



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

# Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Republic of Marshall Islands

A Medium Sized Project for Capacity Building, Policy Development  
and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management

Funded by the Global Environment Facility and  
Implemented by the United Nations Development Programme  
Executed by the Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)

## Terminal Evaluation Report November 2012

## **Acknowledgments**

The Team Leader of the Terminal Evaluation would like to thank the people who have contributed to the evaluation through interviews, discussions and email correspondence. In particular I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the following people without whom this evaluation could not been made possible:

The RMI Government, particularly the Acting Director of OEPPC, Mr Warwick Harris and the SLM Project Assistant, Mr .Ned Lobwij for their assistance during the visit in RMI. I also wish to thank Mr. Floyd Robinson from UNDP MCO, Suva, Fiji for his willing assistance and support.

***Kommol tata***

## List of Acronyms

CMI	College of the Marshall Islands
CRE	Cooperative Research and Extension
DLF	Detailed Logical Framework
DSAP	Development of Sustainable Agriculture in the Pacific
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ET	Evaluation Team
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FP	Focal Point
GIS	Global Information System
GIZ	Gesellschaft fuer International Zusammenarbeit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IWRM	Integrated Watershed Resource Management
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LOA	Letter of Agreement
LF	Logical Framework
MCT	Micronesian Conservation Trust
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MIMRA	Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Medium Size Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAP	National Action Plan
NDS	National Development Strategy
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OEPPC	Office of the Environment and Economic Planning and Coordination
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change

PIF	Pacific Island Fund
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Pacific Survey Company
R&D	Ministry of Resources and Development
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
SD Unit	FSM Sustainable Development Unit
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SOPAC	Applied Geoscience Technology Division, SPC
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TPR	Tripartite Review
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UOG	University of Guam
USFS	United States Forest Service
VF	Venezuela Fund

## Table of Contents

No.	Contents	Page
1	Executive Summary	8
1.2	Purpose of the evaluation	10
1.3	Main findings	10
1.4	Recommendations	13
1.5	Lesson Learned	15
2	Introduction	17
2.1	Goals and objectives of the project	17
2.2	Purpose and goals of the evaluation	19
2.3	Key issues addressed	20
2.4	Methodology and structure of the evaluation	22
3	The Project and its development context	23
3.1	Project start and duration	23
3.2	Problems that the project seeks to address	23
3.3	Objectives of the project	24
3.4	Main stakeholders	26
3.5	Results expected	26
4	Findings and Conclusions	27
4.1	Project formulation	27
4.1.1	Implementation approach	27
4.1.2	Country ownership and drivenness	28
4.1.3	Stakeholder participation	28

Table 6	Stakeholders and their involvements in the SLM Project	30
4.1.4	Replication approach	31
4.1.5	Cost effectiveness	31
Table 1	Requested funding by OEPPC to UNDP for SLM activities	32
Table 2	Material and equipment including consultant to be requested before the end of Nov.2012	33
4.1.6	UNDP comparative advantage	33
4.1.7	Linkages between project and other interventions with the sector	34
4.1.8	Indicators	34
Table 3	Assessment of progress against measurable indicators	35
4.1.9	Management arrangements	48
4.2	Implementation	49
4.2.1	Financial planning.	49
Table 4	Percentage of inception budget allocated to outcomes and project management	51
Table 5	SLM Budget and GEF disbursement	52
4.2.2	Monitoring and Evaluation	53
4.2.3	Execution and implementation modalities	53
4.2.4	Management by the UN joint presence office in RMI	53
4.2.5	Coordination and operational issues	54
4.3	Results rating of project performance	54
4.3.1	Rating of Project Performance	56
4.3.2	Sustainability	57
4.3.3	Contribution to upgrading of skills of staff	57
5	Recommendations	58
5.1	Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits of the project	58

6	Future Project Strategy	59
7	Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success	62
Annex 1	List of documents reviewed	63
Annex 2	List of persons interviewed	64
Annex 3	Questionnaire used	65
Annex 4	Terms of References RMI SLM Terminal Evaluation Team Leader	69
Annex 5	Summary of Evaluation Findings	78

## **1. Executive Summary**

### **1.1 Brief Description of Project**

The Medium Sized Project (MSP) on Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) is a Global Environmental Facility (GEF) funded project and implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). In partnership with the Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC), the project commenced on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2008 and was scheduled to end in May 2011. Two extensions were granted until June 30<sup>th</sup> 2012 and a final extension until November 30<sup>th</sup> 2012.

The overall expected goal of the project is sustainable land management in RMI, contributing to the achievement of the national Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets and Sustainable Development goals established by the people and government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

The project objectives were to enhance and develop the individual institutional and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) to mainstream SLM considerations into national development strategies and policies, to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the development arena, to develop a National Action Plan (NAP) for SLM as well as a medium term investment plan, while ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views were reflected and integrated into the process.

The key activities included completion of a National Action Plan (NAP) under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), capacity building and review of legislation, agro-forestry, degradation, water catchment, coastal management , gender, land polices and policy framework and development of a Medium Term Investment Plan. There is a total of 4 outcomes, 14 outputs and 56 activities.

Compounding the land degradation problem of RMI is the pressure placed on the limited land area by population growth and urban migration especially on the island of Majuro and Ebeye. Other contributing factors to the achievement of sustainable land management in RMI include limited capacity at all levels of government.

The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) project was intended to help lift some of these barriers for SLM thus paving the way for the RMI to achieve greater economic success, food security and environmental sustainability. Capacity building activities of the project will help develop the knowledge and understanding of local farmers about SLM practices and tools with



their application. It will also help increase the understanding and appreciation of government agencies thereby facilitating the effective mainstreaming of SLM into national strategies.

The purpose of the SLM project within the RMI can therefore be viewed as a means to provide a comparative advantage in the environment sector where certain funding and technical gaps exist, particularly in bolstering ongoing local, national and regional projects and initiatives in the RMI.

With a view toward sustainable community-based livelihoods, gender equality, sustainable land use and the improvement of ecosystems, the RMI continues to work toward effective land management and natural resource use. It does so in the context of the ongoing activities and factors affecting sustainable land management, agriculture practices and infrastructure development. Assistance with these land management and socio-economic goals is provided through ongoing on-the-ground projects in partnership with other regional and international organizations

The total project cost of the SLM MSP was US\$1,064,000, and consisted of a GEF contribution of US\$500,000 (including PDFFA funding of \$25,000) and co-financing of US \$564,000. UNDP is responsible for providing the oversight of the project, in particular for management of GEF funds (US\$ 500,000)

Due to lack of management by the RMI Focal Point and due shortage of human resources, the project only achieved approximately 30% of the planned activities and less than 30% of the GEF funding was spent at the time of the terminal review.

Progressive work towards the completion of the National Action Plan has started and this should be completed by December 20<sup>th</sup>. 2012. This is highlighted as one key project achievements.

## 1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is clearly spelled out in its TOR that states as; follows:

- Assess the relevance, performance and success of the project;
- Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outputs;
- Assess the extent to which the overall project design remains valid.
- Assess potential impacts and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of the global environmental goal;
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementations;.
- Provide recommendations on design modification that could have increased the likelihood of success;
- Assess overall project performance against project objectives and outcomes as set out in the project document;
- Assess project outputs to date and review planned strategies and plans for achieving overall outcomes within the timeframe;
- Assess the substantive effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- Assess project relevance to the national priorities including the extent to which the project is seen as making a meaningful contribution to addressing issues relating to SLM in the RMI;
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements for the project;
- Provide guidance for future project activities if necessary. This includes consideration of how the present project design should be adjusted to take into account the operational experience to date and planned up-scaling of financing for the achievement of outcomes;
- List and document lessons-learned concerning project design, implementation and management;
- Make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP projects.

## 1.3 Main Findings

As a result of the analysis of written documentation, a 6-days visit to the RMI plus meetings, discussions and interviews with an extensive range of stakeholders to activate the terminal evaluation the following conclusions were made on the overall impact of the MSP:

- As mentioned under “lessons learned” (section 1.5, p15), the project took a long time to get started and there were several reasons contributing to the delay. The main reason was due to insufficient attention given to the SLM project and lack of leadership by the Director of OEPPC who was the Focal Point (FP) for the SLM Project. Although the project got two extensions from May 2011 to November 2012, only 30% of the activities have either been completed or partially completed. At the time of the review less than 30% of the GEF funding has been spent. Other factors which contributed to the delays were slow payments of project funds through the Department of Finance, lack of human resources and insufficient stakeholder involvement.
- The implementation of the project activities have been centralized at the OEPPC with very little input from other agencies that had been identified as partners and stakeholders. OEPPC has limited human resources and the potential for other expertise (outside OEPPC) to assist the project implementation has not been fully utilized. Furthermore there seemed to be unwillingness on the part of the FP to consult and coordinate with those outside OEPPC. For these reasons hardly any stakeholder and steering committee meetings were held and activities were not satisfactorily executed or simply never started.
- One major activity was the National Action Plan (NAP) to address land degradation and utilize it to guide SLM programs and activities in the RMI. In line with the Strategic Action Plan a consultant was engaged to draft the NAP in year 1. Unfortunately, since this time, no stakeholder meetings have taken place, with the exception of a validation workshop in 2011. However after this no actions occurred. There is still a need to finalize the NAP present it to Cabinet and raised awareness before submission to UNDP and UNCCD. In late November a consultant was recruited to finalize the NAP by December 20<sup>th</sup> 2012.

Some aspects of the project seemed to have had good achievements, unfortunately this activity started very late; For example, in late October 2012 a Mobile Team consisting of members from the Health Department, Education, Agriculture, CMI, local government and NGO's visited Arno, Mele and Aur Atolls to assess amongst others food security, coastal erosion using local trees, coconut replanting and invasive species. This activity should be continued with funding under GEF 5.

- Little gains have been made with mainstreaming SLM principles into the RMI development planning and land management strategies; there remain a number of important outcomes still to be achieved which warrant consideration of further development programs in this important area.

Another activity which was supposed to be completed in year 1 and was satisfactorily executed in 2011 was the gender assessment and inception including validation of national action plan workshops. This is one of the very few activities that was implemented and documented after the workshop.

- Effectiveness of project implementation was affected by the lack of a coherent strategy for engagement of stakeholders outside OEPPC. Except for some R&D, and EPA other potential stakeholders such as CMI, Department of Lands, and NGOs have had little knowledge or awareness of what the SLM project was doing. There was no clear strategy in place to show how these stakeholders could be engaged, or their potential role in project implementation.
- Members of other important groups like the Marshall Island Marine Resource Authority (MIMRA) and the Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS) who should have been more involved in the SLM Project reported that they would have liked to be more involved in the SLM Project if the OEPPC would have asked them, they have already carried out many activities which are in line with the SLM activities.



## **1.4 Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

That a consultant is engaged to conduct stakeholder meetings/workshops to finalize the National Action Plan (NAP). The engagement of the consultant and field work needs to be completed before the end of November 2012. The final NAP document needs to be completed before the end of December 2012.

### **Recommendation 2**

That OEPPC provides all supporting documentation to UNDP for UNDP to be able to respond to the requests from 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 and September 5<sup>th</sup> 2012 which are listed in the letter to the UNDP Resident Representative dated 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012 and also in a request in July 2012 for a list of items and costing (see Table 1).

### **Recommendation 3**

That the OEPPC is providing a final request together with supporting documentation and responding to questions asked by UNDP for funding of some of the outstanding/incomplete activities, e.g. finalization of NAP, before the end of November 2012 and execution before the end of December 2012 with a final report. For the list of items and costing see Table 2.

### **Recommendation 4**

The MOU between OEPPC, R&D and the Ebeye landowner is signed before the end of November 2012. This is a pre-condition for funding for the Ebeye nursery (output 2.3).

### **Recommendation 5**

When designing future SLM projects, UNDP should ensure that successes from previous projects are built upon and practical mitigating factors of potential risks considered.

**Recommendation 6**

For future projects a Mid-Term Review should be conducted. This will help to determine if the project is on target and if corrections need to be made.

**Recommendation 7**

For future projects a full time project manager who is dedicated to the project should be engaged to ensure that stakeholders and steering committees are in place and the planned activities are carried out.

**Recommendation 8**

For future such projects NGO's and college representatives should be utilized especially when their organization or institution is expected to be actively involved in the project implementation. This should have been done when annual work plans and respective budgets were prepared.

**Recommendation 9**

For future such projects the OEPPC should identify partners/stakeholders who will implement the activities. In the case of the SLM Project the OEPPC was an implementing agency for many activities, however OEPPC does not have the human resources and expertise for the implementation of these activities. It is recommended that the OEPPC should be a coordinating body. OEPPC should sign agreements or MoUs with partners/stakeholders on detailed funding, expected deliverables and disbursement timeframes.

**Recommendation 10**

That the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) be appraised of the suspension of the UNCCD NAP and investment strategy process in the RMI pending the development of the Pacific country template for alignment of NAPs with the UNCCD 5 years Action Strategy and requested to elevate the RMI in priority for technical assistance for completion of these tasks within 12 months.

