However, no follow up training was conducted as recommended by the MTR. One GPS unit was also procured and co-financed with other existing IWRM and PACC projects .This unit is to be shared amongst these three Projects on any related GIS/LIS activities on the ground. Part of the training included the preparation of the functionality map for the demonstration farm in Mutalau. It also incorporated new information on vanilla farm initiatives. The manpower capacity has improved and aiming to be more responsive to increasing volume of needs of agencies. But hardware and software needs to be updated to be |

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|---|---|
| | fields. | better able to generate new information that may be developed by new and pipeline projects. |
| Output 2.4 Land Information Systems for SLM developed and operational. | 2.4.1(a) Identify overlaps and gaps amongst existing LISs.<br><br>2.4.1(b) Develop an interagency protocol on LIS information access; sharing and data standards for resource users, government institutions and investors. | The Land Use Information System is in place and managed and maintained by a senior professional of the Department of Lands. New information on organic vanilla production was introduced by DAFF. A New Zealand assisted Project is presently helping update soil information. The hardware needs major upgrading.<br><br>No formal written protocol has been established to guide efforts to contribute or retrieve information. However in practice, personnel from the different departments are able to easily retrieve available information at cost, with the help of the senior professional managing the system. DAFF is a major regular user. The DAFF is also in the process of engaging a GIS person to organize new data in the agriculture sector and contribute proactively to the LIS. |
| Output 2.5 Monitoring and evaluation systems for SLM developed and operational. | 2.5.1 Develop a system for monitoring agricultural sustainability and management. | For 2.5.1 no monitoring system of this nature has been developed and the MTR recommended dropping this.<br><br>No guidelines for items 2.5.2. and 2.5.3 were prepared as suggested by the MTR. |
| | 2.5.2 Develop a system for monitoring soil organic matter content. | |
| | 2.5.3 Develop a system for monitoring soil fertility improvement. | |
| | 2.5.4 Develop a system for monitoring water usage as a management tool to determine the availability of water for potable use vs. irrigation/future economic | The Water Department staff joined the training on GIS and soil testing. At the same time, the SLM DAFF staff joined discussions to review the old Water Law; and develop the new IWRM program in 2008 during the Inception Phase. They also participated in World Water Day Activities and participated in developing the protocols for delineating well-head protection zones and promote adoption of on |

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|---|---|
| | developments and as a drought mitigation tool. | farm land use practices that promote better water infiltration and safeguard groundwater. Initial observations indicate negative observations for agricultural pesticides while continuing threats coming from some septic tanks.<br><br>The newly promulgated Water Act of 2012 provides for improved water monitoring of water for three (3) sectors: health; public works and environment.<br><br>The FAO TCP Irrigation Project 2008 implemented by DAFF also utilized low pressure water saving drip irrigation systems on several farms and carried out training on crop-water usage and requirements. |

**Outcome 3: Resources are mobilized for the implementation of Niue's completed NAP.**

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|---|---|
| Output 3.1 Project concepts and ideas for financing are developed. | 3.1.1 Participatory consultation with relevant stakeholders.<br>3.1.2 Formulation of project proposals. | No special proposals solely targeted for SLM has been prepared. Instead, GON incorporated SLM concerns and actions in selected concept proposals. This included the joint proposal with UNDP to secure support from the Adaptation Fund for climate change adaptation; and the joint FAO proposal for food security, Telefood Projects and TCP Value adding. None have moved forward so far. The Project also worked to incorporate SLM concerns in the joint Niue-SPC Country which identified the multi-year ppriority areas for SPC TA to Niue including the promotion of germplasm conservation and organic agriculture, among others. |
| Output 3.2 Strategic Investment Programmes are developed. | 3.2.1 Formulation of a Strategic Investment Programme.<br>3.2.2 Prioritization of projects by as per Niue's Strategic Investment Programme. | GON did not prepare an investment program specific for SLM but incorporated SLM features in the Agricultural Corporate Plan. The Corporate Plan does not have budgetary statements. Instead it establishes thematic priorities which will in turn guide the development of annual budgets |
| Output 3.3 Bilateral and multilateral discussions with donors on resource mobilization for NAP implementation are completed. | 3.3.1 Traditional and alternative funding avenues identified for resource mobilization for NAP implementation. | Based on a UNCCD global program, GON staff attended a regional orientation on the Integrated Financing System (IFS). GON subsequently requested for UNCCD Technical Assistance for the conduct of the IFS. No subsequent follow up has been done. |
| Output 3.4 Identification of innovative sustainable financing | 3.4.1 Setting up meetings with Private Sector Businesses.<br>3.4.2 Letters of Commitments. | The Mutalau Demonstration farm is being promoted as an investment opportunity between the Mutalau Village Council and the business sector. Preparatory talks have been made with adjacent business ventures adjacent to the farm. These include a local tourist retreat house, a coconut oil processing |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| mechanisms. | 3.4.3 Memorandum of Understanding/Agreements between Government and Private Sector. | plant and a noni processing plant.<br><br>The EPDSU has facilitated a promotion of the Mutalau Demonstration Farm to investors in the Pacific islands. This facility is currently announced in the website of the Pacific Islands Trade and Invest. This is an arm of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat based in Fiji. (http://www.pacifictradeinvest.com/index.php/component/jomdirectory/35-Mutalau-Farm-Research-Developments?Itemid=#.UODakqz6WFI). There are no letters of commitment so far. |

