

16 June 2019

TA-7753 REG: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2)

Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) for Global Environment Facility

Prepared by James T. Berdach, Evaluation Specialist

Asian Development Bank

This consultant's report does not necessarily reflect the views of ADB or the Governments concerned, and ADB and the Governments cannot be held liable for its contents. In preparing any country program or strategy, financing any project, or by making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area in this document, the Asian Development Bank does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

Page 1

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Acronyms and Abbreviations	2
Project Identification and Financial Data	4
I. Introduction	5
A. Background	5
B. Purpose of the Evaluation	5
C. Scope and Methodology	6
D. Structure of the Evaluation Report	10
II. The Project and its Development Context	10
A. Project Start and Duration	10
B. Problems that the Project Sought to Address	11
C. Project Impact	12
D. Project Outcome and Outputs	12
E. Project Theory of Change	13
III. Findings: Assessment of Project Performance and Results	13
A. Overall Project Design	13
1. Project Framework	14
2. Indicators	15
3. Assumptions and Risks	1/
B. Assessment of Project Outputs and Outcome	18
1. Output 1: Capabilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable coastal and	10
marine resource management	19
2. Output 2: Coastal communities experienced in applying best practices in ecosystem-based	10
management.	19
Output 3: Resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced	20
4. Project Outcome, increased resilience of coastal and manne ecosystems attained in the live Pa	
Countries	Z I
D. Project Management	2 I
D. Floject Management of Execution and Implementation	20 20
Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems	20
2. Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems	3/
F Sustainability	35
IV Lessons Recommendations and Conclusion	37
A Lessons	
B Becommendations	
C Conclusion	40
Annexes	42
Annex A: Consultant's Terms of Reference—Evaluation Specialist	43
Annex B: References	46
Annex C: Mission Schedule—Field Activities, Meetings, and Site Visits Conducted for the Terminal	
Evaluation	49
Annex D: List of Persons Met / Interviewed	50
Annex E. GEF Rating Scales	57

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEPA	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CI	Conservation International
CTI	Coral Triangle Initiative
EAFM	ecosystem approach to fisheries management
EBM	ecosystem based management
FAD	fish aggregating device
FCAS	fragile and conflict-affected situation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ICRM	integrated coastal resources management
ICZM	integrated coastal zone management
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LICUS	Low Income Countries Under Stress
LMMA	locally managed marine area
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MTR	Midterm review
NCC	national coordinating committee
NPMU	national program management unit
NPOA	National Plan of Action
PARD	Pacific Department (ADB)
PATE	Transport, Energy and Natural Resources Division (PARD/ADB)
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMC	program management consultant
PMU	Project Management Unit
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PPMS	Project performance management system
RCIF	Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund
RPMO	regional program management office
RPOA	Regional Plan of Action
SDCC	Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department
SDES	Environment and Safeguards Division
SIELA	Solomon Islands Environmental Law Association
SLR	sea level rise
SST	Surface sea temperature
ТА	technical assistance
TASF	Technical Assistance Special Fund

TCR	technical assistance completion report
TCU	technical assistance coordination unit
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TER	Terminal Evaluation Report
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society

Project Identification and Financial Data

PROJECT SUMMAR	Y TABLE					
Project Title:	Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2)					
GEF Project ID	3591					
ADB Project ID	43427 (TA-7753 REG)					
	(GEF Financing				
			At Endorsement	At Completion		
		DDG grant	(03\$)	(03\$)		
		GEETE grant	13 118 183			
			10,110,100			
		Sub-Total GEF	13,418,183			
			10,110,100			
		Co-Financing				
			At Endorsement	At Completion		
			(US\$)	(US\$)		
Countries	Fiji	Government, In-kind	500,000	500,000 ¹		
	Papua New Guinea	Government, In-kind	850,000	850,000 ¹		
	Solomon Islands	Government, In-kind	500,000	500,000 ¹		
	Timor-Leste	Government, In-kind	250,000	250,000 ¹		
	Vanuatu	Government, In-kind	500,000	500,000 ¹		
Other	Asian Development Bank	Multi-lateral, cash	1,600,000	1,465,641		
	United States Government	Bilateral, cash/in- kind	19,200,000 ²	N/A		
	Australian Inst. Marine Sci.	Bilateral, in-kind	449,000	0		
		<u> </u>				
Focal Areas	Multi-focal area: Biodiversity,	Climate Change, Interna	ational Waters			
GEF Operational Programs	 BD-SP2: increasing repr BD-SP4: strengthening t 	esentation of effectively he policy and regulatory	managed MPAs in PA sys	stems; nina biodiversity:		
5	IW-SP1: restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological					
	diversity:					
	IW-SP2: reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution					
	of coastal waters in LMEs;					
	CC-SPA: strategic pilot on adaptation					
GEF Agency	Asian Development Bank Starting Date Proposed: Actual: Jan 2011 Jun 2011			Actual: Jun 2011		
Other Executing	CTI National Coordinating	Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:		
Partners	Committees of	-	Dec 2014	Dec 2018		
	Governments of Papua					
	New Guinea, Solomon					
	Islands, and Timor Leste,					
	plus Governments of Fiji					
Fuelmeter	and Vanuatu					
Evaluator	James I. Berdach					
Completion	Warch 2019					
Completion						

¹ Commitments are as indicated in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request; based on governments' participation in the project, it is assumed that cofinancing was contributed as indicated.
² Per the GEF CEO Endorsement Request, the US co-financing was to be implemented through the US Coral Triangle

² Per the GEF CEO Endorsement Request, the US co-financing was to be implemented through the US Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP), the US CTI Program Integrator (PI), a State Department Grant and a Partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Based on USAID's long-running support for these activities, it is assumed that cofinancing was contributed as indicated.

Introduction

Ι.

A. Background

- The Coral Triangle (map, Figure 1) is a global center of marine biodiversity covering 5.7 million square kilometers and containing vast marine resources critical to the economic and food security of an estimated 120 million people. Five Pacific Island countries which lie within or border the Coral Triangle—Fiji Islands, Papua New Guinea [PNG], Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, and Vanuatu—raised key concerns regarding the management of their coastal and marine resources. In response, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) provided a regional technical assistance (TA) grant to prepare a program to strengthen the management of coastal and marine resources in the Coral Triangle.
- 2. This program, ADB TA-7753 REG: "Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific—Phase 2 (the "CT Pacific" project)" has provided assistance to PNG, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste to fulfill objectives set forth under the Regional Plan of Action (RPOA) and National Plans of Action (NPOAs) promulgated as part of the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) program. For Vanuatu and Fiji, project actions were undertaken to address pressing issues on climate change resiliency, the protection of coral reefs, management of fisheries resources, and promotion of food security—all issues of primary concern that continuously threaten coastal communities in these countries.
- 3. These five Pacific countries have demonstrated their interest in cooperating with the Global Environment Facility—Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS). Since there are strong complementary objectives between the CTI and GEF-PAS objectives, and the Fiji Islands and Vanuatu are eligible for GEF cofinancing, this TA has provided a common approach to integrated marine protected area management with efforts to control damage from pollutants derived from onshore activities. The TA also has complemented efforts of ADB's Southeast Asia Department, especially through the regional TA, "Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle-Southeast Asia,"³ as well as those of its development partners (including the GEF, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Australian Agency for International Development) in the Coral Triangle, all of which are intended to support the Coral Triangle countries in the conservation and management of coral reefs and associated habitats, which are critical for ensuring continuing food security and poverty reduction for the region. For the CT Pacific project, the governments of the five participating countries were consulted, and agreed with the proposed impact, output, outcomes, implementation arrangements, cost and financing arrangements, and terms of reference for consultants.
- 4. As part of the process required under GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, a Terminal Evaluation (TE) was conducted to provides a comprehensive overall assessment of the project at its conclusion. This Terminal Evaluation Report (TER), which is an attached Appendix of the ADB's technical assistance completion report (TCR) for the project, presents the findings of that evaluation.

B. Purpose of the Evaluation

5. The TE was carried out by an independent Evaluation Specialist.⁴ Support and assistance were provided to the Evaluation Specialist by other consultants who were assigned as part of the project management support team.⁵ The approach that was utilized is detailed in the

³ ADB RETA-7813-REG.

⁴ James T. Berdach, Evaluation Specialist.

⁵ The Evaluation Specialist was joined for the mission in Fiji and Solomon Islands by Mr. Thomas Gloerfelt-Tarp, Senior Project Advisor, and by Ms. Haezel Barber, Project Planning and Coordination Specialist, in Timor-Leste. Mr. Gloerfelt-Tarp and Ms. Barber provided logistical and technical support for the mission activities, and have been valuable resource

Methodology section of this report, and the complete Terms of Reference for the TE are presented in Annex A.





(source: Impact Lab: http://www.impactlab.net/2009/05/12/the-coral-triangle-most-diverse-ecosystem-on-earth/

- 6. The TE focuses on evaluating (i) project implementation performance; (ii) results of implementation, including attainment of intended outcomes and higher-level project objectives; and (iii) lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Based on the findings and lessons learned, the evaluation provides recommendations for strategies, approaches, and activities that could help to improve future efforts for the conservation of marine biodiversity through (i) institutional strengthening; (ii) promotion of an ecosystem approach to fisheries management, and integrated coastal zone management; and (iii) fostering greater resiliency to the impacts of climate change.
- 7. The TE evaluates the accomplishments of the project as defined by the following key criteria:
 - Relevance
 - Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - Sustainability
 - Attainment of Objectives (the extent to which the project's immediate and development objectives were achieved)

C. Scope and Methodology

8. This TE has been conducted, and this TER conforms with requirements, according to the

persons throughout this evaluation.

Page 7

guidelines presented in several ADB and GEF guidance documents.⁶ The scope of the TE was to assess the overall performance of the project, "Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific—Phase 2." While the entire project is evaluated, this TE emphasizes assessment of project performance during the latter phase of its implementation, i.e., after the conclusion of the Midterm Review.

- 9. For its methodology, the TE followed a systematic, logical approach, to arrive at an evidencebased, unbiased and informed determination about the performance of the project. The various components and steps followed in the methodology are represented in Figure 2.
- 10. As shown in Figure 2, the TE was conducted by employing several parallel data-gathering processes. These included:
- 11. <u>Review of project documents</u>: The extensive documentation that had been compiled over the course of the project implementation was reviewed. This included a range of project status reports, progress reports, monitoring reports, and financial reports, as well as various other resource materials and publications that were produced under the project. Other related reference documents, as well as internet sources, were also reviewed. A list of the principal reference materials that were researched in the course of the TE is provided in Annex B.
- 12. <u>Evaluation mission:</u> An evaluation mission was conducted over a period of 21 days from 29th October to 18th November 2018. While in the field, the evaluation specialist conducted several activities which are described below. A detailed schedule of activities during the mission is presented in Annex C.
- 13. <u>Stakeholder interviews and group discussions</u>: A series of meetings were held, both with individuals and groups, to discuss stakeholders' views and tap their knowledge about the project. In cases where personal meetings were not possible, information was obtained through other communications, primarily e-mail. Persons consulted included stakeholders at all levels, from grass-roots community members to high-level government personnel at both provincial and national level. A listing of the persons consulted in presented in Annex D.

⁶ Among the key guidance documents consulted were: ADB. September 2018. Project Administration Instructions: Technical Assistance Completion Report. PAI 6.08; ADB-GEF. 5 May 2013. Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) Guidance Note for GEF-Cofinanced Projects; and GEF. April 2017. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects.



- 14. <u>Site Visits</u>: Due to limitations of time and budget, and other important considerations,⁷ it was not possible to travel to all 5 of the CT Pacific countries during the evaluation mission. Therefore it was decided to select three countries—Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste—where it was judged that the time to be spent during the mission would be the most productive and informative. In the 3 countries, arrangements were made to visit relevant sites, where useful information could be gathered and observations could be made, that would help to inform the evaluation. Site visits were conducted to inspect marine protected areas (both land-based and underwater observations were made), to observe deployed fish aggregating devices (FADs), and to conduct on-site consultations with community groups, government personnel (typically in agency offices in the capital cities) and other local stakeholders.
- 15. <u>Analysis</u>: Following the gathering of data, the information was reviewed and analyzed according to the prescribed evaluation criteria and methodology. Also, the GEF stipulates that ratings should be used to assess project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Since the GEF and ADB evaluation systems have different rating scales, a separate rating of the project and its components has been prepared for this TER, which differs from the rating done for the ADB's technical assistance completion report (TCR). While there are some differences between the two systems, the ratings conducted for the two institutions are, in general, mutually consistent. The rules that govern the assignment of rating scores in this evaluation are presented in Annex E.

D. Structure of the Evaluation Report

16. This TER is divided into the following sections: (I) an Introduction (this section) that provides project background, discusses the purpose of the evaluation, and defines the evaluation scope, methodology, and structure of the report; (II) a section on the Project and its Development Context, which explains the purpose of the project, its objectives, and expected results; (III) a section on the Findings of the evaluation, which includes detailed discussion of the relative success of the project in achieving the desired outcomes; and (IV) a final section which presents the Conclusion (the overall performance rating for the project); Lessons Learned from the project; and Recommendations which could be applied in improving future projects or carrying forward initiatives that would further strengthen objectives that are closely aligned with the project objective. Lastly, the Annexes provide important supporting information, mainly concerning the mechanics of the evaluation (among others: Consultant's Terms of Reference, list of references, list of persons met, and a schedule of field activities undertaken during the evaluation mission).