**Recommendation 11**

Existing capacity and regional mechanisms should be utilized for future UNDP projects e.g. SPC North Pacific Office, UNFPA-led UN Joint Presence Office, Micronesia Conservation Trust, etc. specifically for providing core administrative support (reporting, procurement, financial) and technical assistance. This is especially for the purpose of building capacity on the ground in the

North Pacific region. These sub-regional institutions can be used for any number of aspects of the project, from financial administration, to serving on steering committees and technical working groups.

#### **Recommendation 12**

That a full report and joint presentation by the UN Joint Presence Office and the OEPPC on the goals, outcomes and benefits of the SLM Project be given to (i) members of the RMI Congress and (ii) the heads of SLM related government agencies and stakeholders. The presentation would help increase understanding of SLM principles, provide responses to technical questions and promote strengthened governance and stewardship for land resources amongst the countries leaders.

#### **Recommendation 13**

That in future projects budgetary transparency is achieved so all implementing stakeholders are aware of funding allocations and are kept updated on revisions and reallocations of funding with approval being sought or at least consultation taking place before budget lines are reduced or reprogrammed.

#### **Recommendation 14**

Delegate remaining activities directly to the agencies responsible for their implementation. This should be implemented through MOUs between OEPPC and partner agencies clearly stating their respective roles and responsibilities.

#### **Recommendation 15**

To improve project monitoring and evaluation RMI Government should support a more involved role of the UN Country Development Manager in the RMI is recommended.

### **1.5 Lesson Learned**

The RMI SLM project took a long time to get off the ground for several reasons which are outlined below. These can be learned from for future projects:



1. One of the main reasons why the RMI SLM was very slow and inactive was due to insufficient attention to the SLM Project and poor leadership from the Director of OEPPC who was the Focal Point (FP) for the SLM Project. There could have been corrective actions implemented by UN Country Development Manger when the slow development of the project was observed in the early stage of the project. Country visits by UN personal, a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), more active stakeholders and steering committee would all have helped to make improvements or changes.

2 After almost three years delay, when the Inception and Validation workshop in January 2011 was conducted the SLM Project became suddenly more active. This shows that activities like a workshop and consultant visit is a wake-up call.

3 There was one SLM Project Assistant, but he was spending more time on other activities. If a full time Project Manager with good management skills would have been engaged, better and faster results could have been achieved.

4 The lack of stakeholder involvement was other main reasons why many activities like the NAP were not completed in time. This could have been improved if the National Focal Point would have been willing delegate tasks to other agencies/departments and if an active steering committee would have been in place. in place.

5 There could have been more stakeholders like NGO's and the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) involved, e.g. Objective 2.7 should have been under the responsibility of CMI and not Ministry of Resources and Development (R&D).

6 The critical role of human resources was highlighted in the project implementation. This particularly addresses the need for manpower requirements to ensure the prepared NAP has a fully operational SLM steering committee and to also resolve issues regarding accountability and roles of the various agencies and partners engaged.

7 Applying more land management principles and up-scaling proven techniques will take time and experience to become established. The expected results from the SLM within a 3 year time frame may have been too ambitious. Realistic expectations should drive future project designs. The SLM program will need to be much more strategic, simple and issue/ground-oriented than has been if it is to be effective in future.

8 The development of strong programmatic linkages with regional agencies such as SPC, SPREP and regional organizations greatly strengthens the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives especially those related to capacity building, e.g. workshops on Gender Assessment Inception and Validation of the NAP by the SPC.

9 Strong partnerships with NGO's can significantly improve prospects of effective implementation especially where community based activities are involved.

10 OEPPC did not have the capacity to implement all the activities for the SLM Project. OEPPC should have identified partners/stakeholders who will implement the activities. OEPPC should have done a better job in the coordination and monitoring of activities.

## **2. Introduction**

### **2.1 Goals and objectives of the project**

The overall expected goal of the project is sustainable land management in the RMI contributing to the achievement of the national Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets and sustainable development goals established by the people and government of the RMI.

The objectives of the Medium Sized Project (MSP) are to enhance and develop the individual, institutional, and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), to mainstream SLM considerations into national development strategies and policies, to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the development arena, to develop a National Action Plan (NAP) for SLM (as well as a medium term investment plan) and ensure that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process.

These were ambitious goals and objectives for a 3 year project given the limited human resources available.

More specifically the projects logical framework identifies 4 outcomes and 56 activities to be achieved through project implementation:

**Outcome 1 National Action Plan (NAP) to address land degradation completed and used to guide SLM programs and activities in the RMI.**

Output 1.1: NAP developed as a result of stakeholder consultation.

Output 1.2: NAP priorities are incorporated into national development plans and national budgets and awareness raising activities are accomplished to aid its promotion.

*The total cost of Outcome 1 is \$US 27,000. GEF allocation for this output is \$US 5,000 and co-financing were sourced from the RMI OEPPC and SPREP: 1*

**Outcome 2: Strengthening capacity for planning, implementing and monitoring SLM at the systemic, institutional and individual level.**

Output 2.1: Enhanced capacities for the effective planning administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources.

Output 2.2: Enhanced capacity in Land Information Management and use of appropriate technologies for recording land use and land use change.

Output 2.3: Strengthened capacity for sustainable agro-forestry particularly in areas of high population density.

Output 2.4: Enhanced capacity to assess for and monitor land degradation.

Output 2.5: Enhanced capacities for the rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas through pilot community based activities.

Output 2.6: Strengthening capacity for increased water catchments to support livelihood and organic farming activities.

Output 2.7: Strengthening capacity to undertake research into land degradation issues in the RMI.

Output 2.8: Enhanced capacity of the RMI EPA to promote and implement the RMI Coastal Management National Framework.

*The total cost of Outcome 2 amounts to \$US 699,000.00. Co-financing sourced from the RMI Government totals \$US 244,000.00, US \$15,000.00, SPC \$US 15,000.00, Government of Taiwan (ROC) \$US 15,000.00. SOPAC \$ 5,000.00 and Government of Venezuela \$US89,000.00. The GEF funds allocation for this output comes to the total of \$US 325,000.00.*

**Outcome 3: SLM mainstreamed into national strategies, sector policies and local government and departmental work plans.**

Output 3.1: Gender promoted and mainstreamed into SLM policies and strategies.

Output 3.2: Review and revision of land policies to incorporate SLM principles.

Output 3.3: SLM mainstreamed into NDS and MDG targets.

*The total cost of Outcome 3 is \$US 70,000.00. GEF will fund \$US 40,000.00 and RMI will co-finance at the value of \$US 22,000.00, SPC \$US 3,000.00 and Pacific Forum Secretariat \$US 5,000.00.*

**Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed and supporting implementation of the NAP.**

Outcome 4.1: Development of a Medium Term Investment Plan with associated resource mobilization plan supporting SLM.

*Total Cost of Outcome 4 is \$US 25,000.00 with GEF funding of \$US 15,000.00 and co-financing from the RMI Government of \$US 5,000.00 and SPREP \$US 5,000.00.*

## **2.2 Purpose and goals of the evaluation**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final

evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

The overall objective of this terminal evaluation is to review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature.

In the Project document Monitoring and Evaluation Budget, a total of \$US 40,000 was allocated for workshops, MTR,TPR "lessons learned" and others. Unfortunately many of these activities were not carried out.

### **2.3 Key issues addressed**

As already mentioned in "Lesson Learned" (section 1.5), the SLM project in the RMI had a very slow start, from 2008 to 2011 hardly any activities were implemented. Some of the main reasons why it was so slow were due to insufficient attention by the FP to the SLM project, lack of human resources and lack of leadership from the Director of OEPPC who was the focal point for the SLM Project from the beginning until May 2012.

- **Policy-** constrains in enabling OEPPC to partner with other line ministries and NGOs on the implementation of SLM activities, delays in the timely development of RMIs NAP, e.g. poor stakeholder involvement.
- **Operational-** delays in project start-up, dissatisfaction amongst stakeholders and intended beneficiaries, poor project management skills
- **Financial-** delays in financial disbursements, lack of collaboration between Finance and OEPPC personnel in acquitting funds, addressing audit gaps.

- Another key issue of the slow movement of the project and long delays was that there was no full time Project Manager; The Project Assistant who should have been working full time on SLM project was spending most of his time on other OEPPC related matters.
- Another key issue is the low involvement of stakeholders and partners in the SLM project which is mainly due to an insufficient leadership of the focal point.

## **2.4 Methodology and structure of the evaluation**

The individual contract for the team leader (TL) for Terminal Evaluation commenced on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and shall expire upon satisfactory completion of the services described in the Terms of Reference no later than 14<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

From the 14<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> November 2012 the TL visited the RMI to start with the review. Before and during the visit the TL collected as many reports and documents as possible related to the RMI SLM project from the OEPPC, stakeholders, NGOs and UNDP Office (see Annex 1: List of documents reviewed).

During the visit in the RMI the TL had meetings with the Acting Director of OEPPC and the SLM Assistant as well as most of the stakeholders. Unfortunately some of the stakeholders, e.g. the Director of R&D, were off-Island during the time of the TLs visit (see Annex 2: List of persons interviewed during the visit).

At the end of the visit a meeting with stakeholders was organized for the TL to present his findings. The TL shared the Logical Framework of Assessment of Measurable Indicators particularly with the TL's remarks on achievements of the different activities (see Table 3). The TL also shared "Lesson Learned" and recommendations. Unfortunately only some of the stakeholders attended the meeting.

Before November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012 the draft report has to be submitted to the UNDP Office. While drafting, the TL was in contact with the UNDP Office, OEPPC and stakeholders via Skype or email. Due to many activities and a shortage of human resources the feedback from the OEPPC office was very slow.

The final report has to be completed before December 12<sup>th</sup> 2012.

The visit was structured into different parts, the first part was the introduction to the OEPPC staff to obtain as much information as possible about the SLM project, the second part was visits to stakeholders and projects and the final part was a stakeholder meeting with a presentation of findings.

### **3. The Project and its development context**

#### **3.1 Project start and duration**

The project officially commenced on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2008. It was designed for a 3 year duration and was supposed to be completed on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2011. However, by May 2011 less than 30% of the activities had started and less than half of the GEF funding was spent.

The reasons for these delays were mainly due to poor management by the Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination (OEPPC) which was designated as the RMI executive agency. Besides insufficient management there was a lack of human resources and lack of interest by some stakeholders.

There were two extensions; the first one was from May 2011 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2012. In September 2012 OEPPC requested another extension until 30<sup>th</sup> November 2012. This was granted by the UNDP. In the request for extension letter by the OEPPC, several activities and requested funding were made (see Table 1).

#### **3.2 Problems that the project seeks to address**

With its very limited land area, RMI faces difficult challenge to accommodate its growing population especially with people migrating to Majuro and Ebeye from the outer islands. There is a greater demand being made on the land resources of the islands, especially at and near shore coastal systems. The SLM project has provided support to ensure RMI has the capacity to carry out such land use assessments and mapping.

The growth in the construction sector has increased mining of sand and coral thereby making the foreshore vulnerable to the impact of wave action and beach erosion and increased sedimentation.

Despite greater awareness of these problems at government, local level and within NGOs', businesses manage to continue with dredging for coral and sand.

The Land Use Policy and Land Use Plan envisaged under the project are expected to serve this purpose and there is growing support for the development of these instruments as soon as possible.

In early 2000 EPA stopped a construction company from dredging of coral. The construction company took EPA to court. This shows that there is some control mechanism in place but



unfortunately there is a lack of enforcement. RMI is also very vulnerable to climate change. On the main island of Majuro the highest point above sea level is a bridge at a height of 6 meters. RMI has only atolls which are very vulnerable to sea-level raise and tidal waves. Significant parts of the islands are washed away by the sea which could be reduced if protective measures like tree planting or seawalls are implemented.

### **3.3 Objectives of the -project**

The overall objective for the RMI MSP SLM project is a “Supportive enabling environment, improving capacity to access financial resources and strengthened capacity at all levels for sustainable land management, improved levels of participation by stakeholders and better utilization of scientific and socio-economic data to address priority land degradation issues. More specifically the projects Logical Framework identifies 4 outcomes to be achieved through project implementation:

#### **Outcome 1: National Action Plan (NAP) to address Land Degradation completed and used to guide SLM programs and activities in RMI.**

Output 1.1: NAP developed as a result of stakeholder consultation.

Output 1.2: NAP priorities are incorporated into national development plans and national budgets and awareness raising activities are accomplished to aid its promotion. .

*The total cost of Outcome 1 is \$US 27,000. GEF allocation for this output is \$US 5,000 and co-financing were sourced from the RMI OEPPC and SPREP: \$US 15,000.*

#### **Outcome 2: Strengthening capacity for planning, implementing and monitoring SLM at the systemic, institutional and individual level.**

Output 2.1: Enhanced capacities for the effective planning administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources.