**Outcome 4: SLM principles are mainstreamed into National Policies, Plans and Legislation.**

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|---|---|
| Output 4.1 Undertake assessments of capacity gaps and barriers in existing policies and regulations to support integration of SLM principles and practices at the national level. | 4.1.1 Conduct a review of current policies/regulations in place for SLM to identify gaps. | No cross sectoral policy analysis has been done except previously under the NAP<br><br>An analysis of policies and programs for organic farming was conducted. The DAFF Project leadership also participated in the preparation of working papers for food security (2011) and water management. |
| | 4.1.2 (a) Conduct a workshop for stakeholder inputs and validation.<br><br>4.1.2 (b) Prepare a post workshop report on identified barriers and possible solutions for the mainstreaming of SLM principles. | |
| Output 4.2 Protocols/guidelines for the integration of SLM into national policy and planning frameworks are developed. | 4.2.1 Finalization of Niue's Forestry Legislation which incorporate SLM principles. | DAFF co-led the preparation of a Forestry Management Plan which is now under final cabinet review. The plan includes SLM protocols in the farming sector in order to minimize its effect on forest cover. This include the designation of appropriate machinery to be used for land preparation; on farm buffer strips; minimal soil disturbance. Also, DAFF with SPC assistance carried out the Forest Inventory on major tree species and forest cover. The Department of Environment (DOE) also spearheaded the Draft Forest Act currently with the Crown Law. |
| | 4.2.2 Development of Organic Farming Policies which incorporates SLM principles. | The Project under DAFF leadership and with the help of a Peace Corps Volunteer conducted an analysis of prospects for organic farming and identified short term and long term strategies to promote it including limitations. A working paper is currently under review by the Legislative Assembly. |
| | 4.2.3 Code of Practice for Land Clearance which incorporate SLM principles. | No discrete policy instrument has been developed. However, selected good practices in land clearance has been incorporated in the proposed Forest Management Plan (e.g. designation of D6 machinery instead of D8 in clearing brush |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | fallow land for rotational agriculture, among others.) |
| Output 4.3 SLM principles reflected and incorporated into current and future National Integrated Strategic Plans. | 4.3.1 Formulation of National Integrated Strategic and Investment Plans which incorporate SLM principles. | Members of the National Assembly visited the Demonstration Farm to be acquainted with the key practices associated with SLM.<br><br>SLM has been incorporated in the Niue National Strategic Plan (2009-2013). SLM management strategies and target indicators included in environmental pillar of strategic plan[1].<br><br>The NNSP provides direction for the development of sector policies that address underlying issues/opportunities such as private sector participation, development of niche markets (e.g. organic products), and specific practices such as groundwater protection and rainwater harvesting. |

[1] The Environment Sector is the 5th of 6 Pillars under the Niue National Strategic Plan. Under the environment sector, there are 26 key indicators for 2013 with 2009 as baseline and grouped into 11 clusters. Examples of indicators most relevant to SLM include the following: a) preparation of SLM and soil management plan; b) EIA legislation and increase in enforcement; c) increase in funding for the environment by 20%; d) increase in number of climate change adaptation initiatives by 50%; e) reduction of agricultural chemicals use by 20%; f) increase in use of organic materials as fertilizer by 10%; and g) promotion of environment principles in school curriculum.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION - OVERALL RATINGS

Each outcome is assessed by certain parameters, namely: Effectiveness (Efv); and Efficiency (Efy), M&E and Implementing Agency (IA) & Executing Agency (EA) the ratings are done for each Outcome.