II. The Project and its Development Context

A. Project Start and Duration

17. The project was approved by Asian Development Bank (ADB) on 14 December 2010 with an original completion date of 31 October 2014, which was later revised to a completion date of 31 December 2018. Approved funding for the project was \$15,068,183, consisting of \$1,150,000 from ADB's Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF-IV); \$800,000 from the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund (RCIF); and \$13,118,183 from the Global Environment Facility

⁷ During the period in November 2018 for which the evaluation mission was being planned, the Government of PNG was planning for an upcoming APEC summit, and issued a moratorium on all missions of development partners. For this reason (in addition to the financial and time constraints mentioned) it was not possible to include PNG in the planning for the evaluation mission. Further, in light of the limitations mentioned, it was necessary to prioritize the countries to be included for the mission. The countries selected for inclusion were those where (i) it was most practical to conduct mission activities (i.e., those with efficient air connections; ability to access project sites; likelihood that stakeholders can be met for consultations during the available timeframe [among other factors]); and (ii) it was expected that the productive value of visiting the country (i.e., prospects for gathering information important to the evaluation; ability to meet with multiple stakeholders; and opportunity to visit project field sites) would be highest.

(GEF).

18. The first consultant for the project was engaged in June 2011; the PMC was mobilized in November 2011. The inception meetings were completed in early 2012; the midterm review process finished in September 2014. Following extension, the project was officially closed on 31 December 2018.

B. Problems that the Project Sought to Address

19. The reef ecosystems of the Pacific Islands in the eastern Coral Triangle (CT) are in relatively good condition, with low to moderate yet increasing threats, although with some areas now facing significant coastal development and fishing related pressures. In many Pacific Island countries, inshore fisheries resources comprise a critical component of the livelihoods of islands communities. Over 50% of the people in this region rely on marine resources as their primary source of protein, principally from fishing or aquaculture in near-shore waters. Over-fishing is devastating ecosystem integrity in complex coral communities and pelagic systems across the CT. Some estimates indicate that by 2020 fish catch will exceed total sustainable yield, based on population growth and demands for fish projections. As demands increase, supply stocks will be drawn down, lower value species exploited, inappropriate harvesting increased, creating significant risk to natural habitat integrity such as coral reefs. Additionally, the rapid development of tourism and coastal housing is creating significant degradation on coastal ecosystems. Inland commercial livestock and agriculture drain significant nutrient levels into water systems, that reach and degrade coral reefs. A wider integration and coordination between land, coastal, and seaward management systems is critical. The environmental threats the 5 participating countries have experienced are summarized in Table 1, below. These mainly include: i) natural habitat destruction; ii) unsustainable exploitation of fish stocks and other resources; iii) pollution (including land-based); and iv) the adverse impacts of climate change.

Country	Habitat destruction	Unsustainable exploitation	Pollution	Global Change / Climate Change
Fiji	poor land-use practices; urbanization and tourism development	overexploitation of groupers and emperor fishes, trochus, beche de mer, mangrove, coconut crabs, giant clams; use of poisons and fish- bombs	Sedimentation, nutrient overload; solid waste; industrial chemical pollutants	sea level rise (SLR); elevated sea temperature (SST)
Papua New Guinea	sediment over seagrass beds; blast- fishing and use of poisons on coral reefs	destructive fishing practices; in general fisheries are underexploited	Sedimentation, logging; fertilizer from oil palm plantations; mining domestic waste	as above
Solomon Islands	logging	overfishing of beche de mer, trochus, other demersal species	Sedimentation, solid waste	elevated SST causing coral bleaching
Timor Leste	land degradation/agriculture; future threat –	increasing demand for fish	Sedimentation, poor waste management,	SLR elevated, SST

Table 1. Significant Threats t	Environment and Biodiversit	y in CT Pacific Countries
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Country	Habitat destruction	Unsustainable exploitation	Pollution	Global Change / Climate Change
	expansion of tourism urbanization		mining threat	
Vanuatu	large-scale plantations; urbanization	Overfishing; use of poisons and fish- bombs	sedimentation from slash and burn agriculture; poor domestic waste management	SLR elevated; SST (3 sets of islands already identified as vulnerable)

Source: GEF CEO Endorsement Request

- 20. These environmental concerns prevail and are reported to be worsening, due to: i) lack of legislation and corresponding regulatory framework to address land-based sources of pollution to the marine environment; ii) lack of capacity in governmental agencies to implement integrated coastal resources management; iii) insufficient experience among coastal communities in environmental management; iv) increasing threat of climate change on coastal ecosystems, and v) poor coordination on land-use planning among the different sectors and with neighboring municipalities.
- 21. These countries have taken important steps to address these issues by engaging in the Coral Triangle Initiative and the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability, but on their own, these steps have not been sufficient to address the array of threats that are being faced. The CT project was conceived to continue efforts to address these challenges.

C. Project Impact

22. The intended impact of the CT Pacific project was to promote conservation and sustainable use of *coastal and marine resources ensure sustainable food security for the population in the five Pacific countries*. The project offered regionally coordinated solutions to address the threats to the coastal and marine ecosystem, with activities planned and carried out primarily at the country level, but within the context of regional cooperation. The desired impact of the project also was considered to achieve significant global environmental benefits, specifically, conservation of globally significant marine biodiversity and critical habitats and their associated ecosystem services. These include mangrove forests, seagrass beds, and coral reefs, all of which provide critical spawning grounds for many fish species, as well as being areas that support other economic activities, such as ocean recreation and tourism. Furthermore, conserving these habitats contributes to the reduction of emissions from carbon to the atmosphere and helps conserve important natural barriers which protect coastal areas from loss or damage due to severe weather conditions.

D. Project Outcome and Outputs

- 23. To achieve its intended impact, the project outcome aimed to bring about *increased resilience* of coastal and marine ecosystems attained in the five Pacific countries.
- 24. In turn, the project outcome was supported by three technical outputs:8

⁸ A fourth output in the project results framework is related to project management. While the project management functions that fall under this fourth output are also assessed in this terminal evaluation, they are not grouped together here with assessment of the technical performance functions of the project. Rather, they are treated as a separate subject in the Implementation and Execution section of the report.

- <u>Output 1</u>: Capabilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable coastal and marine resource management. The expected result of the activities financed under this component are the establishment of a legal basis in the Pacific governments for an ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) and integrated coastal and marine resources management (ICRM),and strengthened capacity of relevant Government agencies to implement the program.
- <u>Output 2</u>: Coastal communities experienced in applying best practices in ecosystembased management. For this output, the project design called for best management practices in EAFM and ICRM to be applied by coastal communities, to ensure that resources in 5 identified priority seascapes would be managed effectively according to EAFM principles. It was also the intention that in this component, selected coastal communities in the 5 countries would engage in the management of their natural resources, and local governments would implement integrated and ecosystem-based coastal resources management practices, especially through adopting land-use and marine spatial planning practices that included biodiversity and sustainable livelihood considerations.
- <u>Output 3</u>: Resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced. This output was intended to bring about increased resilience of coastal and marine resources and vulnerable communities through habitat mapping and vulnerability assessments, and integration of climate change adaptation measures within coastal zone planning and frameworks.

E. Project Theory of Change

- 25. It is often too early to assess the long-term impacts of a project at the point of project completion. The "Theory of Change" is a tool which has been developed to address this matter. According to the theory, it is reasoned that if certain intermediate states are achieved, and if project assumptions hold, then it is likely that the desired project impact may ultimately be achieved, even if this only occurs long after the project is completed.
- 26. Figure 3 presents the Theory of Change diagram for the project. The degree to which the intermediate states are attained, will determine the probability that the project impact can also be achieved. This aspect is further discussed in the section on "Progress to Impact" later in this report.

III. Findings: Assessment of Project Performance and Results

A. Overall Project Design

27. For the TE, no rating is required concerning project design. Nonetheless, discussion of the project design, as presented below is considered to be important for gaining a better understanding of how the project design can fundamentally affect project implementation and performance.

Figure 3. Project Theory of Change Pathway



1. <u>Project Framework</u>

28. It is important to note that, despite significant changes which had occurred around the project midterm in project implementation and the scope of project activities, no corresponding updates were made to the results framework. In fact, in a final monitoring and evaluation report prepared for the project,⁹ the M&E consultant expressed the following opinion: "In hindsight, the project DMF (framework) could have been updated during the project mid-term..." Among the significant changes that were made in the project, at mid-term and beyond, but not reflected in the framework, were (i) dropping activities at some MPA sites, and adding new ones; and (ii) shifting emphasis to deployment of FADs as a means for promoting food security, reducing pressure on vulnerable nearshore fish stocks, and improving resiliency to climate change.¹⁰ While these changes might not have been so substantial as to affect the outcome- or objective-level statements in the results framework, changes likely should have been made at the output level, and the indicators in the framework.¹¹ The main implications of not making the needed changes to the framework are

⁹ ADB. 26 December 2018. Final M&E Report: A summative view from the DMF perspective.

¹⁰ These changes occurred at around the same time that a shift was made from supervision under a regional project management consultant, to direct hire by ADB of NGOs in the 5 countries, to lead project activities. However, it is noted here that such changes in project management arrangements are not directly germane to changes which might need to be reflected in the project framework.

¹¹ It is part of the GEF's approach to project management, that the results framework should be reviewed and referred to regularly, and adjustments to the framework made as needed. Such processes are a central feature of "adaptive management" which GEF strongly encourages, and sees as being a requirement to meet unexpected eventualities as

twofold: (i) this then adversely affects having a reliable and up-to-date roadmap to guide ongoing project implementation, and (ii) it makes accurate monitoring and evaluation of project performance more difficult, especially if indicators are not adjusted to reflect new targets.

29. ADB has its own process for dealing with changes in project scope, as presented in the following guidance:

"Scope changes may be necessary to maintain or increase the relevance of a project in the face of unexpected events. The appropriateness of these changes and their approvals and disclosures by appropriate authorities (ADB Management for minor changes in scope and the Board for major changes) need to be assessed."¹²

- 30. While this guidance does not specifically require updates to the results framework, it is well aligned with the GEF's "adaptive management" principle. ADB's scope-changing process would accommodate changes to the project framework, if it were determined that such changes were needed. It is the determination of this evaluation that in the case of the CT Pacific project, with the significant changes in scope and management that were made, a review and revision of the project framework should also have been undertaken, so that the changes could also be reflected in the results framework.
- 31. Furthermore, it appears that the project framework was not much reviewed or referred to during project implementation. In the same M&E report cited earlier, it is mentioned: "As noted during the Project Close-out Workshop...most of the participants especially from government agencies were not familiar with the project DMF. *Ipso facto*, they were not aware of the indicators or measures by which project performance was to be assessed."
- 32. These points suggest that the project results framework was not used as intended, namely as a roadmap to guide the implementation of the project; to correct weaknesses as they were detected; and to properly monitor and evaluate project performance. Also, it is believed that the framework was not critically reviewed, nor was an effort made to make revisions in the framework, before *de facto* scope changes were put into effect.

2. Indicators

33. Project indicators are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Project Indicators

Impact: Coasta countries	I and marine resources ensure sustainable food security for the population of the five Pacific
	By 2020, from 2010 baseline:
	(1) 10% increase in area of mangrove forests, seagrass beds, and live coral cover
	(2) 10% increase in biomass of coral reef fishes in managed areas
	(3) 10% increase in total supply of fish and other seafood
Outcome: Incre	eased resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems is attained in the five Pacific countries
	By 2014 :

projects are being implemented, and as a means for ensuring that optimal project results are realized. ¹² ADB. April 2016. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Public Sector Operations. Independent Evaluation Department.

	(1) 10%–30% of coral reefs, seagrass beds, and mangrove forests designated as managed areas
	(2) 1,000 km of coastline under ICRM
Output 1: Capa resources man	abilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable coastal and marine agement
	Policy, legal, and regulatory framework for institutionalizing effective ICRM and EBFM established by 2013
	Coastal and marine resource management policy guidelines and legal and regulatory instruments drafted by 2013
	Coastal and marine resource management policy guidelines and legal and regulatory instruments approved by national/ local government authorities by 2014
	Organizational reform and retooling of government agencies concerned completed by 2014
	Skills upgrading for about 1,000 trainees from relevant government agencies and NGOs completed by 2014
Output 2: Coas and climate cha	tal communities experienced in applying best practices in ecosystem-based management ange adaptation
	By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed
	By 2014: 48 community pilot demonstration projects implemented
Output 3: Resil	ience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced
	By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared
	Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities
	Climate change adaptation measures integrated in ICRM plans of 2–3 districts

Source: GEF CEO Endorsement Request.