Output 2.2 Enhanced capacity in Land Information Management and use of appropriate technologies for recording land use and land use change.

Output 2.3: Strengthened capacity for sustainable agro-forestry particularly in areas of high population density.

Output 2.4: Enhanced capacity to assess for and monitor land degradation.

Output 2.5: Enhanced capacity for the rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas through pilot community based initiative.

Output 2.6: Strengthening capacity for increased water catchments to support livelihood and organic farming activities.

Output 2.7: Strengthening capacity to undertake research into land degradation issues in the RMI.

Output 2.8: Enhanced capacity of the RMI EPA to promote and implement the RMI Coastal Management National Framework.

*The total cost of Outcome 2 amounts to \$US 699,000.00. Co-financing sourced from the RMI Government totals \$US 244,000.00, \$US 15,000.00, SPC \$US 15,000.00 and Government of Taiwan (ROC) \$US 15,000.00,*

*SOPAC \$US 5,000.00, Government of Venezuela \$US 89,000.00 and the GEF funds allocation for this output comes to the total of \$ US 325,000.00*

### **Outcome 3: SLM mainstreamed into national strategies, sector policies and local government and departmental work plans.**

Output 3.1: Gender promoted and mainstreamed into SLM policies and strategies.

Output 3.2: Review and revision of land policies to incorporate SLM principles.

Output 3.3: SLM mainstreamed into NDS and MDG targets.

*The total cost of Outcome 3 is \$US 70,000.00. GEF will fund \$US 40,000.00 and RMI will co-finance at the value of \$US 22,000.00, SPC \$US 3,000.00 and Pacific Forum Secretariat \$US 5,000.00.*

### **Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed and supporting implementation of the NAP.**

Output 4.1: Development of Medium Term Investment Plan with associated resource mobilization plan supporting SLM.

*Total Cost of this Outcome is \$US 25,000.00 with GEF funding of \$US 15,000.00 and co-financing from the RMI Government of \$US 5,000.00 and SPREP \$US 5,000.00.*

## **3.4 Main Stakeholders**

According to the Logical Framework (LF), the SLM Project in the RMI had only three stakeholders listed who are responsible for the implementation of activities. The stakeholders listed in the LF are:

- The Office of Environment Planning & Policy Coordination (OEPPC)
- The Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Agency (RMI EPA)
- Ministry of Resources and Development (R&D)

There were several other parties which were indirectly involved in the implementation of projects, for example Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS) and the State Government.

There are several other Institutions like the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) who should have been involved as stakeholders.

Most of the activities for the implementation were listed under OEPPC. Unfortunately OEPPC did not have adequate human resources and lack of management skills. It would have been better if OEPPC would have been more involved in planning, coordination and evaluation and not in the implementation. Due to the lack of stakeholders and insufficient management the project did not achieve its Objectives.

### **3.5 Results expected**

According to the Project Logfram, Matrix there were 4 outcomes, 14 outputs and 56 activities to be achieved with in three years. Goals and objectives of the project are listed under 2.1 , page.17 and Objectives of the project are listed under 3.3, page 23.

The objectives of the Medium Sized Project (MSP) are to enhance and develop the individual, institutional, and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), to mainstream SLM considerations into national development strategies and policies, to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the development arena, to develop a National Action Plan (NAP) for SLM, as well as a medium term investment plan, while ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process.

## **4. Findings and Conclusions.**

### **4.1 Project formulation**

Major findings are reported under section 1.3. With regards to the project formulation most of the stakeholders agreed on how the project was formulated.

Generally the finding of the project formulation was planned relatively well, particularly through the use of the Logical Framework (LF) which tied outcomes, outputs and activities very well together.

As already mentioned once before in this report, if the LF would have identified more stakeholders (including NGOs) for the implementation the results would have been more achievable.

The total cost of the SLM MSP is US\$1,064,000 and consists of a GEF contribution of US\$ 500,000 (including PDFFA funding) and co-financing of US\$564,000.

#### **4.1.1 Implementation approach**

The Focal Point (FP) for the SLM Project was the Office of Environment and Economic Planning and Coordination (OEPPC) under the Director of OEPPC There was one project assistant, however only part of his time was spent working for the SLM program. Therefore there was no project manager. As already mentioned under lessons learned (see section 1.5), the main reason why the RMI SLM was very slow and inactive was due to insufficient attention to the SLM Project and poor leadership from the Director of OEPPC There should have been corrective actions by UNDP Office when the slow development of the project was observed. Country visits by UN personal, Mid -Term Evaluation, more active stakeholders and a steering committee would have helped to make improvements or changes. Unfortunately there was no active steering committee in place and little stakeholder participation. Furthermore many of the activities were under the responsibility of OEPPC including their implementation, but OEPPC did not have the capacity to implement these activities. OEPPC should have been more involved in the coordination, control and management of the SLM Project and not in the implementation.

The range of activities and the associated management and technical inputs presented a significant challenge to the limited capacity of the key implementing agencies over a relatively short time (3 – 4 year time frame). It can be concluded that on the technical side, greater attention could have been given to aligning the activities to existing SLM related activities, or reducing the number of activities and /or increasing the amount of time available to implement actions.

#### **4.1.2 Country ownership.**

With regards to the ownership of the SLM Project the Terminal Evaluation (TE) is rating it as a low ownership by the RMI. Only some stakeholders were involved, there was not much community outreach and very few activities were completed. The MSP is a long way from achieving its mainstreaming goal and a lot more work is necessary in order to achieve this, Stakeholder consultations clearly suggested that efforts to integrate SLM into key sectors of the Government are still a "work in progress". For example pilot demonstration projects that were supposed to demonstrate benefits to the communities are still in an infancy stage.

Whilst the NAP priorities have been discussed in one stakeholder workshop, some of these priorities have been constrained by the lack of data at the country level. There is also a poor recognition of the role of the NAP and how the proposed actions would lead to more concrete initiatives and implementation.

#### **4.1.3 Stakeholder participation**

It was a major challenge for OEPPC to coordinate the activities of the SLM Project with its stakeholders. In the Logical Framework there are only three agencies, OEPPC, EPA and R&D listed to be responsible for the implementation of activities. Unfortunately there was a lack of coordination by the Focal Point, which resulted in insufficient stakeholder participation.

It was however noted that, because of other commitments and limited in-house capacity, some of these stakeholders may not be able to commit the amount of time and resources required to the project. There would have been many other stakeholders who could have been involved in the implementation of activities; unfortunately the FP did not communicate and/or coordinate with them. Some of those groups which could have been actively involved are the Marshall Islands Conservation Society, (MICS), College of Marshall Islands (CMI) and the National Government. Some of these groups conducted similar activities as intended by the SLM and would have provided good linkage.

In October/November 2012 there was one activity (Mobile Teams visiting outer islands) linked with the SLM Project which was showing good achievements. The Mobile Team consisted of different teams from Health, Agriculture, Education and others. The UN Country development Manger was on the team and he was helping to get funding from the SLM project for this activity.

**Table 6 Stakeholders and their involvement in the SLM Project**

<b>Name of stakeholder</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Involvement</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	Government Office of the President	Involvement in 8 Outputs, in coordination and evaluation	Limited human resources should have been more involved in coordination
Marshall Island Environmental Protection Agency (RMI EPA)	Government	Involved in 4 Outputs	Most of the activities were not achieved
Department of Resources and Development (R&D)	Government	Involvement in 2 Outputs	Some of the activities like nurseries were achieved
Marshall Island Marine Resource Authority (MIMRA)	Semi Government	No direct involvement	MIMRA should have been more involved in some of the implementation of activities.
Marshall Island Conservation Society (MICS)	Non-Government Organization (NGO)	No direct involvement	MICS should have been more involved in implementation of activities
Collage of the Marshall Islands (CMI)	Non-Government Organization (NGO)	No direct involvement	CMI should have been more involved in the implementation of activities

#### **4.1.4 Replication approach**

With regards to the design of the SLM Capacity Building Project it can be judged as an overall success and a good model for other similar projects. A potential replication can be seen in activities related to sustainable agriculture practices with the establishment of tree and vegetable nurseries as listed in activity 2.3.2. Nurseries can have many positive impacts. For example, tree planting along the coastline protects from land degradation and erosion and vegetables provide healthy local food. Therefore the nurseries will have a good replication approach. Another potential replication is the visit of Mobile Team with professionals/specialists from different Government Departments and NGOs to outer Islands to provide help in environmental issues, health/sanitation, land degradation, food security and others.

#### **4.1.5 Cost-effectiveness**

According to the information provided by the Acting Director of OEPPC (new FP) only about \$US 150,000 (30%) has been spent by November 2012. Requests for funding have been made to the UNDP Office in June and September 2012 for as much as \$US 261, 734(see Table 1). According to the FP one more request for funding will be made before the deadline of the SLM Project (end of November 2012) for a consultant to finalize the NAP and for more equipment. This request will be for a total of \$US 81,175 (see table 2).It is difficult for the TE to judge whether or not the project was cost effective because very few activities have been completed. However, some of the activities, such as the nurseries, can be judged as positive. There are some good activities for which funding was requested such as water tanks, equipment for nurseries and a Arial photo project which will be implemented after the termination of the SLM Project if UNDP will provide the funding. According to personal communication with the FP from the UNDP office in Fiji, UNDP is ready to provide the requested funds if OEPPC is replying to the questions asked, e.g. what is the output, activity, timeline etc.

**Table 1: Requested funding by OEPPC to UNDP for SLM activities**

Date of request	Output/activity	Stakeholder/ Organization	Items	Amount	Remarks
July 3, 2012			VHS Radio	364.96	
			Materials	9,030.63	
			Camera equipment	2,779.89	
			Supplies	4,040.92	
				1,715.10	
			Shredder	3,502.88	R&D
			Outboard Motor	24,500.00	EPA
	Mobile Team		Boat charter	23,800.00	
<b>Total</b>				<b>69,734.38</b>	
Sept. 5, 2012	2.3 Nurseries	R&D	Material equipment for nurseries	50,000.00	In Ebeye and Mejit
	2.6 Water tanks	OEPPC	Water tanks	50,000.00	Laura area
	2.7 Arial Photo Project	OEPPC	Arial photo	30,000.00	To study coastal erosion
	2.2 GIS Land information	EPA	GIS Training	10,000.00	CMI can assist in training
	2.5 Community Development	CMI Land Grant Youth to Youth Mimra	Charter of local vessel	12,000.00	Rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas
	Organic pig litter	OEPPC	Material	10,000.00	Promoted IWRM
<b>Total</b>				<b>192,000.00</b>	



**Table 2: Material and Equipment including consultant to be requested before the end of November 2012**

<b>Date of request</b>	<b>Output/ Activity</b>	<b>Stakeholder/ Organization</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
	1.1 Finalize NAP	OEPPC	Consultant	15,000.00	Need stakeholder meeting and finalization of NAP
	2.3 Renovation of nursery in Laura	R&D	Material and equipment	10,500.00	This activity has been pending for a Logical Framework
	2.3 Irrigation for nursery for Laura	R&D	equipment	10,500.00	Is needed for the nursery
	2.7 Summer Camp	CMI		30,1754	Refund back CMI
	2.4 Translation of guide book	EPA	transition	5,000.00	
	2.4 Print guide book	EPA		10,000.00	
<b>Total</b>				<b>81,175.00</b>	

#### **4.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage**

UNDP is well known as a world-wide organization with much experience in project management. It has a large network of technical expertise around the region and the world. UNDP should have a comparative advantage to SLM projects which were carried out simultaneously at several Pacific Island countries.

There it is a comparative advantage that there is UN Joint Presence Office based in the RMI. Therefore it would have been useful if the RMI office would have been more involved in the SLM Project.

The decision to recommend and successfully seek an extension to the project is an example of the comparative advantage of UNDP and its understanding of the issues of project implementation in the region and the need for flexibility and adaptation.

#### **4.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector**

The project design recognized the multi-disciplinary nature of the SLM and thus called for the creation of effective partnership between OEPPC and other stakeholders for the implementation of project activities. Land degradation has resulted in the loss of biodiversity and will reduce the resilience of the low-lying islands of the RMI to the adverse impacts of climate change and sea level rise.

There is a linkage to many projects within this sector. SPC was involved in the Gender Assessment and Inception of the NAP and in other related activities in agro-forestry with the DSAP. SPC and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) is also assisting with the preparation of the Land Use Plan and climate change activities. The linkage with State Government, CMI and NGOs like the Marshall Island Conservation Society (MICS) was very important. The TE would have liked to see a much closer linkage with the three parties. The TE concludes the identification and linkage with other related interventions is a demonstrated strength of the RMI SLM project without which some of its activities would have been significantly reduced in impact.

#### **4.1.8 Indicators**

The project indicators are reasonable and SMART. They provide a good guide to the success or otherwise of the project in terms of its outputs. The table below shows if the success of the activities under the logical framework.