6. Highly Satisfactory (HS) - No shortcomings
5. Satisfactory (S) – Minor shortcomings
4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Significant shortcomings
2. Unsatisfactory (U) - Major problems
1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) – Severe problems
   Unable to Assess (UA)

### 7.1 RATINGS FOR OUTCOMES

| Project Outcomes | Description of Target Outcomes Indicator | Status as at November 2012 | Efc | Efy |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome 1:** Human resource and institutional capacities are adequately trained in SLM. | 1. One commercial scale sustainable agriculture unit, integrating /demonstrating SLM principles relevant to atoll agriculture. Targeted bottom up, practical, participatory approach to SLM with tangible outputs, allowing for continuation beyond the life of the project. | 1. A commercial scale unit has been set up, supported by clear land tenure; technical facilities and linkages to specific niche markets for its products. GON through DAF is pursuing discussion with the host village to take over operations in the next three (3) years since this did not happen during project life.<br><br>2. GON though DAFF also collaborated with other on-going projects to introduce SLM in village level planning in one village and in the dialogue in 13 other villages. | MS | MU |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacities for knowledge development and management for SLM are developed. | 1. DAFF, DJLS, DOE and EPDSU have at least one staff member able to integrate/utilise Niue's LIS data as a planning tool for SLM. | 1. GON staff from the above agencies is able to utilize the LIS data for planning purposes partly as result of training received and with assistance of a senior LIS staff.<br><br>2. Unwritten protocol exists DAFF is engaging additional staff for data management and interphase of | MS | MS |

| Project Outcomes | Description of Target Outcomes Indicator | Status as at November 2012 | Efc | Efy |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. One clearly defined protocol in place for government departments and civil society to gain access to information from the SLM-related land information systems.<br>3. SLM M&E systems are operational for agriculture and agroforestry. | agricultural data with the LIS.<br><br>3. No monitoring systems have been established for land degradation in agriculture but guidelines for water quality monitoring system are improving.<br><br>Note: No outputs related to synthesis of lessons learned, best practices, knowledge gaps and research needs. No policy briefs were produced. | | |
| **Outcome 3:** Resources are mobilized for the implementation of Niue's completed NAP | 1. One Strategic Investment Programme in place for the prioritization of Niue's projects. | 1. No strategic investment program in place solely for SLM. However SLM is reflected in the multi-year Agriculture Corporate Plan (but without budgetary implications).<br><br>2. It is also reflected in several project proposals submitted and in pipeline to avail of climate change adaptation funds, among others. | MU | MU |
| **Outcome 4:** SLM principals are mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation. | 1. Clear concise protocols/guidelines to facilitate the integration of SLM policies into standard practice. | 1. SLM concepts and practices have been incorporated in selected national planning documents including the Niue Development Strategy, Agriculture Corporate Plan, Forest Management and Forest Act. | MS | MS |

Overall Rating on OUTCOME:

Relevance: Relevant on all aspects; but impact is mostly negligible (See Sect 7.3 for explanations)
Effectiveness: MS
Efficiency: MU
Overall: MS

Rating for M& E (See Section 5.1 and 5.4 for explanations)

Quality of design: no rating per GEF protocol
Implementation: MU
Overall: MU

Rating for IA & EA (See Sections 5.1 to 5.5)

Quality of IA implementation: MS
Quality of EA Implementation: MS
Overall quality of implementation and Execution: MS

## 7.2 RATINGS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Overall Rating: Likely Sustainable

A discussion is provided below on four aspects of sustainability as specified by GEF protocols. A rating is then provided based on the following scale:

4. Likely (L) – negligible risks to sustainability
3. Moderately likely (ML) – moderate risks
2. Moderately unlikely (MU) - significant risks
1. Unlikely (U) - severe risks

The NSC is currently discussing a draft sustainability plan developed by DAFF. This is a good move. The following is the current situation on sustainability using the 3 aspects under GEF protocols.

**Political.** The ownership and participation of the Village Development Council in Mutalau Demonstration Unit and Investment promotion appear uncertain based on the most recent stance of the Village Development Council Chairperson. However, the GON particularly the DAFF is committed to pursue the concept at least until another 3 years. The DAFF leadership in particular is proactively seeking dialogue with the village leadership on the next steps and to address underlying issues. The EPDSU on the other hand through its network with the South Pacific Commission is helping seek investors in the region to become partners with the Village Development Council.