34. The project indicators at the impact and outcome levels have been evaluated according to SMART criteria, and the results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Assessing Project Indicators Using SMART Criteria

Indicators		S-M-A-R-T Criteria			
	S=Specific	M=Measurable	A=Achievable	R=Relevant	T=Time-bound
Impact level					
1) Area of mangrove forests	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
2) Area of seagrass beds	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
3) Area of live coral cover	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

4) Biomass	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
5) Fish supply	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
		Outco	me level		
1) Area of coral reefs managed	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
2) Area of seagrass beds managed	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
3) Area of mangrove forests managed	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
4) Length of coastline under ICRM	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Source: ADB 2018. Final M&E Report.

- 35. From this analysis it is apparent that most of the indicators selected are not entirely satisfactory, from a SMART perspective. Furthermore, going beyond the SMART indicators, the final M&E analysis determined that there were additional weaknesses in the indicators and that several measures would be needed to strengthen them:
 - indicators should be supported by available data; otherwise, project budgets should cover data generation;
 - Indicators should be measurable and targets proportionate to inputs; and
 - The indicators could be simplified.

3. Assumptions and Risks

- 36. Assumptions and risks are factors which can affect project implementation and the long-term sustainability of project benefits, but are outside the control of the project. An assumption is a condition that will support project success, whereas a risk is a condition that can constrain the project from achieving a desired result or results. The important consideration is that these are both *external* factors, not subject to influence by project actions.
- 37. In reviewing the project framework, the question must be raised as to whether or not the assumptions and risks which are indicated are indeed external to project influence. Table 4 presents the stated assumptions and risks, and comments on them. From the table it can be seen that most of the risks and assumptions included in the framework are in fact elements which could be affected, at least to some degree, by project action. In fact, some of the stated assumptions and risks are specifically targeted for change through project actions. Thus there is some question or ambiguity as to whether these are legitimate assumptions and risks as defined in the context of the results framework. While making a determination about externality is a somewhat subjective exercise, according to the understanding of the results framework qualify as such. Thus the assumptions and risks in the results framework and risks indicated constitute a significant weakness in the project framework.

Framework Level	Assumption or Risk	Assumption or Risk Statement	Comment
Impact	Assumption	Participating governments are fully committed to the CTI and provide the necessary resources to attain its intended impact and outcome	Commitment of government can be motivated through project actions, thus this is not fully external to the project

Table 4. Analysis of Assumptions and Risks

Framework Level	Assumption or Risk	Assumption or Risk Statement	Comment
	Assumption	The participating countries continue to collaborate on common environmental concerns	The project actually promotes regional collaboration thus this is not an external assumption
	Risk	Climate change effects on coastal ecosystems are too severe to prevent, mitigate, or offset	The project is intended to promote resiliency to climate change thus this is not entirely external to project influence, however, the most severe effects of climate change could be considered to be externalities
Outcome	Assumption	Current and future threats to resource status are effectively managed through the application of ecosystem-based coastal and marine management	The project actually promotes EBRM so this is not an external assumption
	Risk	Participating government agencies are not able to secure full community engagement in program implementation	Community engagement is an integral part of the project approach so this is not an external element
Output 1	Assumption	Government and other stakeholders concerned are fully supportive of coastal and marine resource management	Commitment of government can be motivated through project actions, thus this is not fully external to the project
	Assumption	National and local policymakers and legislators are fully supportive of ICRM and EBFM	Commitment of government can be motivated through project actions, thus this is not fully external to the project
	Assumption	Training courses are effective and enable the trainees to apply skills learned	Effectiveness of training depends on how it is conducted, thus this is not external
Output 2	Assumption	Current and future threats to resource status are effectively managed through the application of ecosystem-based coastal and marine management	The project actually promotes EBRM so this is not an external assumption
	Assumption	Communities are willing to participate in ecosystem-based management	Commitment of communities to participate can be motivated through project actions, thus this is not fully external to the project
Output 3	Assumption	National and local policy makers and	Since the purpose of the project is to

B. Assessment of Project Outputs and Outcome

EBFM

38. According to guidance from GEF:13

"The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in terminal evaluation are: outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution."

legislators are fully supportive of ICRM and

39. While ratings for outputs are not explicitly required, since outputs are the basis for achieving the outcome, providing ratings for the outputs is the most logical method that leads to a reliable rating for the project outcome as well.

promote ICRM and EBFM, this is not

an external assumption

¹³ GEF. April 2017. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects.

This logic is further reinforced in the guidance from GEF:14

"In the causal pathways of a project, its outputs are expected to lead to its intended outcomes."

40. The discussion in this section therefore follows this approach, and provides ratings for the outputs to arrive at a rating for the project outcome.

1. <u>Output 1: Capabilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable</u> <u>coastal and marine resource management</u>

41. In the CT Pacific countries, capacities of national and local government agencies are in general quite limited. This is primarily due to the fact that, in agencies tasked to address issues related to coastal and marine resources management, the number of skilled and qualified personnel available to take on the responsibilities assigned to them is limited. Thus the baseline of skill and ability at the outset of the project was low. The project conducted numerous activities, mainly in the form of training workshops and seminars, to build capacity within the respective agencies. To be sure, not all capacity needs were addressed, and not all gaps were filled, through the project interventions (for example, government budgets for hiring additional personnel are limited, as are the number of available qualified people entering the job market), but the view that was expressed to the evaluation specialist was that the project had made possible some significant improvements (e.g., improving knowledge and understanding among current agency employees, and demonstrating successful methodologies for management).

42. For this output, the core criteria are rated as follows:

- <u>Relevance</u>: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**: the output was well in line with GEF strategies, especially in the biodiversity focal area, country priorities, and agency mandates, and the activities as designed were appropriate for delivering the expected output.
- <u>Effectiveness</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: the effectiveness of interventions carried out in order to strengthen the capabilities of national and local institutions, was in keeping with expectations.
- Efficiency: Unable to Assess (UA): For the CT Pacific project, it is quite difficult to assess efficiency, especially at the output level. This is because many of the output indicators are not readily measurable¹⁵ (discussed further in the section on Indicators). While the budget for this full-size project was generous, the absorptive capacity was limited. In a seeming paradox, while overall project disbursements and expenditures fell short of full utilization (thus "saving" money), it appeared that the number of people who directly benefitted from project interventions was small, relative to the cost.¹⁶ Again, without measurable indicators, it is difficult to accurately assess efficiency.
- <u>Overall output rating</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: Taken cumulatively, the assessments of core criteria for Output #1 yield a Satisfactory (S) rating.

2. Output 2: Coastal communities experienced in applying best practices in

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Refer to: ADB 2018. Final M&E Report.

¹⁶ In several instances, an offsetting consideration was the fact that tangible benefits that were achieved at the community level (e.g., especially, improved management of MPAs, and successful deployment of FADs), though small in scale to begin with, were rapidly replicated and taken up by neighboring communities. This produced a larger impact that carried beyond the initial beneficiary population, and in the end, benefitted a much larger group.

ecosystem-based management

- 43. The CT Pacific project implemented a wide array of activities designed to enable communities to gain experience in ecosystem based management (EBM). These were interventions in comanagement, with the community taking a leading role in serving as the stewards for resources upon which they rely for their own livelihoods and food security. Among the activities that were successfully carried out, which contributed to the application of best practices for EBM, were the following:
 - ICRM and EBFM Strategic Plan prepared (PNG)
 - ICRM plans for Ra Province and for Tikini approved (Fiji)
 - Multi-stakeholder ICRM Committees formed (e.g., for Ra Province, Fiji)
 - Marine protected area (MPA) and EBFM plans developed (North Isabel, Solomons)
 - MPAs established and management plans approved (Timor-Leste)
 - Skills upgrading conducted for about 1,000 trainees
 - workshops conducted to effectively impart knowledge and skills through on-site, hands-on application
 - biodiversity conservation plans completed (Kimbe Bay PNG, Isabel and Malaita provinces, Solomons)

44. For this output, the core criteria are rated as follows:

- <u>Relevance</u>: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**: the output was well in line with GEF strategies for the biodiversity focal area, country priorities, and agency mandates, and the activities as designed were appropriate for delivering improved experience of communities for applying best practices in EBM.
- <u>Effectiveness</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: the effectiveness of project interventions carried out in order to strengthen the capabilities of communities to apply EBM best practices, was in keeping with expectations.
- <u>Efficiency</u>: **Unable to Assess (UA)**: The same reasons as given for the UA rating for Output 1 apply here as well, resulting in the same UA rating.
- <u>Overall output rating</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: Taken cumulatively, the assessments of core criteria for Output 2 yield a Satisfactory (S) rating.

3. Output 3: Resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced

- 45. In the process of carrying out the TE, it was observed that there was already good evidence that a number of practices which were put in place as part of project activities, were already helping to improve the resiliency of ecosystems to the effects of climate change. Two examples of this were (i) the effectiveness of FADs in reducing pressures on vulnerable reef fisheries, by shifting the focus of fishing effort to more sustainable pelagic stocks (e.g., in Fiji and Solomons); and (ii) the recovery of damaged coral reefs, and associated fish populations, apparently due to stronger protection and better management following the establishment of MPAs (e.g., on Atauro island in Timor-Leste).
- 46. For this output, the core criteria are rated as follows:
 - <u>Relevance</u>: Highly Satisfactory (HS): the output was well in line with GEF strategies

- <u>Effectiveness</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: the effectiveness of interventions carried out in order to improve climate change resiliency of coastal ecosystems, was in keeping with expectations.
- <u>Efficiency</u>: **Unable to Assess (UA)**: The same circumstances which prevented an assessment of efficiency for Outputs 1 and 2, also apply for Output 3; thus it is also not possible to assess efficiency for this output, resulting in a UA rating.
- <u>Overall output rating</u>: **Satisfactory (S)**: Taken cumulatively, the assessment of core criteria for Output 3 yields a Satisfactory (S) rating.

4. <u>Project Outcome: increased resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems attained in</u> <u>the five Pacific countries</u>

47. Based on the ratings for the component outputs, a fairly reliable rating for the project outcome emerges. Since the rating for all the three technical outputs was **Satisfactory (S)**, and since the accomplishment of the outputs leads to the achievement of the outcome, the rating for the project outcome is also **Satisfactory (S)**.

C. Progress to Impact

- 48. As earlier mentioned, it is often too early to assess the long-term impacts of a project at the point of project completion. Accepting that this is often the case, some evidence on progress towards long-term impacts, and the extent to which the key assumptions of the project's theory of change hold, may be available, and it may be feasible to assess and report on progress toward impact. In fact, precisely this task is at the heart of the TE process.
- 49. In the case of the CT Pacific project, it was noted that considerable progress was made on multiple fronts, that increase the probability that the desired project impact will be realized in the future. In the context of the theory of change (refer to Figure 3), the project was instrumental in setting up the necessary enabling conditions, or intermediate states, which would ultimately lead to achievement of impact. In fact, even before project closure, some project actions were already having some perceptible beneficial effects.
- 50. It is felt that multiple key accomplishments under the CT Pacific project will be sustainable, and several points are noteworthy in this regard:
- 1) Since achievement of the project impact is a long-term goal, *a strong indication of sustainability in and of itself can point to a greater likelihood that the project impact will be achieved*.
- 2) Also, the *numerous project accomplishments are interconnected, mutually supportive and synergistic*, thus strengthening the chances for success.
- 3) During the evaluation mission, in discussions with various stakeholders, the evaluation specialist was repeatedly impressed by the fact that many of the stakeholders expressed the opinion that the project, especially through its demonstration activities, had played a *catalytic role in jump-starting processes that were then rapidly taken up and spontaneously replicated*. This was especially true in the case of community-level interventions, including the establishment and

management of MPAs (or locally managed marine areas [LMMAs]), community organizing activities (e.g., formation of fishers' associations); and deployment of FADs as a means to sustainably improve food security.

- Similarly, another important role that the project played, the *institutionalization of ICRM and EBFM through policy, legal, and regulatory reform*, was also clearly acknowledged during the course of the TE.
- 5) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, these effects were, for the most part, clearly attributable to the project. The critical consideration here is that *these effects would not have occurred, without the influence and involvement of the project*. This point was emphatically made on several occasions during stakeholder consultations in the course of conducting the TE.
- 51. The final M&E report prepared for the project¹⁷ identifies many key accomplishments, which are presented in Table 5, below. Listed here are numerous successes of the project, which have helped to contribute to creating the "enabling conditions" which would increase the likelihood that the desired project impact could be realized. The table breaks down these results according to project outputs and indicators. It is considered that to some degree, each of these will contribute to achieving project impact; several exceptional accomplishments are highlighted in bold blue font.