**Table 3 Assessment of progress against measurable indicators**

**Outcome 1: National Action Plan (NAP) to address Land Degradation completed and used to guide SLM programs and activities in RMI**

**Output 1.1 NAP developed as a result of stakeholder consultations**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>TEs remarks on achievements</b>
1: Draft NAP developed and validated by stakeholders  By OEPPC	1.1.1 Engage consultant /expert to plan and facilitate NAP consultations.  In year 1	<b>Achieved:</b> Consultant was engaged .A NAP draft was produce in 2008 by Frank Wickham in Y.1.
	1.1.2 Conduct consultations amongst national stakeholders for the development of the NAP.  1.1.3 Conduct validation workshop to obtain stakeholder input and support for final draft.	<b>Partially completed:</b> In January 2011 an Inception and Validation NAP Workshop was held, facilitated by SPC, Mereseini Seniloli. Not all stakeholders attended the workshop and there is still a need to have more stakeholder input Some changes and additions were made during the workshop. The NAP needs to be finalized and presented to cabinet(see recommendation).

**Output 1.2 NAP priorities are incorporated into national development plans, national budgets and awareness raising activities carried out to promote it**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
1. NAP endorsed by cabinet and presented to the UNCCD Secretariat.	1.2.1 Make final revisions to NAP document and present to cabinet for endorsement.  In year 1	<b>Not done</b>

	1.2.2 Plan and implement awareness raising activities on the NAP at national and local government levels.  In year 1	<b>Not done</b>
--	--	-----------------

**Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity for planning, implementing and monitoring SLM at the systemic, institutional and individual level.**

**Output 2.1 Enhancement capacities for the effective planning, administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
Strengthening land planning and administration processes resulting in improved coordination and stakeholder participation.	2.1.1 Engage consultant to review and update current Land Ordinance and regulations targeting urban land-use and incorporate SLM principles.  In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
By OEPPC	2.1.2 Conduct community consultations and national workshops to revise land policies, review applications and approval processes and incorporate SLM principles.  In year 1	<b>Not done</b>

	2.1.3 Revise urban planning policy and incorporate SLM principles. In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	2.1.4 Present draft policy to Atoll Councils, Government Ministries and Cabinet for consideration and endorsement. In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	2.1.5 Plan and conduct awareness training for effective and coordinated enforcement and monitoring of urban planning and development activities. In year 3	<b>Not done</b>

**Output 2.2 Enhancement capacity in Land Information Management and use of appropriate technologies for recording land use and land use changes**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
Land information management system policy established and targeted capacity development implemented.  By EPA	2.2.1 Engage expertise and conduct a needs assessment on information and land resources  In year 1	<b>Not done</b>  Note: EPA received from the SLM project 2 desk top computers, one laptop and databases  In 2012 EPA requests through the OEPPC funding for consultant for GIS training, two outboard motors and GIS equipment.

	2.2.2 Analysed findings of Needs Assessment. In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	2.2.3 Plan and implement workshop on findings of Needs Assessment and Develop a Land Resources Information management Policy. In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	2.2.4 Procure appropriate equipment and software for Land Information Management. In year 3	<b>Not done</b>
	2.2.5 Engage expertise and implement training activity in Land Information Management.	<b>Not done</b>

**Outcome 2.3 Strengthened capacity for sustainable agro-forestry particularly in areas of high population density**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
Enhanced capacity of field staff and targeted communities to plan and implement introduced and traditional agro-forestry technologies to minimize land	2.3.1 Community based participatory assessment planned and implemented to determine community's priorities for agro-forestry activities to minimize land degradation. In year 1	<b>Partially done</b> Moderately satisfying In September 2012 R&D requested funds for material and equipment for a nursery in Majet and Mile for the pilot project. These funds have not been received (see recommendation).

<p>degradation in high populated areas.</p> <p>By R&amp;D</p>	<p>2.3.2 Establishment of nurseries to support community based agro-forestry activities.</p>	<p><b>Partially done</b></p> <p>Moderately satisfying</p> <p>In 2012 an assessment was made in Ebeye.</p> <p>In 2012 two sites were selected for nurseries and a piggery. The MOU with the landowner needs to be signed (see recommendation).</p> <p>A total of \$US12,500 was requested.</p>
	<p>2.3.3 Pilot agro-forestry activities implemented in selected locations.</p> <p>In year 1</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>
	<p>2.3.4 Demonstration activities planned and implemented to promote organic farming and agro-forestry.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>
	<p>2.3.5 Awareness raising programs and material developed to promote island agro-forestry to address land degradation.</p> <p>In year 2 and 3</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>

**Output 2.4 Enhanced capacity to assess for land degradation and recommended rehabilitation measures.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
-------------------------	-------------------	---

<p>Targeted institutional and individual level capacity within the EPA strengthened to assess for land degradation and provide recommendations on rehabilitation measures.</p> <p>By EPA</p>	<p>2.4.1 Engage expert/consultant to develop a guide for assessing land degradation and identifying rehabilitation measures.</p> <p>RMI EPA .</p> <p>Guide developed and completed in year 2.</p>	<p><b>Achieved</b></p> <p>In 2011 a guide book was developed and drafted. It needs to be translated, published and distributed (see recommendation).</p>
	<p>2.4.2 Plan and implement a pilot participatory assessment activity to trial out the guidelines the RMI EPA pilot assessment activity implemented and report produced.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>
	<p>2.4. 3 Conduct a survey in Majuro atoll to identify areas that are highly degraded and recommend measures to prevent and/or minimize further degradation.</p> <p>RMI EPA Survey completed and priority areas identified</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>
	<p>2.4.4 Conduct training for local government officials and staff on the use of the guidelines in planning land use and land rehabilitation.</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>



**Output 2.5 Enhanced capacity for the identification and rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas through pilot community based initiatives.**

Output Indicator	Activities	Consultant's remarks on achievements
<p>Improved capacity of communities and government agencies to work together and implement low-cost coastal rehabilitation measures</p> <p>By EPA</p>	<p>2.5.1 Use findings of survey carried out in activity 2.4.3 and conduct further consultations to identify a priority coastal area needing rehabilitation.</p> <p>RMI EPA .</p> <p>Priority coastal area for rehabilitation identified</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p> <p>Photos not funded</p> <p>In September 2012 \$US 12,000 was requested for community development</p>
	<p>2.5.2 Conduct a community-based participatory approach to identify options for rehabilitation.</p> <p>RMI EPA Participatory planning activity undertaken and option identified.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>
	<p>2.5.3 Plan and implement a rehabilitation measure using traditional knowledge and natural resources such as trees and mangroves etc.</p> <p>RMI EPA Rehabilitation project implemented.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p>

	2.5.4 Document process of rehabilitation and make information available for future use.	<b>Not done</b>
--	---	-----------------

**Output 2.6 Strengthened capacity for increased water catchments to support livelihoods and organic farming activities.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
<p>At least two targeted atoll communities capacity to adapt to periods of low rainfall strengthened through improvements in water catchments and use for livelihood purposes.</p> <p>By OEPPC</p>	<p>2.6.1 Assessment carried out to identify priority affected areas needing assistance to improve water catchment capacity.</p> <p>OEPPC</p> <p>In year 1</p>	<p><b>Partially achieved</b></p> <p>In late October 2012 a Mobile Team consisting of members from the Health Department, Education, Agriculture, CMI, Local Government and NGO's visited Arno, Mele and Aur Atolls to assess amongst others food security, coastal erosion using local trees, coconut replanting and invasive species. For this project US\$ 23,000 were provided from the SLM project.</p> <p>A request was made in September 2012 to fund water tanks for Laura (US\$ 50,000-)</p>
	<p>2.6.2 Detailed community-based assessment undertaken to determine inputs required and role of community and government in implementing the project to improve water catchment.</p> <p>OEPPC</p> <p>In year 1</p>	<p><b>Partially achieved</b></p>

	<p>2.6.3 Supply and supervise installment of water catchment facilities.</p> <p>OEPPC</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>2.6.4 Community-based training activity implemented on maintenance and upkeep of water catchment facilities.</p>	<b>Not done</b>

**Output 2.7 Strengthened capacity to undertake research into land degradation issues in the RMI.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
At least 2 research activities implemented and findings documented and used to assist with planning for SLM in RMI	<p>2.7.1 Engage a research institution to conduct a review of priority research themes for SLM in RMI.</p>	<p><b>Not done</b></p> <p>Funding for aerial photo project was requested in September 2012</p>
R&D	<p>2.7.2 Promote research awards amongst RMI tertiary students.</p> <p>R&amp;D</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>2.7.3 Award two research awards, including training attachments.</p> <p>R&amp;D</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>

	2.7.4 Implement research activity and document findings.  R&D In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	2.7.5 Conduct a public forum to share findings and recommendations from the research activity.	<b>Not done</b>

**Output 2.8 Enhanced capacity of the RMI EPA to promote and implement the RMI Coastal Management National Framework.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
Coastal management plans developed for at least 2 atolls communities and local governments  EPA	2.8.1 Using the RMI Coastal Management Framework plan for consultations with two atoll government and communities  EPA Yr 2	Was done in 2009 in Watche and Jelout Atoll
	2.8.2 Conduct consultations with communities and local governments using existing methodologies EPA Yr. 2	Done to some extent
	2.8.3 Hold a community consultation workshop to discuss outcomes of the separate consultations and draw up a draft coastal management plan EPA Yr 2	Was done

	2.8.4 Edit, print and distribute copies of the coastal management plan EPA Yr 3	Was done
	2.8.5 Conduct training for community and local government representatives on the use and monitoring of the plan EPSA Yr 3	Was done

**Outcome 3: SLM mainstreamed into national strategies, sector policies and local government and departmental work plans.**

**Output 3.1 Gender promoted and mainstreamed into SLM policies, strategies and interventions through the SLM MSP Activities**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
SLM policies, strategies and interventions developed and implemented during this MSP have been subjected to a gender analysis and this analysis used to promote participation of women.	3.1.1 Local consultants engaged to develop gender analysis tools for use in the SLM project.	<b>Achieved in 2011</b> This was not done in year 1 In 2011 a workshop on gender assessment was held by SPC.
OEPPC	3.1.2 Gender analysis tools developed for use in the SLM MSP.  OEPPC  In year 1	<b>Achieved in 2011</b> In 2010 and 2011 women's training was held by R&D in Laura.

	<p>3.1.3 Training conducted for project staff in use of gender analysis tools.</p> <p>OEPPC</p> <p>Training planned and implemented.</p> <p>In year 1</p>	<b>Achieved</b>
	<p>3.1.4 Gender analysis tools used in planning and implementing SLM project activities.</p>	<b>Achieved</b>

### **Output 3.2 Review and revision of relevant land policies to incorporate SLM principles**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
<p>Relevant national land policy reviewed to mainstream SLM principles and policy revised.</p> <p>OEPPC</p>	<p>3.2.1 Local expert engaged to review land policy and identify areas for incorporating SLM principles.</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>3.2.2 Training held with staff of relevant government and local government agencies on recommended changes to the land policy.</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>3.2.3 Revisions made to the Land Policy.</p>	<b>Not done</b>

### **Output 3.3 SLM targets and principles mainstreamed into NDS and MDG goals**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
<p>NDS and MDG goals include SLM targets and principles and processes established for incorporating SLM considerations in national planning and budgetary processes</p> <p>OEPPC</p>	<p>3.3.1 Identify expert and hold consultations with policy makers and senior planners on the importance of SLM and how SLM principles can be incorporated into national planning processes.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>3.3.2 SLM targets aligned with NDS and MDG goals.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>
	<p>3.3.3 Recommendation paper developed on the process of mainstreaming SLM into national planning and budgetary processes</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<b>Not done</b>

**Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed and supporting implementation of the NAP.**

**Output 4.1 Medium Term Investment Plan developed with associated resource mobilization plan supporting SLM.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Consultant's remarks on achievements</b>
<p>SLM Investment Plan completed within project timeframe and used to guide resource mobilization for SLM in the NAP and NDS by MELAD</p>	<p>4.1.1 Consultations undertaken with government agencies, NGO's and donor partners to develop the SLM Investment Plan.</p> <p>In year 1</p>	<b>Not done</b>

OEPPC	4.1.2 Investment Plan developed and presented to stakeholders and cabinet for consideration and endorsement.	<b>Not done</b>
	4.1.3 Training carried out for the Government and NGOs in project management and development of project proposals.  In year 2	<b>Not done</b>
	4.1.4 Project proposals developed based on priorities and presented to the Government and donors for consideration and support. Proposals completed and presented for funding consideration.	<b>Not done</b>

#### **4.1.9 Management arrangements**

According to the information from the staff of the OEPPC and from some of the stakeholders there was a lack of management arrangements and this was the main reason why the project had poor achievements. The Focal Point (FP) for the SLM Project was the OEPPC where the organization and most of the implementation was supposed to take place. There was very little delegation by the FP and very little sharing and coordination. According to the logical framework most of the activities were supposed to be implemented by the OEPPC. The OEPPC did not have the capacity and technical “know-how” to implement all the activities. OEPPC should not have been an implementing organization it should rather have been an organizational body to coordinate and evaluate achievements. Furthermore, there was one project assistant who was made to spend most of his time on other activities than the SLM activities. It would have been better to have a full time project manager in place to take over the management from the OEPPC Director. There was a problem with SLM funds taking a long time to be made available by the Department of Finance. At the end of the project most of the payments have been made directly by the UNDP



to the vendors to overcome this problem. According to the UNDP representative responsible for the RMI SLM Project, the reasons for the slow disbursement by the UNDP office was often due to missing supporting documentation by OEEPC. For future projects better arrangements should be made by the Project implementing agency, the Finance Department and UNDP to avoid delays.