At the ground level, SLM oriented priorities have also been identified by both village councils and DAFF in the 14 villages. There is a civil society group called the Niue Organic Farming Association that is also advocating for SLM practices at the regional/international level, the Niue government and the South Pacific Commission have identified SLM priorities in their multiyear cooperative program. Thus, the interest in SLM is reflected in all multi levels and sustainability.

The major threats to non-sustainability of SLM is not so much about SLM itself but on the threats to agricultural activities itself such as lack of farm manpower; aging farm population and high rate of outmigration of Niue youth. The Niue Government is proactively addressing the concerns on the agriculture and with it the concerns for SLM. One of the compelling reasons is the basic need for food security and water security (the latter in relation to prevention of agricultural chemical pollution).

Rating: Likely Sustainable

**Financia**l. SLM is reflected in the Niue Development Strategy and in the Corporate Plan for Agriculture. It is reflected in the budget for 2013. It is also reflected in various proposals being prepared for external co financing especially those that will tap Climate Change Adaptation Funds.
Rating: Likely Sustainable

**Institutional/ Governance.** SLM is reflected as a discrete subject matter in the DAFF work plan and reporting system. SLM principles are likewise **reflected in the strategies of several sector plans such as those for IWRM and forestry.** The GON is presently implementing reforms in project management so that the Office of the Secretary of Government will supervise more closely the outcome oriented aspects and financial related aspects of projects while Departments will focus on technical management of projects.

Rating: Likely Sustainable

**Environmental.** There are no known unintended effects of SLM technologies**.** A possible concern that needs to be monitored closely is one observation from one Member of Parliament that Mucuna could be an invasive species. International experience does not indicate that this is threat; however the DAFF is regularly monitoring this. Field trials indicate that proper management (regular cutting) is the key. Another possible concern is that many SLM oriented practices generally tend to be labour intensive and this might be a challenge because of the lack of farm manpower and aging farm population. The government has a tradition of providing machine assisted services for farms such as for land preparation and land mowing. It is thus possible for the government to consider the possibility of extending these types of farm support services to other SLM oriented practices.

Rating**:** Likely sustainable

### 7.3 RATING FOR RELEVANCE AND IMPACTS

The ratings for Relevance are: RELEVANT (R) OR NOT RELEVANT (NR). The ratings for impacts are: Significant (S); Minimal (M) or Negligible (N). The ratings below are made for those aspects of the Project accomplishments that have been fairly successful. It does not apply to those aspects that did not work out well.

| **Planned Project Outcomes** | **Ratings of actual outcomes and explanation** |
|---|---|
| **Outcome 1:** Human resource and institutional capacities are adequately trained in SLM. | **Relevant but minimal Impact**<br><br>The relevance of the Mutalau demonstration project can be appreciated if one were to consider the reality of limited manpower and outmigration of the youth. Its strong agribusiness orientation may make farming more attractive to the youth. But the GON still has to overcome several hurdles before |

| Planned Project Outcomes | Ratings of actual outcomes and explanation |
|---|---|
| | reaping the benefits of the concept. Impact is minimal.<br><br>Incorporating SLM in village level development planning and extension activities is a good start. Both aspects of capacity building for SLM are relevant but their overall impact at the moment is significant. However, if the DAFF maintains the momentum of the services being provided, these have high potential for high impact. |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacities for knowledge development and management for SLM are developed. | **Relevant but minimal impact**<br><br>The GON through the DAFF has identified technologies and sites where SLM best practices may be demonstrated. However documentation of the actual benefits has been minimal, thus it has limited material to use for its advocacy programs. The land information system is a system that is being used by the agriculture sector and can be improved over time. |
| **Outcome 3:** Resources are mobilized for the implementation of Niue's completed NAP. | **Relevant but minimal impact**<br><br>The efforts to mobilize resources will likely generate funding in the near future particularly from the Adaptation Fund. However, resource mobilization efforts are not guided by a plan. Discussions with UNCCD for supporting the conduct of the IFS have moved slowly. |
| **Outcome 4:** SLM principles are mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation. | **Relevant but minimal Impact**<br><br>SLM is reflected in both the overarching National Strategy and in sectoral plans for agriculture, water and forestry. This will go a long way to guide the allocation of manpower and financial resources. |

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 8.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GON

#### (a) Combine good governance practices with continuing manpower capacity development

The DAFF provides a good enabling environment for sustaining and mainstreaming efforts for SLM. One noteworthy practice is the conduct of regular village level dialogue in order to be updated of the situation. Another is the participation in village development planning processes as technical resource persons, as in the case of Tuapa. In another project, the DAFF co adapted aspects of the concept of farmer field schools (FFS) to the Niue situation which created a network of farmers who can share innovations to other farmers.