Outputs/Indicators	Country	Status of Accomplishment		
Output #1 Capabilities of national and l	ocal institu	tions strengthened in sustainable coastal and marine		
resources management (5 indicators)				
Indicator #1 Policy, legal, and regulatory	FIJ	ICM Framework developed for Ra Province		
framework for institutionalizing effective	FIJ	National Climate Change Policy (2012) formulated		
ICRM and EBFM established by 2013	FIJ	National Integrated Coastal Management Committee supported		
		(and remains active)		
	FIJ	project activities upscaled by French-funded RESCCUE		
		Project		
	SOL	Malaita Provincial Fisheries Ordinance developed, approved		
		and implemented		
	PNG	ICRM and EBFM Strategic Plan 2016-2019 prepared (finalized		
		later with support from UNDP, GEF and JICA)		
	TIM,	trust fund initiated		
	VAN			
Indicator #2 Coastal and marine	FIJ	ICRM plans for Ra Province and for Tikini approved		
resource management policy guidelines	FIJ	Multi-stakeholder Ra ICRM Committee formed		
and legal and regulatory instruments	FIJ	ICM Regulatory Roadmap for Developers initiated (IUCN		
drafted by 2013; and		followed through)		
	SOL	North Isabel MPA and EBFM plans developed		
Indicator #3 Coastal and marine	TIM	Batugade and Atauro MPAs established and management		
resource management policy guidelines		plans approved		
and legal and regulatory instruments	TIM	Bisqueli MPA Management Plan/ Uaru Ana Hamlet initiated		
approved by national/local government	VAN	Vunausi River Estuary and Coastal Area Ecosystem		
authorities by 2014		Management Plan 2015-2025 developed and approved		
	PNG	Kimbe Bay policy guidelines and instruments developed (CEPA		
		and UNDP followed through)		
	PNG	Indigenous LMMA Community Women Engagement Tool		
		developed		
	PNG	ecosystem framework influenced formulation of Policy on		

Table 5. Accomplishments Measured Against Output Indicators

¹⁷ ADB 2018. Final M&E Report.

		Protected Areas
	ALL	NGOs (engaged directly by ADB after ANZDEC) prepared 21
		more community-based plans (seascape, local fisheries
		management, provincial resource use, LMMA and ward level
		plans)
Indicator #4 Organizational reform and	VAN	While organizational reforms were not accomplished, enabling
retooling of government agencies		conditions to jumpstart the process were facilitated. In Vanuatu,
concerned completed by 2014		an organizational assessment of the Department of
		Environmental Protection and Conservation was conducted
		that resulted to among others a proposed organizational
		structure and staffing, and required management competencies
		and training programs for ICRM and EBFM. These were initially
		well received by the department, but eventually did not get the
		approval of the then head of DOE." (source: Consolidated M&E
		report, Feb 2017)
	PNG	In PNG, a manual of operation for conducting NCC meetings
		was developed (source: ANZDEC Final Report, 2016).
		However, no feedback as to its usefulness was received from
		the government
Indicator #5 Skills upgrading for about	ALL	Over two thousand trainees in five countries (as of end of
1,000 trainees from relevant government		ANZDEC engagement in Oct. 2015)
agencies and NGOs completed by 2014	ALL	Multiple training activities conducted (mainly workshops
		designed to effectively impart knowledge and skills through on-
		site, hands-on application)
	ALL	NGOs (engaged directly by ADB after ANZDEC) trained over
		200 more individuals
	FIJ	72 fishers from 29 communities in Ra Province trained on safe
		and effective FAD-fishing methods
Outrout #0 Occepted communities companie	in a a d time a m	while where the section of the secti
Output #2 Coastal communities experie	nced in ap	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity	<i>nced in ap</i>) PNG	by best practices in ecosystem-based management and
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel	<i>nced in ap</i>) PNG	Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through)
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for	nced in ap) PNG SOL	Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through)
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed	<i>nced in ap</i>) PNG SOL	Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed)
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management andKimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through)Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completedMalaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed)60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL	Image: plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators)
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clii	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL eems to clii	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL eems to clin	Image: plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared	nced in ap) PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared	nced in ap) PNG SOL ALL ems to clii ALL FIJ VAN	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL eems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC)
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL eems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	Plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building,
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management andKimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through)Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completedMalaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed)60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total targetmate change enhanced (3 indicators)WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countriesRa Province habitat map of mangroves preparedVunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC)All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clii ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management andKimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through)Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completedMalaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed)60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total targetmate change enhanced (3 indicators)WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countriesRa Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertakenMalaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC)All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources degradation
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL SOL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources degradation "Malaita Model" developed to locally adapt the CBRM
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL SOL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources degradation "Malaita Model" developed to locally adapt the CBRM implementation process and innovations for effective scaling-up
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL SOL ALL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources degradation "Malaita Model" developed to locally adapt the CBRM implementation process and innovations for effective scaling-up TAILS coastal fisheries data collection system operational
Output #2 Coastal communities experie climate change adaptation (2 indicators) Indicator #6 By 2013: 3 biodiversity conservation plans for Malaita and Isabel provinces in Solomon Islands and for Kimbe Bay in PNG completed Output #3 Resilience of coastal ecosyst Indicator #8 By 2014: Habitat maps and climate change vulnerability assessments for 2,200 km of coastline prepared Indicator #9 Adaptation measures to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems demonstrated in 15 communities Indicator #10 Climate change adaptation	nced in ap PNG SOL SOL ALL ems to clin ALL FIJ VAN SOL ALL SOL VAN ALL	plying best practices in ecosystem-based management and Kimbe Bay Biodiversity Conservation Plan prepared (CEPA and UNDP followed through) Isabel Province (San Jorge and Haevo) biodiversity plan completed Malaita Province biodiversity plan initiated (but not completed) 60 subprojects implemented, thus surpassing the total target mate change enhanced (3 indicators) WorldFish vulnerability assessment and mapping spanned 34,440 km. of coastline (16 times the target) in the five countries Ra Province habitat map of mangroves prepared Vunausi Estuary and Coastal Area mapping undertaken Malaita Province resource maps prepared by WorldFish (digitized by TNC) All five countries achieved the target through activities adjunct to Indicators #5 skills upgrading/ training, and #7 community pilot demonstration projects, e.g., awareness-building, planting/re-planting of mangroves and other tree species, and solid waste management linked to coastal resources degradation "Malaita Model" developed to locally adapt the CBRM implementation process and innovations for effective scaling-up TAILS coastal fisheries data collection system operational

Page 23

3 districts	PNG	ward level planning added to accomplishments
Output #4 Effective Program Manageme	ent (4 indic	ators)
Indicator #11 Program implementation		(not accomplished)
completed on time and within budget		
Indicator #12 M&E system developed and established in NPMUs and aligned	ALL	Start-up phase of M&E (Oct. 2011-Dec. 2012): comprehensive M&E system designed, tested, refined, and adopted
with CTI M&E	ALL	Succeeding phase of M&E – Jan. 2013-Oct. 2015 (end of ANZDEC engagement): M&E focused on quarterly reporting on achievement of DMF-specified outputs, related inputs and activities, and the degree of physical and financial progress
	ALL	ADB directly engaged M&E Specialist from Aug. 2016-Dec. 2018 to assess progress in achieving DMF objectives and targets
Indicator #13 Project information documents uploaded onto the CTI website	ALL	Project documents continually uploaded by ADB TCU
Indicator #14 Regular coordination meetings conducted with NCCs, CTI secretariat, and other CTI regional projects	ALL	Regular coordination meetings conducted as planned during period of ANZDEC engagement (Oct. 2011-Oct. 2015)

Source: Adapted from ADB 2018. Final M&E Report.

52. In fact, key accomplishments which are believed can and will contribute to achieving project impact, went even further than those identified in the terminal M&E report as presented in Table 5 above. Additional accomplishments which can contribute to project impact, as identified during the TE consultations, are presented in Table 6 below. The table presents the achievements realized in each country, and also includes accomplishments which were achieved in a regional context. Again, several accomplishments which are highlighted here in bold blue font are recognized as being exceptionally powerful mechanisms that can eventually lead to the realization of the desired project impact: ensuring sustainable food security for the populations of the 5 CT Pacific countries.

O a sum turn s	
Country	Key Accomplishments
Fiji	 Project provided support for successful establishment of a national ICM framework National ICM framework linked to development of provincial ICM plans and setup of ICM committees ICM planning process being disseminated, replicated and institutionalized in other provinces (from Ra to Kandavu Bua, and Macuata provinces) Project supported successful establishment of fishers' associations, engagement with communities, and engagement with provincial government FADs successfully deployed and established FADs showing early evidence of effectiveness for improved income generation and food security FADs showing potential for reducing fishing pressure on vulnerable reef fishery through replacement of other fishing methods, especially spearfishing Project (especially FAD deployment) has motivated women to assume a more active role in fishing Mangrove rehabilitation conducted in Ra
Papua New Guinea	 Project stimulated appreciation and adoption of CTI goals and targets, and internalization of its guiding principles, by the CEPA, CCDA, and NFA Project successful in enabling ten communities from across Manus province – with a combined population of over 5,600 people, to more effectively manage their marine

Table 6. Key Project Accomplishments by Country

Page 24

Page 25

Terminal Evaluation: Draft Final Report

Country	Key Accomplishments			
	resources and better secure future food sources, especially in light of climate change			
	pressure			
	 ten fisheries management plans endorsed by four respective Local Governments, 			
	encompassing the ten communities			
	subproject successfully completed to engage women in local marine area management Three Marine Distributed Areas (MDAs) astabilished the local sector stiller			
	Inree Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) established by local communities			
	I en FADs deployed and a voluntary glilnet exchange program initiated			
	Mariculture trials for glant clam culture conducted at two sites			
	Drought tolerant crops distributed and farmers trained in their cultivation;			
	anecoolar reports regarding the gardening activities and associated livelihood plans are			
	Project raised awareness at the community level, and inspired community			
	members to appreciate the threats to their inshore marine resources, and to work			
	within their communities to take actions for sustainably managing their coastal			
	customary resources, and improve food security			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Solomon	Project supported drafting of Malaita (Provincial) Fisheries Ordinance			
Islands	Project supported milestone 'ridge to reef' management plan and integrated solid waste			
	management project for Isabel Province			
	Crocodile surveys conducted			
	• With project support, important leatherback turtle nesting site (in Hivo, Isabel), previously			
	subject to poaching and egg collection now managed and protected, and offering			
	sustainable ecotourism as an alternative livelihood opportunity (in partnership with TNC)			
	Conservation mapping by both community-based methods and GIS conducted on Isabel			
	and Malaita			
	• Current provincial government in Malaita, in collaboration with WorldFish has passed a			
	resolution for provincial leaders to work with communities to create a network of			
	Introduction of community based marine management practices under the project base			
	• Introduction of community-based marine management practices under the project has effectively bridged the gap between previous traditional management and modern-day			
	requirements for management			
	 23 LMMAs established and operational on Malaita 			
	Evidence of uptake of project activities has been observed:			
	 provincial fisheries officers have shown strong commitment and interest to 			
	continue activities			
	communities have approached WorldFish to replicate project activities in			
	their area			
	 CBRM approach of the project being applied in other new initiatives 			
	• Deployment of FADs successfully piloted as a CBRM and EAFM intervention; materials			
	for FADs are locally sourced, communities are trained for FAD construction, and FADs are			
	constructed by communities			
	Activities in Solomons strongly supportive of CTTNPOA			
	Solomons NGC proved effective decision-making body to guide and direct project			
	Project facilitated government outreach to communities: linkages between			
	community/provincial/national levels strengthened through project			
	Best practices for ICM_EAEM_CBRM_piloted/demonstrated in Isabel_Choisul_and			
	Malaita: as a result there has been increasing demand from other provinces for			
	provincial planning, ICM, marine spatial planning			
	Under the project:			
	Solomon Islands Environmental Law Association was established			
	Solomon Islands Ranger Association was created			
	CBRM Symposium with over 300 participants was conducted			