## **4.2 Implementation**

### **4.2.1 Financial Planning.**

The project document has an extensive financial plan which included the GEF and donors contribution and co-financing by RMI. Table 4 below provides a summary of the detailed project budget planning and allocations and Table 5 shows the actual spending by years. As it can be seen on Table 5 the spending of GEF funds was very slow for the first 3 years and this is reflected by the activities carried out and achievements made.

By November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 when the Terminal Review took place, less than US \$150,000 out of the US\$ 500,000 GEF contribution had been spent.

Requests for funding had been made to the UNDP office in June and September 2012 for as much as US\$261, 734 (see Table 1).

According to the new FP one more request for funding will be made before the deadline of the SLM project (end of November 2012) for a consultant to finalize the NAP and for more equipment. This request will be for a total of, US\$ 81,175 (see Table 2).

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) was informed by OEPPC staff there are long delays in the disbursement of project funds from UNDP.

The UNDP Office informed the TE that funds were only released once financial reports are correctly submitted. Furthermore UNDP informed the TE that UNDP provided support when such situations arose. The project also took longer to acquit advances sent and UNDP often had to make numerous follow ups.

The TE was not able to get any information on co-financing most likely due to no organized recording of co-financing for the SLM Project. There were other partners like SPC, GIZ, EU, SPREP and FAO who either contributed co-financing directly or indirectly to the SLM Project



**Table 4: Percentage of inception budget allocated to outcomes and project management** (Information from Table 5 of the Project Document)

<b>OUTPUT</b>	<b>GEF</b>	<b>Co-financing</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Total Budget</b>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> National Action Plan (NAP) to address Land Degradation completed and used to guide SLM program and activities in RMI....		17,000	17,000	1.7
Percentage GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 1				
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthening capacity for planning, implementing and monitoring SLM at the systemic, institutional and individual level ...	325,000	374,000	699,000	65.7
Percentage of GEF Funding Budgeted for Outcome 2	65.0			
<b>Outcome 3:</b> SLM mainstreaming into national strategies, sector policies and local government. and departmental work plans...	40,000	30,000	70,000	6.6
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 3	8.0			
<b>Output 4:</b> Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed and supporting implementation of the NAP.	15,000	10,000	25,000	2.3
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for Outcome 4	3.0			
<b>Outcome 5:</b> Effective Management and lessons learnt.				
<b>Output 5.1:</b> FSM SLM Project effectively monitored /evaluated.				
5.1.1 Inception workshop	8,000	4,000	12,000	
5.1.2 Annual audit fee	5,000	8,000	13,000	
5.1.3 Field monitoring visits	6,000	8,000	14,000	
5.1.4 Project monitoring and evaluation reporting costs	5,000	4,000	9,000	
5.1.5 Lesson learned workshop and reporting	2,000	2,000	4,000	
5.1.6 Project mid-term review and final evaluation costs	14,000	2,000	16,000	
<b>OUTCOME 5: Sub-Total</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>68,000</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Percentage of GEF funding budgeted for M&E	8.0			
<b>Project Management Unit</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>65,000</b>	<b>115,000</b>	<b>10.8</b>
Percentage of GEF Funding budgeted for PMU	10.0			
<b>Travel</b>		<b>35,000</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Percentage of GEF Funds budgeted for travel				
PDFA	25,000		25,000	2.3
Percentage of GEF Funds budgeted for PDFA	5.0%			
<b>Full Project Budget on Inception</b>	<b>500,,000</b>	<b>565,000</b>	<b>1065,00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 5: SLM budget and GEF Disbursements.**

Outcomes	GEF	Year 1	2008/09	Year 2(2009/10)		Year 3(2010/11)		Year 4(2011/12)		Totals	
	Budget	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
1. National Action Plan (NAP) (NAP) to address Land Degradation ....	5,000	5,000									
2. Strengthening capacity for planning, implementation of the SLM Project	325,000	78,000		215,000		31,000					
3. SLM mainstreaming into national strategies, sector policies and local government.	40,000-	6,000		34,000							
4. Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed ...	15,000-	12,000				3,000					
5. Adaptive Management & Lessons Learned	90,000	35,000		27,000		28,000					
<b>GRANDTOTAL</b>	<b>475,000</b>	136,000		276,000		62,000					
	-										

**Note: This table is incomplete because the OEPPC was not able to provide the information on disbursement of GEF fund**

#### **4.2.2 Monitoring and evaluation**

Overall monitoring and evaluation of the project was insufficient. The Expedited Project Proposal included a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, several elements of which do not seem to have been actioned. These include a detailed schedule of project review meetings, timeframes for tripartite reviews, project executive group meetings, Mid-Term Evaluation Steering Group meetings, country visits by UNDP and quarterly reports. As already mentioned under “lesson’s learned” (section 1.5) if a Mid-Term Evaluation and country visit by the UNDP and steering committee would have been in place corrective actions could have been made and the project would have been more successful.

Clearly M&E is essential in promoting coordination amongst stakeholders, information sharing, resolution of issues and assisting in the continuous forward movement of a project.

#### **4.2.3 Execution and implementation modalities**

The SLM Project was executed and implemented (about 30% of the activities) by the OEPPC. Unfortunately OEPPC does not have sufficient resources to execute and implement all these activities. The linkage with stakeholders or project implementers was inadequate, no steering committee was in place and hardly any stakeholder meetings were conducted. Officers in key positions, like the FP and SLM assistant are often out of office, attending Regional and International meetings or have transitioned to other positions. Subordinate staff is not able to adequately implement new activities or carry out on-going SLM project needs. It is difficult to overcome and indeed is a region wide problem where inevitably in most government agencies, the too few experienced or qualified staff are asked to handle a multitude of tasks and responsibilities.

#### **4.2.4 Management by the UN Joint Presence Office in RMI**

There is a UN Joint Presence Office in the RMI and the TE had a short meeting with the Country Development Manager, Mr. Terry Keju. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation the RMI UNDP representative has been visiting some outer Islands. He informed the TE team that he was in coordination with the UNDP Office in Suva to get funds for the visit with the Mobil Teams to the outer islands. Unfortunately Mr. Keju was not able to attend the TE’s final meeting where he was presenting his findings and recommendations.

The TE has a feeling that the UN Joint Presence Office in the RMI could have been more actively involved in the SLM Project.

#### **4.2.5 Coordination and operational issues**

There was lack of coordination and communication amongst FP, stakeholders and SLM Project Assistant. As already mentioned under 4.2.3 the linkage with stakeholders or project implementers was inadequate, no steering committee was in place and hardly any stakeholder meetings were conducted. The weakness in the RMI SLM Project was in the coordination by the FP which resulted in weak operation or implementation.

There was no serious effort by the SLM to achieve joint implementation of activities and to avoid duplication of efforts. For example R&D had nursery projects with DSAP and FAO at the same time

It became clear from stakeholder discussions that the FP was seen to be primarily responsible for taking the initiative to consult and coordinate SLM activities with other stakeholders. This is particularly so as the other stakeholders often claimed lack of awareness about the SLM project and its activities. Sadly, the FP appeared to believe that SLM implementation was her sole responsibility and no one else. If an active qualified SLM Project Manager would have been in place this could have made a big difference in achieving good results.

The slow process of procurement of SLM funds from the UNDP office and from the RMI Finance Department was not helping to get the work done in time. Some of the stakeholders were very frustrated and lost interest working with the SLM Project.

### **4.3 Results rating of project performance**

In 4.1.8 Indicators, Table 3, Assessment of Measurable Indicator from Project Logical framework, the TE included a column on achievements which provides good overall information.

The project was ambitious to achieve its 4 outputs and 56 activities having limited human resources and insufficient professional management.

Out of the 56 activities listed in the logical framework only 13 (23%) activities were achieved, 4 (7%) were partially achieved and 39 (70%) were not achieved. With regards to the time frame about 90% of the activities were implemented late. The project had a very slow start with hardly any activities carried out from 2008 to 2011.

By November 15, 2012 when the Terminal Review took place, less than US \$150,000 out of the \$ 500,000 GEF contribution had been spent.

It is noteworthy that in all these cases (and other successful activities) implementation has been achieved through or alongside partners with demonstrated expertise in the area and supporting co-finance, often as part of existing SLM related projects. In other cases, success has come about because the activity is something the implementing partners are familiar with and have existing expertise e.g. nursery development and management by departments of R & D or it is related to their traditional practice of SLM with which stakeholders/communities can identify.

Activities where the SLM project has not performed as well as would have been expected have been new technical and policy/planning initiatives. For example enhanced capacity for the identification and rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas through pilot community based initiatives or the review and revision of relevant land policies to incorporate SLM principles coastal protection planning. In these instances the necessary technical expertise to assist in developing capacity to implement and sustain such activities has been difficult to find. The lesson here is that in planning activities, especially ones which fall outside the “business as usual” paradigm, it is essential to identify the sources of support needed.

When looking at the SLM project in a positive way, it is expected that some of activities will continue and the equipment which was funded and which is still expected to be funded will be used for SLM activities. There have been similar activities which were not listed in this GEF 4 funded SLM project but they are executed by different stakeholders and different funding like GEF 5.

There were two outputs, 3.1 Gender promoted and mainstreamed into SLM policies, strategies and interventions through the SLM MSP Activities and Output 2.8 Enhanced capacity of the RMI EPA to promote and implement the RMI Coastal Management National Framework for which the expected results were achieved.

Several other outputs were partially achieved such as the National Action Plan (NAP). The first step of drafting the NAP was achieved in 2008 and since then nothing was done until 2011 when the Inception and Validation of National Action Plan (NAP) workshop was conducted. The rest of the activities include finalizing the NAP, getting it endorsed by cabinet and increasing public awareness are still to be accomplished. It is one of the Terminal Evaluation recommendations to finalize the NAP before the SLM project closes its doors

### 4.3.1 Rating of Project Performance

Rating Indicators	Level of Achievement	Reasons for Rating
<b>Project Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress towards strengthening the enabling environment for SLM.</li> </ul>	<i>Moderately satisfactory</i>	SLM best practices and increased awareness are important outputs providing a foundation for further capacity development and mainstreaming of SLM.
<b>Achievement of Outputs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NAP completion</li> <li>- Enhanced capacity for SLM</li> <li>- Mainstreaming SLM into national plans and policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NAP <i>Unsatisfactory</i></li> <li>- Enhanced capacity <i>Moderately satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Mainstreaming <i>Unsatisfactory</i></li> </ul>	NAP took long time to complete and still not formally approved. Only 30% of activities were achieved or partially achieved and there is no significant uptake of SLM activities into national plans as a result of the project.
<b>Project implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project preparation and implementation</li> <li>-</li> <li>- Budgeting and expenditures rates</li> <li>- Project organisation effectiveness</li> <li>- Adaptive management by UNDP</li> <li>- Project communication</li> <li>- Coordination and operational efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Moderately sat.</i></li> <li><i>Unsatisfactory</i></li> <li><i>Moderately sat.</i></li> <li><i>Unsatisfactory</i></li> <li><i>Moderately sat.</i></li> <li><i>Unsatisfactory</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low project management Lack of coordination between FP and stakeholders.</p> <p>Slow budgeting and expenditure rates</p> <p>Lack of organisation of FP and lack of achievements. Adaptive management by UNDP could have been better. Lack of communication and operational efficiency</p>
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;E process and plans</li> <li>- Monitoring indicator data collection</li> <li>- Quality and timeliness of reporting</li> </ul>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	M&E plan was not strictly followed. No early intervention to resolve issues affecting implementation. Quarterly reporting was either late or not done at all.



### **4.3.2 Sustainability**

Some of the activities like nurseries will continue with or without SLM. There will be co-financing and probably funding from other organizations. Before the SLM project started DSAP was funding nurseries, similarly with some other activities they will be taken up again because SLM is very important. It is very unfortunate that not more has been achieved in the SLM project.

The potential to sustain SLM results beyond the project life does not look very promising. It will depend on establishing a distinct home for SLM advocacy and securing the necessary resources for programs. Unfortunately the National Action Plan (NAP) has not been completed and this would have been the backbone for sustainability of the project. Given this unfortunate situation, it may be in the best interest of SLM in the RMI to determine the advantages and disadvantages by including more stakeholders and partners (including NGOs) and giving less implementation activities to OEPPC and have OEPPC to be a more and organizational and coordination body.