So that these good processes will become more effective and sustainable, it would be helpful if the DAFF can continue with post project capacity building especially of its regular staff. This would help ensure that its personnel would continue to be up to par with the dynamic needs of agriculture

especially with the challenges of climate change. In this connection, DAFF may wish to conduct a post project rapid training needs assessment of its staff in order to take stock of what is known already and what needs to be known based on the recurrent concerns raised by farming communities. The DAFF may then seek the help of friendly international partners (e.g. experts from SPC or Australian / New Zealand partners) to provide support by inviting staff to conference and workshops or provide online coaching.

.

**(b) Mainstreaming specific SLM practices**

**Village level extension.** Maintain the momentum for participating in village planning development efforts and incorporating SLM strategies in village development plans. This should now be a major focus of post project SLM efforts. The experience in Tuapa village may be assessed and measures implemented to address constraints or opportunities that will prevent or enable the community to implement the SLM activities that they have planned earlier.

The Project Coordinator comes from Tuapa village so he should be encouraged to give special attention to this so that Tuapa can become a good model for other villages. This strategy may be accomplished in collaboration with the Department of Community Affairs who is sustaining the village level planning process that was started by the UNDP assisted Community Centred Sustainable Development Project (CCSDP).

**Communicating best practices and vital support services.** There is a need to immediately monitor and document good practices already occurring in parts of Niue. These may include the successful application of Mucuna to help in soil rehabilitation. Results of key famer trials should be recorded and appropriate results incorporated in extension materials that DAFF may prepare. Systematic documentation of this kind of information can also serve as baseline assessment for future project proposals.

Within the context of SLM advocacy, continue to support efforts to promote organic agriculture, through the Niue Organic Farmers Association (NIOFA). DAFF has done admirable work to facilitate access to organic markets by helping build capacity for certification. Expand advocacy to encourage citizens to consume more organic products. The DAFF may work out a strategy to incorporate this advocacy in schools and through the religious congregations among others.

**Mutalau Demonstration Unit**. Continue efforts for dialogue with the Village Development Council to identify underlying issues and work out solutions to enable the village to gradually take over operations. The effort of the EPDSU to invite investors to the Mutalau village may be worth supporting. At the same time, be prepared for the contingency in case the Village Council will finally decide to back out from the arrangement.

The GON should consider the possibility of managing the demonstration unit itself if the village leadership would finally give up but if investors do come in within the next three (3) years.

**Expand the menu of soil rehabilitation and climate change adaptation technologies.** Soil fertility improvement is a vital concern. Application of Mucuna, composting and improving fertilizer efficiency is among the measures being promoted. The DAFF may wish to do a review of these approaches by checking on the field performance so that implementation problems perceived by the community may be addressed proactively.

At the same time, DAFF may continue to try potential practical technologies for soil amelioration. One of these could be to promote the construction of biological fences using Nitrogen-fixing wood

perennials. An example is *Gliricidia sepium* which grows well as a fence in the demo farm. *Gliricidia* biomass can be harvested every 45 to 60 days and used as quick decomposing green mulch (roughly a 50 kg bag of leaves has an N value equivalent to Urea). As bio fence, they can help mitigate the effects of intense heat and prolonged drought. They can also be a good source of bio fertilizer.

**(c) Resource Mobilization**

**SLM as Climate Change Adaptation strategy**. SLM practices should increasingly be promoted not just as SLM technologies but as also as climate change adaptation strategies in order for them to be better appreciated. This is also because most of climate change adaptation strategies are in fact derived from long accepted SLM oriented practices such as use of live mulch, soil and water conservation practices.

**Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS).** Accelerate negotiations with the UNCCD and the Global Mechanism (financial arm of UNCCD) to secure a grant for the preparation of an IFS for Niue. The IFS will help the GON systematically identify and implement specific measures for resource mobilization for SLM.

**Financial management.**- It would be good if GON and UNDP sit down to discuss how to strategically address recurring problems related to financial management of NEX Projects as experienced by the SLM project..

**M&E system.** Future project proposals should benefit from the project's experience on the use (or lack thereof) of the M&E system. The development of and adherence of a project specific, professionally prepared M&E plan should be an important project conditionality for fund releases in future projects. This will also ensure effective adaptive management.