Page 26

Terminal Evaluation: Draft Final Report

Country	Key Accomplishments		
	 Project (especially FAD deployment) has motivated women to assume a more active role in fishing 		
Timor-Leste	 Focus on climate change resiliency and food security well-matched with country priorities and actual needs of communities on the ground 		
	• Training conducted to introduce community stakeholders to concept of integration and harmonization of tarabandu (traditional law) with conventional legal instruments for		
	biodiversity protection and environmental protection		
	 Peer-to-peer training, conducted through cross visits of Atauro island residents to Nino Konis Santana National Park, was effective in providing shared knowledge and understanding for establishment of MPAs, comanagement approach, and rehabilitation of fisheries and other natural resources; in exchange, Atauro residents shared their experiences regarding successful ecotourism development and associated sustainable livelihood benefits 		
	 Local communities on Atauro are successfully applying user fees (from diving and snorkeling, and fines for infractions) for sustainable financing—these funds are being used for community improvement projects and charity (e.g., annual fees collected in Beloy totaling several thousand dollars earmarked for construction of community water reservoir and providing food staples to poor families) 		
	• Original target for establishing 2 MPAs under the project was far exceeded, with 13 MPAs established on Atauro—this was largely a result of local initiative whereby communities adjacent to ones with established, successful MPAs sought to replicate the model to establish MPAs in their own success		
	• Co-management model developed in national park replicated in Atauro; formation of community conservation group is initial step; they are responsible for MPA management; comanagement model is self-sustaining		
	 Fisheries sector strategy developed with project support is in line with government priority to address food insecurity; malnutrition is a serious concern in T-L (3rd highest incidence of childhood stunting globally); significant participation of MAF and communities was demonstrated in the development of the strategy 		
	 Notable recovery of fish stocks has been observed in Beloy since the initiation of the MPA 		
	 Cross visits between Timor-Leste and in Fiji resulted in successful cross-learning: chef from Timor-Leste taught Fijians how to cook pelagic fish, thus overcoming local stigma against eating pelagic fish; Fijians shared experiences about ecotourism 		
	• Program for deployment of FADs successful—FADs attract small pelagics nearer to shore, thus more accessible for capture: reduce effort of fishers to obtain food, reduce pressures on vulnerable reef fishery; FADs considered climate smart		
	 technology; mega-3 fatty acids higher in pelagics than reef fish—more nutritious ADB project launched effort to address data deficiencies: led to the development of 		
	a catch monitoring database—fishers are participating in the program		
	 WorldFish contract was on a lump-sum basis, which helped to avoid processing delays encountered by other NGOs 		
	• In part as a result of project successes, leadership of ADB Country Resident Mission recognizes the importance of preserving coastal and marine resources which underpin national food security, climate resiliency, livelihood, and sustainable economic development; is strongly supportive of continuing synergistic activities in the future; emphasized strong correlation with ADB Strategy 2030		
Vanuatu	 Installation of nearshore FADs provides communities with additional options for catching fish and to shift fishing effort away from coral reefs and onto pelagic species Provision of spare FAD materials to replace FADs lost to future extreme weather events Training: 		
	• Completion of training of communities and provincial fisheries officers on how to build and deploy FADs		

Country	Key Accomplishments
	 Completion of catch data monitoring training Training of Vanuatu Fisheries Department staff and representatives from communities in how to record catch data on computer tablets to provide the information needed on the nature of coastal fishing activities throughout the country to guide future management of coastal fisheries resources Small Boat Operators training to improve sea safety Training on post-harvest handling and processing Production of IEC materials Training modules conducted for crown-of-thorns management, climate change adaptation 10-year ecosystem management plan prepared for Vunausi River Estuary and Coastal Area Environmental and climate change trust fund designed
Regional	 <u>IUCN—learning network</u>: <u>Strengthened environmental law associations as platforms and "champions</u>" of the environment in pursuing the countries' environmental law and policy development, such as the development of protected areas policy and legislation in Papua New Guinea, development of ICRM in Fiji and environmental policy for Vanuatu Solomon Islands Environmental Law Association (SIELA) revived through the formation of a task force that prepared the SIELA strategic plan July 2015 – July 2018; the revival of the SIELA led to funding from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) in the amount of \$80,000 for two years Vanuatu Environmental Law Association (VELA) formally registered and currently formulating its strategic plan PNG ELA established with registration pending; strategic plan for 2016-2019 drafted Workshops on ICRM enforcement conducted by FELA Documented lessons learned and country case studies through IUCN's Lessons Learning Framework for the environmental law component <u>WorldFish—climate change resiliency and food security:</u> The study on "Responding to Climate Change using an Adaptation Pathways and Decision-making Approach" by WF recommended ways to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to assess climate change risks to coastal livelihoods and develop cost-effective planned responses to reduce these risks. IFPRI: economic valuation of fisheries: The study on "Future Prospects and Adaptation Strategies for the Fisheries Sector under Climate Change in the Pacific Coral Triangle Countries" by IFPRI used a modeling approach to food supply, demand, and price scenarios in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, and Vanuatu, and generated a set of 12 general conclusions concerning the implications for food security in these countries <ul< th=""></ul<>
	 video produced and printed learning materials (posters, flipcharts, coloring books, handbooks) prepared
	 Students provided support to attend climate change and disaster risk reduction course at Vanuatu Institute of Technology
Source: Evaluation	Specialist consultative findings

Page 27

D. Project Management

- 53. Project management is included as an output in the project results framework. However, as defined within the GEF guidance for TEs, management considerations are categorized as subject for evaluation which is separate from the technical aspects that lead to tangible project outputs. For this reason it seems more appropriate to treat this subject separately for this TE. Accordingly, this section discusses the evaluation of various aspects of project management.
- 54. Project management includes (a) setting up the necessary implementing mechanisms such as the technical assistance coordination unit (TCU), regional program management office (RPMO), and national program management units (NPMUs) in each of the five participating countries, and engaging a program management consultant (PMC) and required international and national experts for country program planning and implementation; (b) design and installation of a program performance management system in the NPMUs to monitor the progress of the TA; (c) web-based sharing of information; and (d) regular coordination meetings with the national coordinating committees (NCCs), CTI Regional Secretariat and other offices undertaking similar regional projects.

1. Assessment of Execution and Implementation

- 55. The principal actors in project management are (i) the GEF Agency and (ii) the Implementing Agencies who have more direct roles in carrying out project activities. For the CT Pacific project, ADB was the GEF Agency, with the Transport, Energy and Natural Resources Division (PATE)¹⁸ of the Pacific Department (PARD) serving to coordinate project activities within ADB. The government co-implementing partner agencies in each of the 5 countries were as follows:
 - FIJI: Department of Environment, Ministry of Local Government, Housing & Environment, Infrastructure and Transport
 - PAPUA NEW GUINEA: Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA)
 - SOLOMON ISLANDS: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
 - TIMOR-LESTE: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
 - VANUATU: Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Climate Change, Geo-hazard Mapping, Meteorology, Energy and Environment
- 56. While the aforementioned agencies were the formal implementing partners for the project, activities were closely coordinated by entities contracted by ADB. These entities were also the direct recipients of the grant funding provided by GEF and ADB. Initially, FCG ANZDEC (New Zealand) was awarded the contract as regional PMC to carry out and coordinate overall management functions for project activities in all 5 countries, as well as regional activities. About midway through the project, major changes were made in the project management arrangements, with several NGOs being assigned management responsibilities in the 5 countries. These changes are discussed in greater detail below.
- 57. In addition to the arrangements described above, IUCN Oceania, WorldFish, and the International Food Policy Research Institute were each engaged on a single-source selection basis to conduct special studies, research, institutional strengthening, and other selected activities related to climate change adaptation, environmental law and learning, and food security issues.

¹⁸ Now known as the Energy Division.

a. Execution

58. As the GEF Executing Agency, ADB had overall responsibility for liaison with GEF and as the conduit for disbursement of GEF and ADB grant funds, and to ensure, through the project performance management system, that the project work program was kept on-track. In order to facilitate better project operations, ADB formed a TA coordination unit (TCU) within PARD headed by an international program coordinator and assisted by technical support staff. The international program coordinator was responsible to oversee the day-to-day implementation of the TA on behalf of ADB and liaise with all relevant ADB units, which greatly helped to ensure that the multiple requirements of GEF and ADB were met.

However, there were several factors which posed challenges for ADB to effectively manage the project, and two are briefly presented here.

- 59. **Project followed a modality atypical for ADB**: The majority of ADB's projects are loan investments, especially for infrastructure development. For ADB to execute a long-running, standalone technical assistance project solely funded through grants, and one which is not linked to other investments (e.g., project preparatory technical assistance in preparation for a loan project, or TA funding to support and complement a larger loan investment) is rather unusual. Even many of ADB's other projects that involved partnering with GEF, have been TA projects that have been tied to lending.
- 60. ADB procedures for guiding the implementation of loan projects are well developed. However, given the rarity of stand-alone grant projects, ADB really does not have deep experience in the best ways of guiding and managing such projects. Also, project officers, who are more accustomed to processing and guiding loan investment projects, are typically not as well attuned to the different requirements for managing a "soft" project such as the CT Pacific project.
- 61. <u>Frequent changes of Project Officer:</u> Over approximately seven years during which the project was implemented, four different project officers were assigned to the project, with an additional three officers filling in on a temporary basis or for specific purposes.¹⁹ The frequent changes no doubt caused some lack of continuity and loss of "institutional memory" regarding the project.
- 62. The issues described above are believed to have had some weakening effect on the execution of this project. Other issues, which are described in greater detail below, included (i) ADB's limited experience and familiarity in directly engaging with NGOs for project implementation; and (ii) delays in disbursing funds. These factors had further adverse effects on the execution of the project by ADB.
- 63. Despite these shortcomings, PATE, with the assistance provided through the TCU, did manage to fulfil the basic requirements for executing the project—ensuring that a project management structure was put in place, disbursing funds, liaising with GEF, and carrying out other oversight functions. Also, to its credit, the ADB was able to apply a very unconventional, yet necessary adaptive measure, to set the project on-course and ensure better implementation results in its final phase: this was a major overhaul of the management structural arrangements, that was carried out at around the mid-point of the project (further discussed in following sections).
- 64. It is a requirement for the TE that the quality of project execution and project implementation are given separate ratings. In consideration of the various factors described here, the project

¹⁹ The ADB officers assigned principal or related responsibilities on the CT Pacific project included: Mahfuz Ahmed, Anne Witherford, Marilou Drilon, Shigehiko Muramoto, Hanna Uusimaa, Haidy Ear Dupuy, and Deborah Robertson.

execution is rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS).

b. Implementation

- 65. While project approval came in late 2010 (GEF CEO Endorsement Date was 09 November 2010, and ADB Approval Date was 14 December 2010) a rather lengthy delay occurred until the first consultant was engaged on the project in June 2011, and a still longer time period elapsed until the contracting of the PMC in November 2011 (due mainly to the time spent in finalizing the selection of FCG ANZDEC as the firm to serve as PMC, and in executing the consultancy contract). This had immediate repercussions on implementation, and caused added delays, since some consultants who had been identified initially were no longer available and replacements had to be found and fielded. In addition, by the time that the project got underway, some areas of intervention identified during the design phase were no longer needed and the scheduled program and corresponding consultants had to be changed.
- 66. The project suffered a further setback with the sudden demise of the original team leader/regional program manager, who enjoyed an excellent reputation for advising on improved fisheries management in the Pacific. A replacement for the original team leader was found to take over those responsibilities. ANZDEC's chief executive officer and project director also changed during the course of TA implementation leaving another noticeable institutional memory gap.
- 67. As mentioned earlier in the report, a significant change in management arrangements for the project occurred about mid-way through its implementation. During a Pacific Regional Planning Meeting held in Brisbane, Australia in April 2015, key issues concerning the project were discussed among project stakeholders. Key findings and follow-up actions, including a revised list of pipeline subprojects, and a request to GEF for extension of the project deadline, were captured in an Aide Memoire.²⁰ As a result of decisions made during the Brisbane meeting, the contract with FCG ANZDEC as PMC was closed. The budget for activities under FCG ANZDEC supervision was reduced, from USD10,405,236 to USD5,267,589;²¹ a project extension was granted; and main management responsibilities (and budget to carry them out) were shifted to several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which were directly contracted by ADB. The NGOs retained to continue the project in the 5 countries were:
 - FIJI: Conservation International (CI)
 - PAPUA NEW GUINEA: Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
 - SOLOMON ISLANDS: WorldFish
 - TIMOR-LESTE: Conservation International (CI), WorldFish
 - VANUATU: Conservation International (CI)
- 68. As mentioned, a shift in pipeline subprojects accompanied the transition from FCG ANZDEC as PMC, to the NGOs serving as project managers in the 5 countries. This led to changes in the overall direction of the project, the most apparent one being a shift in focus from more regional and national-level activities under ANZDEC, to more local, site-specific interventions under the direction of the NGOs. This shift had come about in part, in response to requests from country implementing partner agencies to focus greater effort on subprojects that (i) could produce tangible impacts on the ground; (ii) would be more responsive to the objectives articulated in the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) Regional Plan of Action (RPOA) and National Plans of Action

²⁰ ADB. April 2015. Aide Memoire for the Pacific Regional Planning Meeting. RETA 7753: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). 26-29 April 2015, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

²¹ FCG ANZDEC. March 2016. ADB TA-7753 Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle Initiative of the Pacific, Phase 2, Final Report.

(NPOAs); and (iii) would be more effective in responding to the urgent need to strengthen climate resiliency and food security in the wake of Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu in 2015.

- 69. Although not entirely by design, the phasing of project activities which took place as a result of this shift, in a way proved to be fortuitous: the regional and national-level activities undertaken under the direction of FCG ANZDEC during the earlier phase (informally referred to as "Phase 1"²² by those involved in the project later on) had helped, at least in some of the countries, to set up enabling conditions, in terms of available legal, policy and regulatory frameworks, for strengthened conservation of marine biodiversity and coastal resources. During the subsequent NGO-led "Phase 2," of the project, it was then possible for communities, with guidance from the NGOs, to implement demonstration projects that yielded tangible on-the-ground results. The establishment of MPAs (and forming these into networks of MPAs), as well as the deployment of FADs that served as a means to reduce fishing pressure on more vulnerable reef fish stocks, while at the same time enabling greater food security and revenue streams, were two of the most successful types of subprojects that were implemented in the latter phase of the project. A more comprehensive and specific list of the subprojects and activities that are regarded as the key accomplishments of the project, has already been provided and is summarized in Tables 5 and 6, above.
- 70. One aspect of the direct-contracting arrangements between ADB and the NGOs that proved problematic, was the fact that neither ADB, nor the NGOs that entered into contracts with ADB, were very familiar with one another's administrative procedures. This resulted in confusion, in some cases NGOs not following proper procedures in getting approvals for expenditures, which caused disbursement delays. In one case, arrangements worked out much more smoothly: this was for the contract with WorldFish in Timor-Leste, which was written as a lump-sum contract. In this case, no approvals were required for individual line-item expenditures, which greatly streamlined financial arrangements.
- 71. Overall, both ANZDEC as the PMC, and later the NGOs as country project managers, proved effective in successfully completing many activities and achieving many of the desired outputs. The implementation of the project is therefore rated as **SATISFACTORY (S)**.

2. Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems

a. Overview

- 72. A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system for the project was presented in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request²³ and in the project results framework (under Output 4, for Project Management). The M&E system presented contains the following elements:
 - Conduct Inception Workshop and prepare Inception Report;
 - Set up adequately staffed and equipped TA coordination unit, regional Project Management Office, and national Project Management Units;
 - Procure required goods and services, including consultants and various contractors;
 - Develop project performance management system (PPMS) consistent with the CTI M&E framework and train NPMU staff on its use;

²² This was in fact a source of confusion for the Evaluation Specialist during the field mission. In project documentation, ADB refers to the current project as "Phase 2", in contrast to the "Phase 1" project preparation phase that was carried out by UNIQUEST Pty. Ltd. Most of the NGO personnel, however, were not aware of this distinction, and referred to their own activities as "Phase 2"—in this case, in contrast to the earlier activities that were carried out under FCG ANZDEC.
²³ ADB. 24 September 2010. Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific. GEF Trust Fund.

- Establish linkages with the CTI Secretariat and other CTI projects in Southeast Asia and the Pacific;
- Conduct baseline survey of beneficiary households;
- Conduct regular M&E of Project activities, including measurement of project implementation progress and delivery of agreed outputs;
- Upload project information and documents on the internet (IW:LEARN website, CTI website);
- Conduct midterm review of the Project (including preparation of GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool);
- Prepare periodic implementation progress reports, including Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), quarterly progress reports;
- Conduct Final Evaluation (including preparation of GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool);
- Prepare Project Terminal Report.

73. Steps were initiated to put in place the project M&E system, as follows:

- Beginning at project start-up (Oct. 2011 through Dec. 2012), a comprehensive M&E system was designed, tested, refined, and adopted;
- The M&E system was set up within the national project management units and aligned with the overarching CTI M&E;
- During the period under supervision of the PMC (ANZDEC), from January 2013 to October 2015, M&E activities focused on quarterly reporting on achievement of outputs, related inputs and activities as specified in the results framework, and the degree of physical and financial progress;
- ADB directly engaged an M&E Specialist from August 2016 to December 2018 to assess progress in achieving project objective and targets as presented in the project framework.

b. Project Reviews and Reporting

- 74. The M&E plan includes requirements for regular project reviews and reporting. In this regard, the following measures have been implemented:
 - Project information documents have been regularly uploaded onto the CTI website by the TA coordination unit within ADB;
 - Regular coordination meetings were conducted with National Coordinating Committees (NCCs), the CTI secretariat, and other CTI regional projects; and
 - 7 annual PIRs were produced, the final PIR dated August 2018.
- 75. It is considered that the review and reporting functions within the M&E system of the project have been adequately carried out.

c. Tracking Tools

76. The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT, or Tracking Tool) has been developed to help track and monitor progress in the achievement of the World Bank/WWF Alliance worldwide protected area management effectiveness target. The Tracking Tool may also be used more generally where it can help monitor progress towards improving management effectiveness. For

all GEF protected area projects, it is a requirement to apply the Tracking Tool and submit the completed METT to the GEF Secretariat at three specified points during the project lifespan:

- With the project document, at CEO endorsement;
- With the mid-term review (MTR) or evaluation for the fiscal year Annual Monitoring Report in which the MTR was completed;
- With the completion report or terminal evaluation for the fiscal year Annual Monitoring Report in which the terminal evaluation or project completion report was undertaken.²⁴
- 77. For the CT Pacific project, in 2009, initial METT was carried out by Uniquest Pty. Ltd. for several sites which had been identified as target MPAs during the project preparatory activities. Follow up METT was conducted at the mid-term in 2015 by ANZDEC, and final METT was completed by the M&E Specialist within the TCU in ADB at the conclusion of the project, in late December 2018. The protected areas for which METT was applied, and the METT scores for each tracking event, are shown in Table 7.

Country	Site and Location	Location METT Assessment Scores				
		Oct-Nov 2009	Dec 2015	Dec 2018		
		(Uniquest)	(ANZDEC)	(ADB TCU)		
Vanuatu	Chief Roi Mata Domain (CRMD),					
vanualu	Efate, Lelepa and Erartok islands	41	43	43		
Vanuatu	Elma Matnakara Park, North Efate	47	48	48		
Vanuatu	Nguna Pele MPA, North Efate,					
vanualu	East Santo, and Epi Islands	30	30	35		
Timor-Leste	Nini Konis Santana National Park	42	43	45		
Timor-Leste	Atauro Island and Batugade	25	32	46		
	Kimbe Bay Network of Marine					
PNG	Protected Areas	56	57	56		
	Manus Island (Pere Community					
PNG	LMMA)	47	47	49		
	Northern Isabel Province Network					
Salamana	of					
30101110115	Community Based Resource					
	Management Areas	39	40	58		
	Northeast Malaita Province (Lau					
	Lagoon area) Network of					
Solomons	Community Based Marine					
	Resource					
	Areas	11	11	60		

Table 7. Marine Protected Area Sites and METT Scores

78. It is somewhat difficult to interpret the results shown in Table 7. Only in North Malaita (Solomons), and in Atauro Island (Timor-Leste), were project activities related to MPA strengthening carried through until the end of the project. It is therefore likely that the results of the final concluding METT for PNG and Vanuatu are not particularly meaningful, in the context of determining the extent to which the project may have catalyzed greater management effectiveness at MPA sites in those countries. And in the case of both North Malaita and Atauro/Batugade, specific sites in the two locations changed through the addition of new MPAs, so the findings reported in the

²⁴ GEF. 2011.

Tracking Tool time series may not be completely comparable.

- 79. From consultations conducted during the TE, it seems that, at least in Solomons and Timor-Leste, the greatest improvements in management effectiveness in MPAs came during the final stage of project implementation, led by the NGOs. In Timor-Leste, while activities in Santana National Park were curtailed, and efforts at the Batugade site were complicated by a conflict between government and the local community,²⁵ in Atauro, the number of MPAs proliferated, and led to discernible improvements in habitat quality and health of coral reefs, and a reported accompanying increase in the numbers of fish. At the Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, site in North Malaita, during a meeting with village elders, the view was expressed that past generations had been responsible stewards of fisheries and other nearshore resources, but that the community had more recently "lost their way" in managing these resources sustainably. The elders expressed their deep gratitude to WorldFish and the project, through which they had been re-introduced to sustainable practices that enabled them to once again act as effective stewards.
- 80. In discussions with NGO representatives in Timor-Leste and Solomons, no mention was made of using the METT as a tool for gauging the impact of project activities in bringing about greater management effectiveness in MPAs, despite the fact that these NGOs should have been involved in that process. While the local accounts mentioned above give strong evidence of tangible improvements in management effectiveness, these may not have been fully captured in the final tracking tools. Nonetheless, these final METT do show a general trend of improved management effectiveness in Sites in Timor-Leste and Solomons, with improvement in North Malaita (from a score of 11 at the baseline, to a final METT score of 60) being especially notable.

d. Assessment and Rating

- 81. The design of the M&E system was appropriate for the needs of the project, and was set up according to accepted practice.
- 82. In implementing the M&E system, the requirements as set forth in the CEO Endorsement Request were generally fulfilled. As indicated above, one area where some weakness was observed, was in applying METT and utilizing the tool to gauge progress toward improving management effectiveness. The question arises as to whether or not new biodiversity tracking tools should have been initiated, when activities at some of the original MPA sites were discontinued, and replacement sites or new expansion sites were added. Recognizing that use of the METT is a core requirement for GEF-funded biodiversity projects, and that it has proven to be a very useful tool in assessing management effectiveness for other projects, it is felt that greater care should have been taken in the manner in which METT were completed and the results of applying the tool analyzed.
- 83. GEF requires that project M&E is assessed both for design and implementation. Considering all the above factors, overall, the M&E design is rated as **Satisfactory (S)**, while the implementation of project M&E is given a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

3. Financial Management

84. Table 8 shows the annual disbursement of funds for the project.

²⁵ A conflict arose regarding the demarcation of an MPA in Batugade. As a result of advocacy work done through the project, an MPA was legally declared and in Batugade, and recognized by the government—but without full acknowledgement by chiefs in the traditional (*suco*) management area. As of the closure of the CT Pacific project (31 December 2018) this matter had still not been resolved.

85. The total GEF grant as presented in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request was USD 13,118,183. Comparing the amount of the GEF grant disbursed (USD 12,358,238 (rounded), to the total amount of the GEF grant which was committed, leaves a total undisbursed amount of USD 759,945 (rounded), or 5.79 percent of the GEF grant amount.

Year	Fund 02 ^{1/} TASF	Fund 07 ^{1/} RCIF	Fund 48 ^{2/} GEF	Grand Total
2011	33,276.00	23,169.00	640,526.97	696,971.97
2012	83,146.00	20,769.00	1,076,510.19	1,180,425.19
2013	30,347.00	7,930.00	1,725,697.56	1,763,974.56
2014	56,930.00	26,532.00	1,701,887.35	1,785,349.35
2015	76,987.00	63,813.00	1,017,207.05	1,158,007.05
2016	133,515.00	86,875.00	1,532,104.92	1,752,494.92
2017	110,014.00	76,414.00	1,397,276.99	1,583,704.99
2018	131,528.00	91,529.00	1,588,461.21	1,811,518.21
2019	144,006.00	100,265.00	1,678,566.00	1,922,837.00
Total	799,749.00	497,296.00	12,358,238.24	13,655,283.24

 Table 8. Annual Disbursements per Fund Category, CT Pacific Project (as of 31 May 2019)

1/ TA Disbursement by Fund,Cost Category and Period (TAIS system)

2/ Statement of commitments and Disbursement (Agency Trust Fund No. 48)

- 86. As discussed above, significant financial adjustments were made at the time that the project transitioned from management under a project management consultant, to management under NGOs in each of the 5 countries. Initially low rates of disbursement were in part caused by delays in approval and initiation of subprojects, as well as low absorptive capacity among the government implementing agencies and cooperating partners.²⁶ On the other hand, relatively low annual rates of disbursement were in part offset by the long extension of the project timeframe—from a 4-year project timeframe as originally conceived, ultimately extending to a project which was implemented over a period of more than eight years. This significant extension in duration certainly was a factor in achieving close to full utilization of the allocated grant funds.
- 87. No separate rating is required for financial performance.

E. Sustainability

- 88. During the course of the evaluation mission, several facts came to the attention of the evaluation specialist, which gave a strong indication that the project is on a good trajectory towards sustainability. Among the key points observed were the following:
 - One of the areas in which the project focused, especially in the earlier phase of its implementation (under FCG ANZDEC), was on establishing or reforming policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks at local or subnational levels, towards greater emphasis on the wise use and management of marine and coastal resources. In several CT Pacific countries, this

²⁶ As reported in the midterm evaluation report.

has created an enabling environment which will allow biodiversity conservation efforts to proceed more effectively and efficiently.

- During the last few years of project implementation, NGOs were contracted directly by ADB to guide project activities, especially at the grass-roots level. The NGOs in general maintain a stable presence and long-term commitment to the target countries. As such, they can be effective partners for implementing actions which are sustained well into the future, and offer a means for fostering continuity of efforts (and resultant benefits) begun under the project.
- Strong emphasis on community engagement, especially during the latter phase of the project implementation, has laid a strong foundation for local ownership and participation, thereby significantly boosting the prospects for sustainability.
- Successful piloting of various activities in target communities has generated spontaneous interest in neighboring communities which has resulted in replication and expansion of successful models, thus broadening the impact of the project, and improving the probability of sustainability.
- 89. At the same time, it must be recognized that some risks which threaten sustainability persist. Among the most significant of these are the following:
 - The 5 CT Pacific countries participating in the project lack the economic and human resources required to adequately address numerous challenges. For example, it was reported that the implementing agencies for the project found it difficult to meet the levels of cost-sharing expected from them.
 - There is a risk of natural and anthropogenic environmental hazards (e.g., typhoons, tsunami, sea level rise and other climate-related impacts) which may absorb limited resources and delay sustainable development.
 - high poverty and population growth rates will likely continue to put increasing pressure on natural resources. This may lead to proliferation of illegal and damaging practices, as heads of households struggle to provide for the food security and economic well-being of their families.
 - institutional structures and policy frameworks are still weak in the CT Pacific countries. Weaknesses include lack of sufficient number of qualified personnel, lack of reliable data for informed decision-making and policy formulation, and governance issues (among others).
- 90. Taking into account the strengths and weaknesses described above, an analysis of the sustainability of the benefits of the CT Pacific project was undertaken according to GEF requirements. There is a direct, inverse relationship between project risks and sustainability: fewer risks, or risks of lesser severity, translate to a higher probability of project success and sustainability. Consideration of the risks, and how these affect the prospects for sustainability, are the basis for evaluating sustainability for this TE. The analysis undertaken here takes into account the risks within four categories—financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental—as specified by GEF. The assessment is as follows:
 - <u>Financial risks</u> continue, as described above; however, the project has contributed towards addressing these, for example by initiating the creation of trust funds to finance improved natural resources management and biodiversity conservation.