### **4.3.3 Contribution to upgrading of skills of staff**

The SLM project has undergone several planning meetings and workshops which has provided a better understanding for the SLM project. In January 2011 a Gender Assessment workshop and an Inception and Validation workshop of the NAP was held which contributed to upgrading skills. Also the involvement of an expert to draft the NAP made provision for counterparts to be involved in the drafting. It was a challenge for national staff to be involved in the implementation of activities. Unfortunately there were limited resources available and most stakeholders had many other activities beside the SLM project. The main beneficiaries of the SLM project was R & D, and EPA staff.

The SLM Project has some positive effects on capacity on a number of levels. Simply going through the process of implementation, building trust, negotiating outcomes and guiding resources (both technical and financial) towards the expected outputs has without doubt helped to increase capacity. The upgrading of capacity is an ongoing process and it is expected that national staff will continue to learn from their experience and from future trainings.

## **5 Recommendations**

### **5.1 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits of the project**

**Recommendation 1:**

That SPREP be appraised of the suspension of the UNCCD NAP and investment strategy process in the RMI pending the development of Pacific country template for alignment of NAPs with the UNCCD 5 year Action Strategy and requested to elevate the RMI in priority for technical assistance for completion of these tasks within 12 months.

**Recommendation 2:**

Funding requests which have been made before the end of the SLM project (30<sup>th</sup> November 2012) are to be considered by UNDP for disbursement (see Table 1 and 2).

**Recommendation 3:**

That consideration be given by UNDP and the RMI government to identifying future project options to build on the momentum and interest which has been generated by the SLM project in RMI. This will aid the further mainstreaming of SLM principles into the development and resource management processes, bringing to fruition, activities and outcomes which remain valid but require additional time and resources

**Recommendation 4:**

That the RMI government consider hosting further internal learning exchanges similar to that undertaken in partnership with SPC. e.g. Gender Assessment.

**Recommendation 5:**

In addition to the Terminal Evaluation, the OEPPC should prepare a close out report based on the template to be developed by UNDP and the PMU. This is aimed at identifying the stakeholders views on advantages and disadvantages and pointing to priorities for any future project which may be developed. These should then be used to support a final close out meeting of Focal Points, PMU and principal NGO's to help inform future priorities.

**Recommendation 6:**

That a report and joint presentation by the UN Joint Presence Office and the OEPPC on the goals, outcomes and benefits of the SLM Project be given to (i) members of the RMI Congress and (ii) the heads of SLM related government agencies. The presentation would help increase understanding of SLM principles, provide responses to technical questions and promote strengthened governance and stewardship for land resources amongst the countries leaders

**Recommendation 7:**

Existing capacity and regional mechanisms should be utilized for future UNDP projects (e.g. SPC North Pacific Office, UNFP-led Joint Presence Office, Micronesia Conservation Trust, etc.), specifically for providing core administrative support (reporting, procurement, financial) and technical assistance. Furthermore for the purpose of building capacity on the ground in the North Pacific region. These regional institutions can be used for any number of aspects of the project, from financial administration to serving on steering committees and technical working groups.

## **6. Future Project Strategy**

### **6.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project**

#### **Recommendation 1**

For future Projects UNDP should visit the country to monitor and evaluate activities and achievements and propose corrective actions if necessary.

#### **Recommendation 2**

When designing future SLM projects, UNDP should ensure that successes from previous projects are built upon and practical mitigating factors of potential risks considered.

#### **Recommendation 3**

For future projects a full time project manager should be engaged to ensure that stakeholders and steering committees are in place and the planned activities are carried out.

#### **Recommendation 4**

For future such projects NGO's and College representatives should be utilized especially when their organization or institution are expected to be actively involved in the project implementation.

#### **Recommendation 5**

For future such projects OEPPC should identify partners/stakeholders who will implement the activities. In the case of the SLM project, OEPPC was an implementing agency for many activities but, OEPPC does not have the human resources and expertise for the implementation of activities. OEPPC should be a coordinating body.

#### **Recommendation 6**

Existing capacity and regional mechanisms should be utilized for future UNDP projects (e.g. SPC North Pacific Office, UNFPA-led Joint Presence Office, Micronesia Conservation Trust, etc.), specifically for providing core administrative support (reporting, procurement, financial) t and technical assistance. In addition, for the purpose of building capacity on the ground in the North Pacific region; these regional institutions can be used for any number of aspects of the project, from financial administration, to serving on steering committees and technical working groups.

#### **Recommendation 7.**

That in future projects budgetary transparency is achieved so all implementing stakeholders are aware of funding allocations and remain apprised on revisions and reallocations of funding with approval being sought or at least consultation taking place before budget lines are reduced or reprogrammed.

#### **Recommendation 8**

Delegate remaining activities directly to agencies responsible for their implementation. This should be implemented through MOUs between OEPPC and partner agencies clearly stating their respective roles and responsibilities.

#### **Recommendation 9**

To improve project monitoring and evaluation a more involved role of the UN Country Development Manager in the RMI is recommended. UNDP will need to clarify with officials in

RMI the channels of communication with respect to the SLM and/or other UNDP or GEF projects and especially the role of its RMI office in the process

## **7.1 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.**

1. The OEPPC as the FP with limited human resources should have concentrated more on coordinating and evaluation and not on the project implementation. More stakeholders and implementers should have been involved.
2. By not having a Mid-Term review and country visits by UNDP there was insufficient overall control to monitor success or failure of the project. If this would have been done in time, corrective measures could have been made and better results could have been achieved.
3. The development of strong programmatic linkages with regional agencies such as SPC, SPREP and regional tertiary institutions greatly strengthens the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives especially those relating to capacity building. For example, two workshops were conducted by SPC in 2011.
4. After the suspension of former FP in May 2012, the UNDP granted another extension and as a result of this the SLM project became more active.
5. Communication break-down between UNDP and OEPPC did not help to get the work done, OEPPC should have been more actively in the communication with UNDP by answering questions to UNDP and providing reports.

## **ANNEX 1 List of Documents Reviewed**

### **FSM National**

- 1 Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in the Marshall Islands 76 pages  
Concept paper including logical Framework on Sustainable Land Management
2. Gender Assessment of the SLM Project Workshop -, 17-21 January 2011 by M.Seniloi, SPC
3. Inception and Validation of the National Action Plan (NAP) Workshop 24-28 |January 2012
4. Draft Action Plan 2008
5. Communication, OEPPC with UNDP about request of extension SLM Project September 5. 2012
6. Trip Report to Ebeye, Kwajalein August 8-10 2012
7. Terms of Reference for Team leader Evaluation of the \RMI SLM Project
8. Reimaanlok National Conservation Area Plan for the RMI Looking to the Future
9. RMI 2011 Article IV Conservation Concluding Statement of the IMF Mission
10. SPC Joint Country Strategy 2008-210, September 2007
11. RMI Strategic Development Framework

## Annex 2 List of Persons Interviewed

Name of person	Organizations	Title	Date	Time	Remarks
Mr. Warwick Harris	OEPPC	Acting Director	Nov.14. 2012	19:00-21:00	Received KE at airport and had a working dinner
Mr. Warwick Harris and Mr. Ned Lobwij	OEPPC	Acting Director and SLM Project Assistant	Nov.15.2012	8:30-9:45 am	To discuss work program
Ms. Mabel Peter and Molly Helkena	Local Government	Chief of Division Assistant Secretary	Nov. 15. 2012	9:50- 11:00 am	Discuss Mobile Team visit to outer Islands
Mr. Herny Capelle	Resources & Development (R&D)	Acting Secretary of R & D	Nov. 15. 2012	11:00-12:15 am	Discuss activities and achievements from R7D SLM program
Mr. Ned Lobwij	OEPPC	SLM Project Assistant	Nov. 15. 2012	14:-15:30	Collection of reports and SLM information
Mr Lowell R. Alik and Mr. Julian Alik	EPA	General Director Assistant Director	Nov. 15. 2012	15:45-17:00	Discuss SLM activities under EPA
Mr Warwick Harris	OEPPC	Acting Director	Nov. 15. 2012	19:00-22:00	Working dinner to discuss SLM matters
Mr. Warwick Harris Mr Herry Capelle and Mr. Ned Lobwij	OEPPC and R&D	Acting Directors and SLM Project Assistant	Nov. 16. 2012	10:00-15:00	Discussion of SLM matters working lunch Gov. Holiday
Mr. Biuma Samson and Mr. Foster Lanwe	CIN -CRE Land - Grant	Dean Extension Agent	Nov.19, 2012	9:00-10:00	Discuss stakeholder involvement
Ned Lobwij Douglas Henry Jula Langrine Albon Ishoda	OEPPC OEPPC EPA MICS	SLM Assistant	Nov. 19 2012	11:30-14:00	Discuss Consultants findings
Mr. Tery Keju	UNDP Office RMI		Nov 19 2012	15:30-16:00	Discuss project findings



Ms. Florence Edwards	MIMRA	Chief Costal Fisheries	Nov. 19. 2012	16:00-16:30	Find out connection to SLM activities
Mr. Glenn Josaph	MIMRA	Director of MIMRA	Nov. 19.2012	16:30-16:45	Find out about SLM involvements
Mr. Henry Capelle	R & D	Acting Director	Nov. 19. 2012	16:45-17:00	Find out about SLM activities

### **ANNEX 3 Questionnaire Used and Summary of Results**

The below questionnaire has been distributed to most of the stakeholders FP and SLM Assistant, only one person from the EPA Office completed it. All others failed to fill out the questionnaire. Unfortunately the time of the visit in by the TE was very short which has contributed to the low participation of completing the questionnaire. For future project a shorter and simpler questionnaire should be used. People get afraid when they get a 3-4 page questionnaire.

## **RMI Sustainable Land Management Terminal Evaluation Questionnaire.**

(Based on Terms of Reference and Evaluation Report Format)

### **1. Project Formulation and Quality of Design**

- Was there enough opportunity for stakeholder input into the design of the project at outset?
  
- With hindsight do you think the concept, strategies and approach worked and how could the design process have been improved?

Has the program design taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Human rights, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Innovation or added value to national development?

- Did you fully agree with the formulation and Quality of design?

## **2. Project Implementation**

- Did the institutional arrangements including joint implementation and coordination, Focal Points etc, for the project work effectively and how could they be improved?
- Were the project management tools – logical framework, work plans , reporting requirements helpful in keeping track of implementation requirements/progress

Did you face problems with the implementation? If yes, What were the problems?

## **3. Country Ownership/Driveness**

The SLM project was by and large, one which RMI wanted to undertake and was of long term value to communities, and country as a whole?

- Would you support a similar new project?

## **4. Replication Approach**

The MTE found that the project was designed well with sharing and replication in mind and had resulted in some notable examples.

- How do you think the project design and approach builds the conditions to replicate and scale up the successful activities?
- Can you identify additional examples where this is occurring locally ?

## **6. Cost Effectiveness**

Was the project cost effective in that activities have delivered community benefits, there is community and political support and the projects have been straightforward and relatable.

- In the light of the additional activities undertaken in the past year do you still think the project has been cost effective?

## **7. Linkages with other Programs**

How well was the Project linked to other programs? Can you give examples?

## **8. Management Arrangements**

Where you satisfied with the management arrangements? If not why?

## **9. Financial Planning**

Do you have problems with planning and flow of funding such as the allocation and withdrawal of funds which is slowing of the project due to time consuming reporting at national level.

- Examples?

## **10. Execution and Implementation Modalities**

Was there a problem with the turnover/inconsistency of staff and additional responsibilities for existing staff?.

- If a future SLM- like project was to be developed do you imagine it would function more effectively and efficiently from the outset by building on the experience of this project
- 

## **11. Coordination and Operational Issues**

Was there a problem with coordination and operational issues

Was there a good relationship and coordination with stakeholders and NGO's?

- If a future SLM- like project was to be developed do you imagine it would function more effectively and efficiently from the outset by building on the experience of this project

## **12. Results Generally**

### **12. Results Generally**

- To what extent do you think the SLM project achieved its outcomes?
- Overall has the project improved the understanding of SLM issues and principles and capacity to plan and manage responses?
- How has the project strengthened the enabling environment for conservation and SLM
- Has the project helped promote local participation on SLM and environmental decision making?

- What are the significant achievements and will these have lasting effect?

### **13. Governance and Capacity Building**

- In what ways has this project contributed to improved governance in and strengthened capacity in your State?
  
- Have governance issues impacted on the implementation of the project.

### **14 Lessons Learned**

Do you have examples on lesson learned, e.g.

- Need for improved co-ordination between key stakeholders (NGO's/Regional organizations) and implementing agencies
- Better financial arrangements
- Need for more substantive mini evaluations during annual reviews
- Need for an SLM Learning/Sharing Mechanism
- Need for strengthened focus on sustainability of outcomes.

### **15. Do you have any other comments regarding the SLM project?**

Thank You for your assistance.