## 9.0 LESSONS LEARNED (BY THE NSC BUT WITH COMMENTS BY EVALUATOR)

The NSC is presently discussing the key lessons learned and the Project Manager has prepared a working paper. This evaluation exercise congratulates the NSC for the substantive identification and analysis of lessons. Some of the lessons identified by the Project leadership are summarized below, using the categories established by the NSC. The evaluator then provides annotations as needed for each set of lessons *(rendered in italics).*

**MANAGEMENT AND GOVENANCE**

a) Proper selection, project management training of Senior Project Staff and follow up technical support is essential. Staff augmentation is essential considering the sheer number of outputs to deliver and the already limited manpower to begin with. Training on financial management is absolutely essential to ensure value for money. *Evaluators comment: Agree. In addition, the DAFF decision to designate regular staff as coordinator is a good move to ensure sustainability. Training and coaching based on TNA would address capacity gaps.*

b) Everybody agrees to interagency collaboration but the reality is that agencies with severe manpower problems would opt to prioritize their core mandates first before attending to those required by the Project. At the design stage, look at the agencies priorities and build from there. Project activities must be perceived as beneficial to the agencies own core concerns in order to elicit full support. *Evaluators comment*: *Fully agree. In addition, the training for Project staff should include the*

*facilitation of delivery of outputs from other agencies responsible for other outcomes. Agency activities should be covered in the regular agenda of NSC.*

**POLITICAL**

c) The championship of senior officials could help facilitate the adoption of a concept. This is based on the experience of the championship of the Mutalau project by the former Minister of Environment. *Evaluators comment: To enhance the effectiveness and relevance of political support it may be useful to ensure that decision making process is supported by sufficient feasibility analysis to ensure that concepts are designed on a scale that can be realistically achieved as well as sustained under various risk scenarios (e.g. change in government). The initiative for this kind of thorough analysis may best come from an equal partner such as the UNDP.*

d) For a major undertaking with the scope and scale of the Mutalau Demonstration Unit, capacity analysis of the community that will implement the project and subsequent capacity building must be done earlier in the design. *Evaluators comment: Agree. In addition, a social analysis will be useful to determine the internal driving forces that affect community decision making.*

**PROJECT ACTITIVITIES**

The scale of project activities should be matched to capacities and risk management planning is essential**.** Capacity building is best done through participatory approaches**.** *Evaluators comment: Agree, this should be done at the project design stage or if not possible at the inception stage. It will help also in future projects for UNDP to exercise full quality assurance on the inception process so that potential issues, plans are significantly adjusted and risk management planning is effectively done.*

Stakeholder analysis is essential to better plan strategies to engage them**.** Community planning is essential where community identifies its own problems and identify priority solutions. A good approach is that of the CSDDP project. *Evaluators comment: Agree. If this was done adequately at the start at Mutalau, the project designers might have a wider range of ideas to choose from which project concepts may be derived.*

**INFORMATION MANAGEMENT**

Systematic documentation of project processes and activities are essential as basis for monitoring as well as identifying early impacts. This is one of the Projects weaknesses. *Evaluators comment: Documentation is also essential to help recognize and disseminate good practices.*

An awareness building plan needs to be formulated and funded adequately to support project processes. *Evaluators comment: Agree. Such an awareness building plan should be based on an analysis of knowledge, attitudes and practices of the key stakeholder groups. Awareness plans should to the extent possible, be audience specific. Feasibility studies and social analysis would be useful references for the analysis.*

## 10.0 KEY REFERENCES

Government of Niue and UNDP. 2005. Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Niue.

Government of Niue: Department of Agriculture. 2011. Mid-term Evaluation for UNDP/GEF Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Niue.

Government of Niue: Village of Mutalau. 2011. Mutalao Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

Government of Niue: Department of Agriculture. 2011. UNCCD Sustainable Land Management Project Exit Strategy.

Government of Niue: Department of Agriculture. 2011. DAFF Village Visits 2011 Progress Report.

Government of Niue. 2010. Reducing Climate Risks To Food Security In Niue Through Integrated Community-Based Adaptation Measures And Related Institutional Strengthening.

Government of Niue and UNDP. May 2007. Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Niue project.