- <u>Socio-political risks</u> exist, but are not judged to be critical. While it is true that 4 of the 5 target countries have recent past history as "fragile and conflict-affected situations" (FCAS),²⁷ by and large, these conditions have improved. While there is still a possibility that any of these countries could slide back into a destabilized political situation, at the present time, this does not seem to be the case.
- <u>Institutional risks</u> are also present, as described above. However, initiatives begun under the project have made progress in addressing a number of these, through such activities as training, knowledge and awareness-raising, and legal and policy reform. Thus there are encouraging signs that the project has helped to catalyze an overall trend toward improvement of institutional capacity, especially as relates to better management of marine and coastal resources.
- As with the other risks mentioned, <u>Environmental risks</u> are present, and could indeed have a negative impact on project sustainability. On the other hand, the project has carried out a suite of activities which have helped to combat these risks: (i) strengthening site-specific management of coastal and marine resources aimed at conserving biodiversity; (ii) conducting policy reform to support conservation and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources; and (iii) improving resiliency, both among human populations and of the living marine resources themselves, in the face of climate change.
- 91. While the above-mentioned risks are not to be ignored, the project performed well in addressing many of these, even if in many cases they were not fully resolved. More importantly, many processes initiated under the project, especially at the grass-roots community level, *have apparently developed sufficient momentum to be self-sustaining*, as has already been seen in the spontaneous proliferation of MPAs and scaling-up into networks of MPAs; greater efforts toward community organizing in forming fishers' organizations and similar groups; and proliferation of FAD deployment as a means for reducing fishing pressure on the most vulnerable stock (nearshore fisheries associated with coral reefs, mangroves and seagrasses), and ensuring greater food security for local communities. These improvements at the grass-roots level have been backed up by significant legal and policy reforms at the national and provincial levels. The key accomplishments highlighted in Tables 5 and 6 provide tangible evidence that supports the findings. Overall, these observations bode well for sustainability of project benefits well into the future.
- 92. In the GEF evaluation process, sustainability is rated on a four-point scale.²⁸ For the CT Pacific project, sustainability has been considered for each of the four risk categories discussed above, and the sustainability rating assigned for each is **Likely (L)**. Thus the overall probability that the project benefits will be sustained, is also rated as **Likely (L)**.

IV. Lessons, Recommendations, and Conclusion

A. Lessons

93. A multitude of lessons emerged from this complex, long-running project. The key lessons learned, which may be useful to bear in mind when similar projects are being developed in the future, are

²⁷ FCAS were previously described as "Fragile states", "Weakly Performing Countries" and as "LICUS" or "Low Income Countries Under Stress" (World Bank). ADB policy on "Achieving Development Effectiveness in Weakly Performing Countries refers: The Asian Development Bank's Approach to Engaging with Weakly Performing Countries" was approved by ADB in 2007.

²⁸ Likely (L). There is little or no risk to sustainability; Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks to sustainability; Moderately Unlikely (MU). There are significant risks to sustainability; Unlikely (U). There are severe risks to sustainability.

presented below.

- a) NGOs, having a stable presence and long-term country commitment, can be effective partners for implementing on-the-ground actions at the community level: Small-scale community-based initiatives are not an area in which ADB has shown great strength, but it is an area where NGOs excel. While the impacts of such activities may be small initially, they can grow as successes are replicated.
- b) NGOs' lack of familiarity with ADB's administrative requirements caused serious delays and risked non-accomplishment of project targets: NGOs and ADB operate according to very different business models. For such partnerships to be effective, extra effort may be needed to ensure a clear understanding of procedural requirements, on both sides.
- c) Effective application of an "adaptative management" approach (an approach which is actively encouraged by the GEF) can be used to overcome barriers, cope with changing conditions and requirements, and make needed course corrections to enable achievement of targeted project outcomes: this took place when changes in management arrangements and scope were made in the CT Pacific project.
- d) If changes are made in project activities as part of an adaptive management approach, it is important that such changes are also reflected in an updated, revised results framework. The framework (i) should serve as a reliable and up-to-date roadmap to guide ongoing project implementation, and (ii) its proper use facilitates accurate monitoring and evaluation of project performance with respect to newly-formulated targets and indicators.
- e) Training of teachers provides an effective mechanism for knowledge dissemination regarding EAFM, CBRM, and sustainable fisheries practices and can broaden impact especially among student and youth populations
- f) Strategic sharing of responsibilities among partners (e.g., assignment of distinct geographic areas among ADB, USAID, AusAID in CT-Pacific Solomons) can avoid redundancy and create synergies
- g) Using local materials, and encouraging local construction, can enhance sustainability: this was observed in the provision of FADs to the project. In some cases (e.g., in Ra Province in Fiji), FADs provided to the project by SPC were imported, but these proved costly to maintain and their replacement could strain community resources. In other cases (e.g., in Solomons) FADs were constructed locally, using local materials. These FADs were more affordable and easier to repair, maintain, and replace, than imported FADs.
- h) Coral reefs which have been damaged or subject to excessive pressure, and their associated fish populations, are highly resilient, and have the potential for quick recovery once effective management regimes are restored: this was demonstrated in Atauro Island, where the establishment of MPAs led to rapid recovery of damaged coral reefs, and accompanying increases in fish populations.
- i) Collaboration and coordination between various levels within government hierarchies national, provincial, district, local, and ward—needs to be more consistent: The CTI NCCs proved to be cohesive management entities that could identify and deal with key issues and establish regular coordination among the various government levels and other stakeholders.

B. Recommendations

94. In many cases, the lessons cited above have led logically to recommendations which could help

to improve performance of future projects which have some commonalities with the CT Pacific project. In addition, other recommendations have emerged, not necessarily as an outgrowth of specific lessons, but as mechanisms that could help to address issues or concerns and which could also help to improve results of similar projects in the future. The key recommendations which were identified are presented here.

- a) The ADB's Strategy 2030 (published July 2018) details seven operational priorities of the Bank, nearly all of which have been furthered through the implementation of the CT-Pacific project. Thus it is recommended that initiatives in the Pacific which were begun under the project be expanded. Such future initiatives should aim at (among others): (i) strengthening institutions' capacities for more effective management of their globally important coastal and marine resources; (ii) building communities' greater resiliency to climate change impacts and improving food security; (iii) recognizing the important role of women in contributing to coastal-based livelihood activities; and (iv) identifying opportunities for regional cooperation. Opportunities for scaling up could be based upon (i) inclusion of additional countries in the region for cooperative programs; and (ii) coordinating GEF grant investments with confinancing through other instruments (e.g., ADB loan financing), in order to build economic development that links key productive sectors (e.g., tourism, fisheries, maritime transport, etc.) across the Pacific Island countries.
- b) Additional opportunities for fostering engagement between NGOs and ADB, and for promoting more efficient interactions between them, should be explored. An integral part of this should be exploring ways in which to facilitate smooth administrative processes, especially in obtaining approvals for expenditures and improving efficiency for funds disbursement. Lump-sum contracting (as was utilized for the WorldFish contract in Timor-Leste) is one simple way in which some of these issues could be addressed.
- c) Design of projects that deal mainly with management and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources should strive to take a more holistic view, in an integrated coastal zone management (ICZM), "ridge-to-reef" approach. Such an approach should consider the downstream effects that land-based activities have in the coastal zone and nearshore area. This could lead to achieving better outcomes for marine and coastal biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihood, climate resiliency, and food security.
- d) Opportunities for innovative financial instruments and mechanisms, mediated through government policy reform and implemented for the benefit of communities, to support more effective ecosystem and resources management (e.g., natural capital accounting, payment for ecosystem services, trust funds, blue/green economy models, etc.) should be explored.
- e) In capture fisheries, it has been the traditional practice to adopt regulations and policies which have promoted the protection of juvenile fishes at the expense of capturing larger, mature individuals (e.g., through banning of small-mesh-size gillnets). However, since larger fishes are by far the most fecund breeders, protecting larger individuals, which typically produce more eggs, can lead to higher levels of recruitment. At the same time, ensuring that juvenile fish survive to adulthood is important for maintaining healthy fish stocks. Therefore, policies should be put in place (and indeed already exist in many developed countries' fisheries programs) which protect both juveniles and mature breeders (e.g., by imposing both minimum and maximum catch size limits) for target species.

Terminal	Evaluation:	Draft Fina	I Report
----------	--------------------	-------------------	----------

C. Conclusion

95. The GEF requirements for carrying out the TE have already been explained, the evaluation has been conducted accordingly, and the requisite ratings have been assigned. A summary of the ratings for the project as a whole is shown in Table 7.

Component			Evaluation Ratings**					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	UA
Output 1	Capabilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable coastal and marine resource management		•					
Output 2	Coastal communities experienced in applying best practices in ecosystem-based management		ullet					
Output 3	Resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced							
Outcome	increased resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems attained in the five Pacific countries							
Project M&E: design								
Project M&E: implementation				•				
Project execution				•				
Project implementation								
		L	ML	MU	U			UA
Project sustainability								

Table 7. Ratings Summary for the CT Pacific Project

**HS=highly satisfactory; S=satisfactory; MS=moderately satisfactory; MU=moderately unsatisfactory; U=unsatisfactory; HU=highly unsatisfactory; UA=unable to assess; for Sustainability: L=likely; ML=moderately likely; MU=moderately unlikely; U=unlikely.

- 96. The overall rating for the project is **Satisfactory (S)**. While ADB has a separate and somewhat different rating system (as presented in the TA completion report [TCR], of which this TER is an appendix), the results of the evaluation according to the GEF and ADB systems are quite similar and consistent with one another.
- 97. The project was successful in overcoming some significant institutional, administrative, and management hurdles, to eventually produce most of the desired outputs and project outcomes (albeit with some delay). This achievement was especially notable in the face of the challenges that accompanied the major transition that occurred midway through implementation, from management under the direction of FCG ANZDEC as PMC, to management through direct contracting by ADB of NGOs to lead activities in each of the 5 countries. At least in some of the target countries, the activities which were completed under ANZDEC leadership laid a solid foundation of legal, policy and regulatory reform, and institutional strengthening, which served to support the more site-specific, community-based activities that followed when a new suite of subprojects was implemented under the direction of the NGOs.

- 98. While it is true that it was not possible to visit all 5 countries during the course of the evaluation mission, direct consultations with multiple stakeholders in the three countries visited (Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste) revealed a consistent pattern of strong appreciation for the project's accomplishments, and provided evidence that many activities which were initiated under the project were being continued and scaled up in a spontaneous manner.
- 99. It is hoped that the lessons learned from the CT Pacific project, and the recommendations which have been presented in this TER, will prove to be valuable in planning, designing, and implementing future projects with similar objectives—strengthening management effectiveness for the conservation of biodiversity and natural resources in the marine and nearshore environment, so that food security, livelihoods, and resiliency to the effects of climate change can be improved and sustained for residents of coastal communities.

Annexes

Annex A: Consultant's Terms of Reference—Evaluation Specialist

Annex B: References

- Annex C: Mission Schedule—Field Activities, Meetings, and Site Visits Conducted for the Terminal Evaluation
- Annex D: List of Persons Met / Interviewed

Annex E. GEF Rating Scales

Page 43

Annex A: Consultant's Terms of Reference—Evaluation Specialist

Contract	145461-S23391
Project	TA-7753 REG: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2) - Evaluation Specialist (43427-012)
Expertise	Evaluation Specialist, Coastal and Marine Management
Source	International

Objective and Purpose of the Assignment

As the TA comes to a close in December 2018, ADB requires a technical assistance completion report (TCR) to be prepared, consistent with ADB's Project Administration Instructions (PAI No. 6.08, revised February 2011). In addition, the GEF requires additional evaluation information on the TA in the form of a Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and associated guidelines. The main objective of the assignment is the preparation of a TCR with the TER as a supplementary appendix to address the additional requirements of GEF. The preparation of the TER will be guided by ADB's Guidance Note on Terminal Evaluation Reports for GEF-cofinanced projects. These reports will present an assessment of the project's design, implementation, and achievement of objectives, as well as recommendation of future actions for similar projects.