## Annex 4 Terms of Reference RMI SLM Terminal Evaluation Team Leader



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

### Consultancy

#### *Terms of Reference for Team Leader: Terminal Evaluation of the Republic of Marshall Islands Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project*

**Title:** Team Leader (International Consultant) for UNDP/GEF Project Evaluation  
**Project:** Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in the Republic of Marshall Islands  
**Duration:** 20 days to be completed by 14<sup>th</sup> December starting no later than 15<sup>th</sup> November

**Supervisor(s):** UNDP Multi Country Office in consultation with national executing agency

**Duty Station:** Majuro, Republic of Marshall Islands

#### **Project Background**

The Medium Sized Project (MSP) on Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable land management in the Republic of Marshall Islands is a Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded project through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The project is implemented by the Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC). The project duration commenced on 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2008 and concluded on 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2011. An extension was granted until November 2012.

Despite the growing official recognition of the problem of land degradation in the Republic of Marshall Islands, SLM objectives have not been adequately mainstreamed into policies, regulations, strategies, plans and educational systems. There is a lack of understanding of decision makers that land degradation is significant barrier to sustainable development. Although integrated farming systems are a way of life for local communities, the planning of local resource utilization is mostly guided by more specific sectoral objectives and policies. This suggests a strong need to create awareness and build capacity for integrative dialogue and land use planning among all stakeholders.

The capacity gaps in land degradation include: i) individual level –lack of technical capacity (district level and community level for implementation); ii) institutional level – financial and human resources, monitoring capacity for enforcement of its rules and regulations); iii) lack of baseline data state and national

level); iv) systematic level – there is a lack of common understanding and mechanisms to coordinate and address common land management issues.

### **Project Objectives and Expected Outputs**

**Objectives :** Objectives of the MSP are to enhance and develop the individual, institutional, and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), to mainstream SLM considerations into national development strategies and policies, to improve the quality of project design and implementation in the development arena, to develop a National Action Plan for SLM, as well as a medium term investment plan, while ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process.

### **Objectives of the Evaluation**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Terminal evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

The overall objective of this TE is to review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature.

### **Scope of the Terminal Evaluation**

#### **Overall evaluation of the project**

The terminal evaluation will address the following specific issues:

#### **Project design**

The terminal evaluation will assess the extent to which the overall project design remains valid. The evaluation team will review the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability. Specifically, the evaluation will:

- assess the extent to which the underlying assumptions remain valid;

- assess the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area;
- assess the plans and potential for replicating or scaling up the site-based experiences;

The evaluation team will also attempt to ascertain the current level of comprehension of the project concept, focusing on three specific sets of actors: (i) project management team; (ii) field officers; and (iii) local communities.

### Project implementation

The terminal evaluation will assess the extent to which project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive. Specifically, it will:

- assess overall institutional arrangements for the execution, implementation, management, monitoring and review of the project. This covers a number of issues, including: the appropriateness of joint implementation and coordination; whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities; the effectiveness of government counterparts; and the effectiveness of relationships between key stakeholders;
- assess the use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- assess indicators of adaptive management;
- assess the quality and relevance of project reporting;
- assess the mechanisms for information dissemination (advocacy and awareness raising) in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management;
- analyze the project financing, specifically how the project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components (this is preferably presented in a matrix form).
- review the effectiveness and the methodology of the overall Programme structure, how effectively the Programme addressed responsibilities especially towards capacity building and challenges, its main achievements and overall impact as well as the remaining gaps.
- assess the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Human rights, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Innovation or added value to national development

### Results

The Evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved by the project to-date, by showing how the component(s) processes and outcomes have contributed (or have the potential to contribute) to the achievement of project and GEF environmental goals. The Evaluation will:

- Assess the extent to which the project achieved the global environmental objectives
- Assess the effectiveness with which the project addressed the root causes and imminent threats identified by the project
- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact in terms of outputs and its contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on promoting local participatory decision-making and local governance;
- assess to what extent the project has or will contribute to the strengthened enabling environment for conservation;
- assess the sustainability of project results (describe the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes)

**The terminal evaluation team will use a project logical framework to determine the overall contribution of project outcomes to development and global environmental goals. The terminal evaluation team is also invited to highlight contributions which are strictly beyond the project scope.**

### Governance and capacity-building

The Project promotes participatory processes and behavior that affect the way land use management is done at the local and national levels. This is principally achieved through the wide participation of local communities, capacity-building, and the promotion of accountability and transparency at different levels of government. In this regard, the terminal evaluation will look at how the project contributed to improved governance at local and national levels, and examine how governance issues have impacted on the achievement of project goals and outputs.

One of the specific areas the evaluation team is asked to assess in this area is how and to what extent the project has built management, planning and operational capacity among the project's stakeholders, particularly at the community levels. This should include an overview of capacity-building techniques employed by the project as well as of the monitoring mechanisms involved.

### Lessons learned

The terminal evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:

- Country ownership/drivenness;
- Stakeholder participation;
- Adaptive management processes;
- Efforts to secure sustainability; and
- The role of M&E in project implementation.

In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly to other similar projects

### Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be determined by the evaluation team, guided by the requirements of GEF and UNDP as articulated in various guidelines, policies and manuals on the conduct of evaluations for GEF projects as well as key project documents such as the approved GEF project brief, the final UNDP project document, the inception workshop report, the project log-frame and annual budgets and work plans, the annual Project Implementation Review, Project Board, and PMT meeting minutes as available, and other technical reports and documents as relevant. The evaluation methodology should be clearly documented in the final evaluation report including comprehensive details of the following:

- documents reviewed
- interviews conducted
- consultations held with all stakeholders
- project sites visited
- techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis

### Conduct of the Evaluation

The evaluation team will work independently but will liaise closely with UNDP MCO, and Executing Agency. The consultant will also liaise periodically with the UNDP ensure that UNDP-GEF and GEF requirements are being met.

The evaluation team will visit the project site to ensure adequate consultation with all key stakeholders. Towards the end of the field evaluation, presentation will be made to all key stakeholders in country. After the presentation the evaluation team consultant will take note of verbal and/or written responses to its presentation and consider these in preparing an interim draft evaluation report that will be provided to



Executing Agency/UNDP before the team leaves for distribution to stakeholders. The executing agency and UNDP will circulate the draft report to all stakeholders requesting written feedback and finalized by the evaluators within the dates reflected in the evaluation schedule.

While the evaluation team is free to determine the actual layout of the terminal evaluation report, this must include the minimum content requirements mentioned earlier. The Team leader will forward the final report by e-mail to UNDP for onward distribution to all stakeholders. The Team Leader will be responsible for the contents, quality and veracity of the report.

### **Deliverables**

The evaluation team will produce the following deliverables to UNDP/GEF:

- (i) Draft copy of terminal evaluation report ;
- (ii) Final copy of comprehensive terminal evaluation report;

The final TE report will include: i) findings and conclusions in relation to the issues to be addressed identified under sections 2 and 3 of this TOR; ii) assessment of gaps and/or additional measures needed that might justify future GEF investment in the country, and iii) guidance for future investments (mechanisms, scale, themes, location, etc).

The report should also include the evaluators' independent final rating on the following:

- Sustainability;
- Achievement of objectives/outcomes (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives and outcomes were achieved);
- Implementation Approach;
- Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and
- Monitoring & Evaluation.

The final terminal report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

### **Products expected from evaluation**

The main products expected from the terminal evaluation are:

- presentation(s) to key stakeholders to solicit feedback/validations on preliminary findings of evaluation ;
- an interim draft terminal evaluation report;
- a final comprehensive terminal evaluation report

### **Qualifications of Team Leader**

- Experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors;
- International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;
- Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations;

- Familiar with SLM approaches in Marshall Islands/Pacific and /or developing countries either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills

**Proposed Methodology and Timelines**

The consultant will undertake the evaluation work according to a planned schedule to be completed by 14th December , 2012. The consultant will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review, submitting the final report as well as supervising the local consultant.

The consultant is expected to propose a work layout, plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

**Proposal Requirements:**

Proposals should contain the following information:

- i) **Technical proposal** including a P11 form (available on the UNDP website <[www.undp.org.fj](http://www.undp.org.fj)>), an updated current CV, contact details of at least three referees and a cover letter setting out:
  - How the applicant meets the selection criteria
  - Evaluation approach and methodology

**ii) Financial Proposal**

The consultant is requested to provide a proposal or quotation of the fees/cost for the services which will be rendered using the following format and should be separate from the technical proposal.

Daily consultancy rates	A daily consultancy rate proposed by the consultant
Air Ticket	To and from home country (if applicable)
Living allowances	Based on the number of days spent at the respective duty station <sup>1</sup>
Other miscellaneous expenses	(please state)

**Payment Schedule**

- a) Fifteen per cent (15%) of the maximum payable Consultancy Fee [Professional Service] will be paid to assist with travel expenses (reimburse consultant for travel expenses paid) upon signing of contract;
- b) Ten per cent (10%) of the maximum payable Consultancy Fee [Professional Service] will be paid immediately following acceptance of a work plan by 16<sup>th</sup> November ;

---

<sup>1</sup> If consultant is based in RMI, living expenses for RMI are not applicable

- c) Twenty Five per cent (25%) will be paid within eight (8) working days of receipt and acceptance by the United Nation Development Program of a draft report by 30<sup>th</sup> November;
- d) The remaining fifty (50%) will be paid within eight (8) working days of the acceptance by the United Nations Development Program of the final Evaluation Report by 14<sup>th</sup> December;

### **Evaluation Method**

The proposals will be evaluated using the UNDP cumulative analysis method whereby the total score is obtained upon the combination of weighted technical and financial attributes.

The highest combined weighted score which provides the best value for money will be awarded the contract.

<b>A</b>	<b>Technical</b>	<b>(70%)</b>
1	Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors;	15%
2	International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;	10%
3	Familiar with SLM approaches in Pacific and /or developing countries either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;	15%
4	Knowledgeable and experienced in facilitating participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;	10%
5	Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress an short deadline situations;	10%
6	Excellent report writing skills	10%
<b>B</b>	<b>Financial</b>	<b>(30%)</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(100%)</b>

### **Reporting Requirements:**

The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Multi Country Office in coordination with national executing agency Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC).

The consultant is expected to submit a report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules. The consultant is expected to provide for his/her own laptop.

Progress and final reports submitted to UNDP shall be in English.

### **Application Submission**

All applications must include a Curriculum Vitae with full contact details of three referees and P-11 form to be submitted by either electronically to [david.lumutivou@undp.org](mailto:david.lumutivou@undp.org) or addressed under confidential cover to:

**Terminal Evaluation of SLM Project Marshall Islands - Consultancy (Team Leader)**

***C/- UNDP Resident Representative***

***UNDP***

***Private Mail Bag***

***Suva.***

Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted.

**Further Information:** For further information concerning this Terms of Reference, Mr. Floyd Robinson, Environment Program Associate, UNDP-MCO, Suva, on email [floyd.robinson@undp.org](mailto:floyd.robinson@undp.org) / telephone (679) 3312500 or Jennifer Debrum , Email: [jennifer.debrum@gmail.com](mailto:jennifer.debrum@gmail.com), **Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC).** ,

**Women candidates are encouraged to apply.**

*\*The Fiji Office covers Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu*

## **Annex 1.**

## **Evaluation Report Outline**

Report should not exceed 50 pages, in addition to the annexes

### **Executive summary**

Brief description of project, Context and purpose of the evaluation, Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

### **Introduction**

Purpose of the evaluation, Key issues addressed, Methodology of the evaluation, Structure of the evaluation

### **The project(s) and its development context**

Project start and its duration, Problems that the project seek to address, Objectives of the project, Main stakeholders, Results expected

### **Findings and Conclusions**

- Project formulation
  - Implementation approach
  - Country ownership/Driveness
  - Stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Indicators
  - Management arrangements
- Implementation
  - Financial Planning
  - Monitoring and evaluation
  - Execution and implementation modalities
  - Management by the UNDP country office
  - Coordination and operational issues
- Results
  - Attainment of objectives
  - Sustainability
  - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

### **Recommendations**

- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

### **Future Project Strategy**

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

### **Lessons learned**

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### **Annexes**

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Overview of co-financing and leveraged Resources
- Summary of Evaluation Findings (see below)

## Annex 5 Summary of Evaluation Findings

STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Successful Achievement	HS Highly Satisfactory
Expected Completion by the End of the Project	S= Satisfactory
Poor Achievement-Unlikely to be Completed	U= Unsatisfactory

### Outcome 1: National Action Plan (NAP) to address Land Degradation completed and used to guide SLM programs and activities in RMI

#### Output 1.1 NAP developed as a result of stakeholder consultations

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
1: Draft NAP developed and validated by stakeholders  By OEPPC	1.1.1 Engage consultant /expert to plan and facilitate NAP consultations.  In year 1	Consultation/expert engaged and achieving established work outputs in Yr 1	Successful Achieved	S
	1.1.2 Conduct consultations amongst national stakeholders for the development of the NAP.	Consultation workshop implemented and guidelines finalized Y1-2	Successful Achieved	S
	1.1.3 Conduct validation workshop to obtain stakeholder input and support for final draft.	Validation workshop implemented Y1	Successful Achieved	S