Government of Niue. 2011 Tuapa Village Plan

## ATTACHMENTS

### 1. TOR

In accordance with United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Sustainable Land Management Project in Samoa and Niue.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

**PROJECTSUMMARY TABLE**

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID: 00043651
GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3403
COUNTRY: SAMOA
PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in **SAMOA** GEF AGENCY: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES): DURATION: Three years
GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: August 31st 2006

| FINANCING PLAN (US$) | |
|---|---|
| **GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT** | |
| Project | $475,000.00 |
| *Total GEF* | 475,000.00 |
| **Co-Financing** | |
| Government of Samoa (GoS) | 300,000.00 |
| MNREM (GoS) | 110,000.00 |
| MAF (GoS) | 70,000.00 |
| Others (UNDP) | 48,000.00 |
| *Sub-Total Co-financing:* | **528,000.00** |
| *Total Project Financing:* | **1,003,000.00** |
| **FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:** | |

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID: 00044093
GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3400
COUNTRY: Niue
PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in **NIUE**
GEF AGENCY: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCIES: Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries; Department of Environment; Department of Justice, Lands and Survey; Economic Planning Development & Statistics Unit
DURATION: Three years
GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: 31st August 2006

| **FINANCING PLAN (US$)** | |
|---|---|
| **GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT** | |
| Project | 474,545 |
| *Sub-Total GEF* | 474,545 |
| Co-financing | |
| Government | 254,063 |
| Bilateral | |
| NGOs | |
| Others | 751,276 |
| *Sub-Total Co-financing:* | **1,005,339** |
| *Total Project Financing:* | **1,479,884** |
| **FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:** | |

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

**Samoa.** Addressing land degradation is a priority issue for Samoa. The country's First National Report to the UNCCD and the GEF Capacity Development Initiative Report both identified unsustainable agricultural practices and deforestation as the two main contributing factors to land degradation. Land degradation in Samoa has not been studied in detail to ascertain the extent of the problem. In recognition of national and global environmental benefits the overall expected goal of this project is the promotion of effective sustainable land management in Samoa so as to promote ecosystem heath, integrity, stability, functions and services. This project is submitted under the LDC-Small Islands Developing States (LDC-SIDS) Portfolio Project and will help achieve the objectives of Operational Programme 15 and Strategic Priority 1 relating to Targeted Capacity Building for sustainable land management. Its objective is to strengthen local and national capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), including mainstreaming into national development strategies and policies, improving the quality of project design and implementation, and ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process. Key activities will include completion of a National Action Plan (NAP) under the UNCCD, capacity building, strengthening legislative and policy frameworks and the development of a Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization. The management of the project will involve the existing National Steering Committee established initially under UNCCD, Technical Advisory Group, Project Manager and possibly a Project Assistant. The operational phase of the project is 3 years after which SLM issues and focus will be mainstreamed into the national development planning and policy framework.

**Niue.** This MSP project will enable Niue to address sustainable land management in Niue, which will complement the NAP process and implementation. And contributes towards the achievement of the following long term goal, which is the sustainable land management of Niue's unique terrestrial resources while at the same time promoting sustainable productive systems contributing to the social well-being of its present and future generations.

The MSP aims to address sustainable land management issues via a targeted practical Participatory "bottom up" approach inclusive of all stakeholders of Niue society. The ultimate objective being that capacities for sustainable land management are built in appropriate governmental departments, civil society groups, resource users and mainstreamed into government planning and strategy development.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. Specific objectives include:

- Assess extent of achievements of projects outputs and results including extent of implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations
- Examine current level of impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to institutional strengthening, biodiversity conservation and conservation friendly livelihood promotion, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals
- Identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the project and also to provide evidences to improve design and implementation of similar projects in near future
- Identify an exit strategy for the project by linking its products to other ongoing initiatives

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[1] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Samoa and Niue visiting the relevant project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (UNDP, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment: land management division in Samoa, DAFF in Niue).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ***Annex 1***), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in ***Annex 3***.

| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Monitoring and** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry | | Quality of UNDP Implementation | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency | |
| Overall quality of M&E | | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance | | Financial resources: | |
| Effectiveness | | Socio-political: | |
| Efficiency | | Institutional framework and governance: | |
| Overall Project Outcome | | Environmental : | |
| | | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | |

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

## PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

| Co-financing (type/source) | UNDP own financing | | Government (million US$) | | Partner Agency (million US$) | | Total (million US$) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | | | | | | | | |
| Loans/Concessions | | | | | | | | |
| ☐ In-kind support | | | | | | | | |
| ☐ Other | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | | |

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[2]

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Samoa.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

---

[2] A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME (SAMOA AND NIUE)

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* working days according to the following plan: **Annex 4** presents schedule of detailed time frame of evaluation.