#### Output 1.2 NAP priorities are incorporated into national development plans, national budgets and awareness raising activities carried out to promote it

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
1. NAP endorsed by cabinet and presented to the UNCCD Secretariat.	1.2.1 Make final revisions to NAP document and present to cabinet for endorsement.  In year 1	Final NAP documented completed and presented to cabinet Y1	Poor achieving	U

	1.2.2 Plan and implement awareness raising activities on the NAP at national and local government levels.  In year 1	Awareness raising activities completed at the national and local Gov. levels by end of Yr. 1	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
--	--	--	-----------------------	----------

**Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity for planning, implementing and monitoring SLM at the systemic, institutional and individual level.**

**Output 2.1 Enhancement capacities for the effective planning, administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
Strengthening land planning and administration processes resulting in improved coordination and stakeholder participation.	2.1.1 Engage consultant to review and update current Land Ordinance and regulations targeting urban land-use and incorporate SLM principles.  In year 2	Planning Ordinance updated and necessary amendments made Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
By OEPPC	2.1.2 Conduct community consultations and national workshops to revise land policies, review applications and approval processes and incorporate SLM principles.  In year 1	Consultation workshop implemented and improved coordination arrangements identified Yr1	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

	2.1.3 Revise urban planning policy and incorporate SLM principles. In year 2	Draft policy developed and distributed for feedback Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.1.4 Present draft policy to Atoll Councils, Government Ministries and Cabinet for consideration and endorsement. In year 2	Policy endorsed by relevant authorities, Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.1.5 Plan and conduct awareness training for effective and coordinated enforcement and monitoring of urban planning and development activities. In year 3	One training activity implemented and outcomes achieved. Yr.3	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

**Output 2.2 Enhancement capacity in Land Information Management and use of appropriate technologies for recording land use and land use changes**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Annual Target</b>	<b>Status of Delivery</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Land information management system policy established and targeted capacity development implemented.  By EPA	2.2.1 Engage expertise and conduct a needs assessment on information and land resources In year 1	Needs Assessment implemented and findings made available Yr1	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.2.2 Analysed findings of Needs Assessment. In year 2	Conduct National workshop Yr 2.	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>



	2.2.3 Plan and implement workshop on findings of Needs Assessment and Develop a Land Resources Information management Policy. In year 2	Networked system established and access improved Yr 3	<b>Poor achieving</b>	U
	2.2.4 Procure appropriate equipment and software for Land Information Management. In year 3	Training implemented Yr 3	<b>Poor achieving</b>	U
	2.2.5 Engage expertise and implement training activity in Land Information Management.		<b>Poor achieving</b>	U

**Outcome 2.3 Strengthened capacity for sustainable agro-forestry particularly in areas of high population density**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
Enhanced capacity of field staff and targeted communities to plan and implement introduced and traditional agro-forestry technologies to minimize land degradation in high populated areas.  By R&D	2.3.1 Community based participatory assessment planned and implemented to determine community's priorities for agro-forestry activities to minimize land degradation. In year 1	Two community based participatory assessments planned and implemented Yr 1	<b>Successful Achieved</b>	S
	2.3.2 Establishment of nurseries to support community based agro-forestry activities.	Nurseries established and maintained in two pilot sites Yr 2	<b>Successful Achieved</b>	HS

	2.3.3 Pilot agro-forestry activities implemented in selected locations.  In year 1	Pilot activities established and used as demonstration sites.  Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.3.4 Demonstration activities planned and implemented to promote organic farming and agro-forestry.  In year 2	Demonstration activities planned and conducted.  Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.3.5 Awareness raising programs and material developed to promote island agro-forestry to address land degradation.  In year 2 and 3	Radio programs and information sheets developed	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

**Output 2.4 Enhanced capacity to assess for land degradation and recommended rehabilitation measures.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Annual Target</b>	<b>Status of Delivery</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Targeted institutional and individual level capacity within the EPA strengthened to assess for land degradation and provide recommendations on rehabilitation measures.	2.4.1 Engage expert/consultant to develop a guide for assessing land degradation and identifying rehabilitation measures.  RMI EPA .  Guide developed and completed in year 2.	Guide developed and completed  Yr. 2	<b>Successful Achieved</b>	<b>S</b>

By EPA	2.4.2 Plan and implement a pilot participatory assessment activity to trial out the guidelines the RMI EPA pilot assessment activity implemented and report produced.  In year 2	Pilot assessment activity implemented and report produced  Yr. 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.4. 3 Conduct a survey in Majuro atoll to identify areas that are highly degraded and recommend measures to prevent and/or minimize further degradation.  RMI EPA Survey completed and priority areas identified  In year 2	Survey completed and priority areas identified  Yr. 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	2.4.4 Conduct training for local government officials and staff on the use of the guidelines in planning land use and land rehabilitation.	Training implemented and guideline used  Yr. 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

**Output 2.5 Enhanced capacity for the identification and rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas through pilot community based initiatives.**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
------------------	------------	---------------	--------------------	--------

<p>Improved capacity of communities and government agencies to work together and implement low-cost coastal rehabilitation measures</p> <p>By EPA</p>	<p>2.5.1 Use findings of survey carried out in activity 2.4.3 and conduct further consultations to identify a priority coastal area needing rehabilitation.</p> <p>RMI EPA .</p> <p>Priority coastal area for rehabilitation identified</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p>Priority coastal area for rehabilitation identified.</p> <p>Yr 2</p>	<p><b>Poor achieving</b></p>	<p><b>U</b></p>
	<p>2.5.2 Conduct a community-based participatory approach to identify options for rehabilitation.</p> <p>RMI EPA Participatory planning activity undertaken and option identified.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p>Participatory planning activity undertaken and option identified</p> <p>Yr. 2</p>	<p><b>Poor achieving</b></p>	<p><b>U</b></p>
	<p>2.5.3 Plan and implement a rehabilitation measure using traditional knowledge and natural resources such as trees and mangroves etc.</p> <p>RMI EPA Rehabilitation project implemented.</p> <p>In year 2</p>	<p>Rehabilitation project implemented</p> <p>Yr. 2</p>	<p><b>Poor achieving</b></p>	<p><b>U</b></p>
	<p>2.5.4 Document process of rehabilitation and make information available for future use.</p>	<p>Report produced on the pilot rehabilitation project</p> <p>Yr.3</p>	<p><b>Poor achieving</b></p>	<p><b>U</b></p>

**Output 2.6 Strengthened capacity for increased water catchments to support livelihoods and organic farming activities.**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
At least two targeted atoll communities capacity to adapt to periods of low rainfall strengthened through improvements in water catchments and use for livelihood purposes.  By OEPPC	2.6.1 Assessment carried out to identify priority affected areas needing assistance to improve water catchment capacity.  OEPPC  In year 1	Yr. 1	Expected Completion	MS
	2.6.2 Detailed community-based assessment undertaken to determine inputs required and role of community and government in implementing the project to improve water catchment.  OEPPC  In year 1	Yr. 1	Poor achieving	U
	2.6.3 Supply and installment of water catchment facilities.  OEPPC  In year 2	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U
	2.6.4 Community-based training activity implemented on maintenance and upkeep of water catchment facilities.	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U

**Output 2.7 Strengthened capacity to undertake research into land degradation issues in the RMI.**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
At least 2 research activities implemented and findings documented and used to assist with planning for SLM in RMI  R&D	2.7.1 Engage a research institution to conduct a review of priority research themes for SLM in RMI.	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U
	2.7.2 Promote research awards amongst RMI tertiary students.  R&D In year 2	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U
	2.7.3 Award two research awards, including training attachments.  R&D In year 2	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U
	2.7.4 Implement research activity and document findings.  R&D In year 2	Yr. 2	Poor achieving	U
Poor achieving			U	

	2.7.5 Conduct a public forum to share findings and recommendations from the research activity.	Yr.3	<b>Poor</b> <b>achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
--	---	------	---------------------------------	----------

**Output 2.8 Enhanced capacity of the RMI EPA to promote and implement the RMI Coastal Management National Framework.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Annual Target</b>	<b>Status of Delivery</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Coastal management plans developed for at least 2 atolls communities and local governments  EPA	2.8.1 Using the RMI Coastal Management Framework plan for consultations with two atoll government and communities  EPA Yr 2	Yr. 2	<b>Successful.</b> <b>Achieved</b>	<b>S</b>
	2.8.2 Conduct consultations with communities and local governments using existing methodologies EPA Yr. 2	Yr. 2	<b>Successful.</b> <b>Achieved</b>	<b>S</b>
	2.8.3 Hold a community consultation workshop to discuss outcomes of the separate consultations and draw up a draft coastal management plan EPA Yr 2	Yr. 2	<b>Successful.</b> <b>Achieved</b>	<b>S</b>
	2.8.4 Edit, print and distribute copies of the coastal management plan EPA Yr 3	Yr.3	<b>Successful.</b> <b>Achieved</b>	<b>S</b>

	2.8.5 Conduct training for community and local government representatives on the use and monitoring of the plan EPSA Yr 3	Yr. 3	Successful. Achieved	S
--	--	-------	-------------------------	---

**Outcome 3: SLM mainstreamed into national strategies, sector policies and local government and departmental work plans.**

**Output 3.1 Gender promoted and mainstreamed into SLM policies, strategies and interventions through the SLM MSP Activities**

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
SLM policies, strategies and interventions developed and implemented during this MSP have been subjected to a gender analysis and this analysis used to promote participation of women.  OEPPC	3.1.1 Local consultants engaged to develop gender analysis tools for use in the SLM project.	Consultant identified engaged  Yr 1	Successful. Achieved	HS
	3.1.2 Gender analysis tools developed for use in the SLM MSP.  OEPPC  In year 1	Gender analysis tools developed for use during the project Yr 1	Successful. Achieved	S
	3.1.3 Training conducted for project staff in use of gender analysis tools.  OEPPC  Training planned and implemented.  In year 1	Training planning and implemented  Yr 1	Successful. Achieved	HS



	3.1.4 Gender analysis tools used in planning and implementing SLM project activities.	Gender analysis tools made use of during project implementation r. 1-3	Successful. Achieved	S
--	---	--	-------------------------	---

### Output 3.2 Review and revision of relevant land policies to incorporate SLM principles

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
OEPPC	3.2.1 Local expert engaged to review land policy and identify areas for incorporating SLM principles.	Land policy reviewed Yr 2	Poor achieving	U
	3.2.2 Training held with staff of relevant government and local government agencies on recommended changes to the land policy.	Training undertaken and recommendations established Yr 2	Poor achieving	U
	3.2.3 Revisions made to the Land Policy.	Revision undertaken and recommendations presented to cabinet Yr 2	Poor achieving	U

### Output 3.3 SLM targets and principles mainstreamed into NDS and MDG goals

Output Indicator	Activities	Annual Target	Status of Delivery	Rating
NDS and MDG goals include SLM targets and principles and processes established for incorporating SLM considerations in national planning	3.3.1 Identify expert and hold consultations with policy makers and senior planners on the importance of SLM and how SLM principles can be incorporated into national planning processes.	Consultation carried out and mainstreaming opportunities identified Yr 2	Poor achieving	U

and budgetary processes  OEPPC	In year 2			
	3.3.2 SLM targets aligned with NDS and MDG goals.  In year 2	SLM Targets and NDS and MDG goals are in alignment Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>UI</b>
	3.3.3 Recommendation paper developed on the process of mainstreaming SLM into national planning and budgetary processes  In year 2	Mainstreaming guide developed  Yr 2	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

**Outcome 4: Medium Term Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed and supporting implementation of the NAP.**

**Output 4.1 Medium Term Investment Plan developed with associated resource mobilization plan supporting SLM.**

<b>Output Indicator</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Annual Target</b>	<b>Status of Delivery</b>	<b>Rating</b>
SLM Investment Plan completed within project timeframe and used to guide resource mobilization for SLM in the NAP and NDS by MELAD  OEPPC	4.1.1 Consultations undertaken with government agencies, NGO's and donor partners to develop the SLM Investment Plan.  In year 1	SLM Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Strategy completed.  Yr 1	<b>Poor achieving</b>	<b>U</b>

	4.1.2 Investment Plan developed and presented to stakeholders and cabinet for consideration and endorsement.	SLM Investment Plan endorsed by Cabinet together with NSAP	<b>Poor</b> <b>achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	4.1.3 Training carried out for the Government and NGOs in project management and development of project proposals.  In year 2	1 training activity completed  Yr 2	<b>Poor</b> <b>achieving</b>	<b>U</b>
	4.1.4 Project proposals developed based on priorities and presented to the Government and donors for consideration and support. Proposals completed and presented for funding consideration.	Proposals completed and presented for funding consideration  Yr 3	<b>Poor</b> <b>achieving</b>	<b>U</b>