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|---|---|---|
| **Preparation** | *3* days | |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *17* days | |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *7* days | |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | |

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | Before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. ***Annex 5*** presents tentative outline of evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator. The international evaluator will lead the team and will be responsible for ensuring overall quality and finalizing the report. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant is required to combine international calibre evaluation expertise, the latest thinking in landscape conservation and sustainable-use, and knowledge of the regional context. The consultant will be hired by UNDP directly, following UNDP rules and procedures.

International Consultant should have following qualification:

- At-least Master degree in natural resource management or relevant subjects
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience with strong technical background

management, or related areas of natural resource management, including demonstrable expertise in project formulation, implementation and evaluation

- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Demonstrated ability to work with developing country government agencies and NGOs.
- Previous work experience in the Pacific, working experience in Samoa and Niue would be an asset
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures, as well as its evaluation policies and guidelines, will be a useful asset
- Previous work experience with United Nations or other multilateral/bilateral development assistance agencies is a useful asset.
- Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams in high stress. Ability to meet short deadlines

The evaluator should conduct a debriefing at the end of evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead the presentation on a draft review of the findings and recommendations with the national level stakeholders, planned at the end of the evaluation mission. Likewise, s/he should lead drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation.

## 2. ITENERARY

| Date | Activity | Discussant |
|---|---|---|
| Pre – Visit | | |
| December 3 | Orientation on TOR for Samoa and Niue (In Apia, Samoa) | Ms. Marta Moneo and UNDP team |
| December 7 | Arrival in Niue from Samoa | |
| December 8-9 | Desk Review | Brief meeting with Mr. Poi Okesene |
| December 10 (Mon) | Meeting with DAF – orientation | Mr. Brendon Pasisi, Dir |
| | Meeting with SOG | Mr. Richard Hipa, Secretary to Government |
| | Meeting with EPDS | Mr. Frank Sioneholo, Dir |
| | Meeting with DOE | Mr. Sauni Togatule- Director |
| | Meeting with Water Division | Mr. Andre Siohane, Head Water |
| December 11 (Tue) | Meeting with NIOFA | Mr. Taufakavalu Tukiuha President-NIOFA |
| December 12 We | Prliminary findings – NSC meeting | Mr. Brendon Pasisi , Facilitator |
| | Meeting with Partner Project – CSSDP | Ms. Gaylene Tasmania, Dir |
| | Meeting with DJLS | Richard Siataga –LIS |
| December 13 Thu | Meeting with Individual Farmers | Mr. Poi Okesene , SLM – Project Coordinator |
| | Meeting with former Head of Forestry | Mr. Brandon Tauasi - Former |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Head of Forestry |
| December 14 | Visit for Famer | Mr. Fisa Pihigia, MP |
| | Meeting with advocate of Demo Farm Unit | Mr. Bill Motufoou (MP), Former Environment minister |
| | Departure for Manila | |

## 3. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

| Name | Position |
|---|---|
| Ms. Marta Moneo | |
| Mr. Poi Okesene | SLM - Project Coordinator |
| Mr. Brendon Pasisi | DAFF Director |
| Richard Siataga | GIS/LIS Officer - DJLS |
| Mr. Andrei Siohane | Head, Water Supply Dv Manager,Coordinator – IWRM |
| Mr. Frank Sioneholo | EPDS Director |
| Ms. Doreen Siataga | Financial Accountant -Treasury Dept |
| Ms. Gaylene Tasmania | Director,Community Affairs and Project Manager (July 2009; September 2010; March, May 2011 ) |
| Mr. Taufakavalu Tukiuha | President-Niue Island Organic Farming Association(NIOFA), Farmer |
| Mr. .Sauni Togatule | Director, Dept of Environment |
| Mr. Richard Hipa, | Secretary to Government |
| Mr. Brandon Tauasi | Former Head of Forestry |
| Mr. Fisa Pihigia | MP for Tuapa Village, Farmer |
| Mr. Bill Motufoou | Member of Parliament , Former Environment & Agriculture Minister |
| Farmer Leaders | |
| Mr. Falaniua Haletama | Farmer |
| Mr. Sam Makatogja | Farmer |
| Mr. Vaugn Misileki ( Poe ) | Crop Research Trainee, DAFF, Young Farmer |