Scope of Work

The Evaluation Specialist (International Consultant) will be responsible for the following tasks. The specialist will work closely and report directly to the TA's Project Officer.

a. Review ADB's PAI for TCRs and GEF/ADB requirements for terminal evaluation of GEF-cofinanced projects (to be provided at inception of assignment).

b. Develop a work plan indicating milestones, outlining the approach and methodology, and detailing timing and implementation of activities, for the TCR completion and supplementary annex for the GEF TER.

c. Review relevant reports such as the ADB Technical Assistance Report, consultants reports, GEF Endorsement Document for the GEF cofinancing including relevant GEF Tracking Tools, and all other project documentation and background information, including, but not limited to project preparation files, progress reports, back to office reports, scientific articles, monitoring and evaluation reports, performance assessments, communications and media outputs, and knowledge products pertinent to the TA.

d. Liaise with relevant ADB staff in the Pacific Department and Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department regarding the project design, implementation and performance, as well as the TA consultants, and focal agencies and non-government organizations implementing partners in each country. To the extent possible, consultations will be held via email and telephone. If needed, short duration visits to the participating countries may be done.

e. To the extent possible and in close coordination with the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, integrate the Biodiversity Tracking Tools in the Final Report.

f. Any other tasks assigned by the TA Project Officer.

The TCR component of the report will:

a. Evaluate the rationale for the TA, adequacy of its formulation (including the level of stakeholder participation and ownership), and clarity and comprehensiveness of the terms of reference;
b. Evaluate the achievement of the outputs and outcome, the delivery of inputs and conduct of activities;

c. Evaluate the quality of the TA outputs and outcome including the reports produced, presentations made, technology transfer achieved (including number trained and staff retention), and achievement of time-bound targets;

 d. Describe TA implementation and any significant changes occurring between TA preparation and implementation (including changes in the context in which the TA was carried out); e. Review the performance of TA consultants; f. Identify the major lessons for ADB and provides recommendations for follow-up actions and improving future TAs; and g. Rate the performance of the TA. The Supplementary Appendix for the GEF will include additional information on: a. General background on the GEF funding b. Implementation arrangements for the GEF funded activities; c. Assessment of the relevance d. Assessment of progress towards impacts; f. Global Environmental Benefits achieved from the GEF, focusing on climate change mitigation impacts g. An assessment of the catalytic role of the GEF; h. Assessment of the effectiveness of the suitability and effectiveness of the M&E framework j. Intuitional arrangements. Detailed Tasks and/or Expected Output The sepcialist is expected to deliver the following: a. A work plan with milestones (within 5 days upon issuance of notice to proceed) b. A draft TCR and supplementary annex for the GEF TER (within 8 weeks). c. A final TCR and supplementary annex for the GEF TER, addressing comments from the 				
Minimum Qualification Requirer	nents	weeks)		
The specialist shall meet the following minimum qualification requirements:				
 a. ten (10) years professional experience in conducting project evaluations/monitoring and evaluation experience in coastal and marine management programs and projects. b. A relevant University degree, preferably at post-graduate level on development administration, natural resource economics, coastal and/or marine science, environmental science, or other related fields. c. Familiarity with initiatives in the Pacific on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security is desirable. d. Experience working with ADB, GEF or other multi-lateral development banks or trust funds, is desirable. 				
Minimum Gen	eral Experience 10	Years		
Minimum Specific Experie	ence (relevant to 10 assignment)	Years		
Regional/Cou	ntry Experience Req	uired		
Deliverables Work Plan	Estimated Submis	sion Date	Type Report	
draft Technical Assistance Completion Report	08-Nov-2018		Report	
Final Technical Assistance	12-Dec-2018		Final Report	

Page 45

Comp	letion	Report

Schedule and Places of Assignment (chronological and inclusive of travel)					
City and Country	<u>Working Days</u>	Est. Start Date	Est. End Date	Other Details	
Home Office, Other	5	05/10/2018	11/10/2018		
Suva, Fiji	5	12/10/2018	17/10/2018		
Port Vila, Vanuatu	5	18/10/2018	23/10/2018		
Home Office, Other	6	24/10/2018	30/10/2018		
Port Moresby, Papua New	5	31/10/2018	05/11/2018		
Guinea					
Honiara, Solomon Islands	6	06/11/2018	12/11/2018		
Home Office, Other	5	13/11/2018	19/11/2018		
Dili, Timor-Leste	5	20/11/2018	24/11/2018		
Home Office, Other	18	25/11/2018	17/12/2018		
TOTAL	60	Intermittent;			
		Max. Working D for Field	ays/Week: 5 for H	lome Office, 6	
NOTE: Actual schedule to be confirmed wit	th User Unit				

Annex B: References

This listing is not exhaustive, but includes the key project reports, documents, and guidelines that were reviewed and utilized for the evaluation.

- ADB. 2008. Project Identification Form (PIF): Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific. GEF Trust Fund. Submission Date: 21 January 2008; Re-submission Date: 22 February 2008.
- ADB. 2010. TA Report for TA 43427L 2010. Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle in the Pacific (Phase 2) cofinanced by the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund under the Regional Cooperation and Integration Financing Partnership Facility and by the GEF.
- ADB. 2010. Technical Assistance Disbursement Handbook. Asian Development Bank. Manila
- ADB. 2011 to 2012. Project Implementation Progress Reports. Regional Cooperation and Integration Trust Funds (ICFF, PRC Fund, RCIF). As of 22 September 2011, 23 March 2011, 1 June 2012.
- ADB. 2011. Edited by Ron Duncan. The Political Economy of Economic Reform in the Pacific. Asian Development Bank. Manila.
- ADB. 2013. Administrative Issues. RETA 7753 Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific. 2nd Implementation Review Workshop, 22-26 April 2013. ADB HQ, Manila.
- ADB. 2018. 2018 Project Implementation Report (PIR).
- ADB. 2018. TA 7753 REG: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2): Workshop Report, Regional Project Close-out Workshop: Harvesting Constructive Lessons. 6-7 December 2018, Nadi Novotel, Fiji. Project Number: 43427.
- ADB. 24 September 2010. Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific. GEF Trust Fund.
- ADB. April 2015. Aide Memoire for the Pacific Regional Planning Meeting. RETA 7753: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). 26-29 April 2015, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
- ADB. May 2015. Mid-term Review Report. Project Number 43427. Regional Technical Assistance for Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle in the Pacific (Phase 2) (Cofinanced by the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund under the Regional Cooperation and Integration Financing Partnership Facility and by the Global Environment Facility).
- ADB. April 2016. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Public Sector Operations. Independent Evaluation Department
- ADB. 31 March 2018. DMF Indicators Report (update). Project Number 43427. Regional Technical Assistance for Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle in the Pacific (Phase 2) (Cofinanced by the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund under the Regional Cooperation and Integration Financing Partnership Facility and by the Global Environment Facility).
- ADB. July 2018. Strategy 2030: Achieving a Prosperous, Inclusive, Resilient, and Sustainable Asia and the Pacific.
- ADB. September 2018. Project Administration Instructions: Technical Assistance Completion Report. PAI 6.08.
- ADB. 26 December 2018. Final M&E Report: A summative view from the DMF perspective.
- ADB-GEF. 5 May 2013. Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) Guidance Note for GEF-Cofinanced Projects.
- Berdach, James T. 21 December 2018. TA-7753 REG: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2)—Terminal Evaluation. (Contract No. 145461-S23391): Progress Report.

Berdach, James T. 26 January 2019 (draft). Technical Assistance Completion Report (TCR) for TA-7753 REG:

Page 47

Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2).

- Conservation International. TA 7753: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). Subproject: Integrated Coastal Management in Ra Province, Fiji. Progress Report 3.
- Contract for consultant services between ADB and ANZDEC in association with TANORAMA Limited, PNG for TA 7753.Contract no. (COSO-41-749), dated 25 October 2014
- Coral Triangle Initiative. Regional Plan of Action Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF)
- FCG ANZDEC Ltd. March 2016. Technical Assistance Consultant's Report, Project Number: 43427 Regional— Policy and Advisory Technical Assistance (R-PATA). Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2) (Cofinanced by the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund under the Regional Cooperation and Integration Financing Partnership Facility and by the Global Environment Facility).
- GEF. 2011. GEF-5 Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Focal Area Guidelines April 2011.
- GEF. April 2017. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects.
- GEF. August 2009. The ROtl Handbook: Towards Enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects. Methodological Paper #2. Progress Toward Impact OPS4. GEF Evaluation Office.
- GEF. 24 September 2010. Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval (GEFSEC Project ID: 3591).
- International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). November 2013. Future Prospects and Adaptation Strategies for the Fisheries Sector under Climate Change in the Pacific Coral Triangle Countries. Washington, DC.
- IUCN. September 30, 2015. Technical Assistance Consultant's Report. Project Number: TA7753-REG. Law and learning component. Final Report: Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste, Fiji & Vanuatu: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). IUCN Oceania Regional Office (IUCN ORO).

Malaita Provincial Government. May 2015. Malaita Provincial Fisheries Ordinance.

- PNG 2013 Country Performance Assessment, June 2013.
- PNG Department of Environment & Conservation. PNF and Coral Triangle Initiative. 2012. Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral reefs, fisheries and food security National Coordination Committee Terms of Reference, Port Moresby.
- PNG. 2012. Updated Country Workplan.
- PNG. 2013. Draft Protected Area Policy for Papua New Guinea. Department of Environment and Conservation.
- PNG. Draft Protected Area Policy for Papua New Guinea, Department of Environment and Conservation, 5 May 2013
- PNG. Papua New Guinea Marine Program of Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security, National Plan of Action (2010-2013)
- Solomon Islands 2013 Country Performance Assessment.
- Solomon Islands. 2009. Solomon Islands Locally Managed Marine Areas Network (Strategic Plan 2010-2014). Supported by CTSP funding to the Coral Triangle Initiative.
- Solomon Islands. 2010. Protected Areas Act 2010 of the National Parliament of Solomon Islands
- Solomon Islands. 2012. National Climate Change Policy 2012-2017. Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology.
- TA-7753 Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). Terms of Reference for various specialists.

Timor Leste 2013 Country Performance Assessment

- UNIQUEST. 2009. Policy, Law and Institutional Capacity Report prepared for the Asian Development Bank on RETA 6471: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resource Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific-Phase, by Uniquest Pty. Ltd. In association with The University of Queensland's Centre for Marine Studies.
- UNIQUEST. 2009. Socioeconomic Report on RETA6471: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resource Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific – Phase 1, Uniquest PTY. LTS, in association with the University of Queensland's Centre for Marine Studies.
- UNIQUEST. 2009. Technical Assistance Report for Project 42073, RETA 6471: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific, financed by Global Environment Fund and Asian Development Bank, Cofinanced by Australian Institute Marine Science.
- UNIQUEST. 2010. Environment Report for TA 6471: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resource Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific – Phase 1
- UNIQUEST. 2010. Final Report prepared for Asian Development Bank, RETA 6471: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resource Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific-Phase 1, by Uniquest Pty, Ltd. In association with The University of Queensland's Centre for Marine Studies.
- UNIQUEST. 2010. Project Concept Paper 42073, Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Cofinanced by the Government of Finland and the Global Environment Facility).
- Vanuatu 2013 Country Performance Assessment.
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). April 2018. TA7753-REG: Strengthening coastal and marine resources management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase II). Lessons learned and best practice guidelines for integrated coastal zone management and monitoring. Manus province, Papua New Guinea. Strengthening local capacity of vulnerable island communities in Papua New Guinea: an ecosystem-based approach to resource management.

Annex C: Mission Schedule—Field Activities, Meetings, and Site Visits Conducted for the Terminal Evaluation

Dates	Country	Location	Activities
Saturday, October 27, 2018	USA	Washington, D.C.	Depart USA
Monday, October 29, 2018	FIJ	Suva	transit Los Angeles-Nadi-arrive Suva
Tuesday, October 30, 2018	FIJ	Suva	meeting Conservation International; meeting Ministry of Fisheries; meeting at ADB Pacific Subregional Office
Wednesday, October 31, 2018	FIJ	Rakiraki, Ra Province	travel to Rakiraki; meeting with Provincial personnel (Ra Province); focus group discussion with Namuaimada Fisher's Association
Thursday, November 1, 2018	FIJ	Suva	visit fish market middleman; return Suva
Friday, November 2, 2018	FIJ	Suva	meeting Department of Environment; meeting University of South Pacific Institute of Applied Science re: integrated coastal management planning work for project
Saturday, November 3, 2018	FIJ	Leleuvia	travel to Leleuvia Island
Sunday, November 4, 2018	FIJ	Nadi	meeting with ADB Project Officer; return to Suva; depart Suva to Nadi
Monday, November 5, 2018	SOL	Honiara	travel Nadi to Honiara
Tuesday, November 6, 2018	SOL	Honiara	focus group discussion with Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources; meeting with WorldFish
Wednesday, November 7, 2018	SOL	Auki, Malaita	depart Honiara to Auki; meeting with WorldFish; meeting with Malaita Provincial Government
Thursday, November 8, 2018	SOL	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	overland from Honiara to Suava Bay; site visit, inspect marine protected area, inspect FAD; focus group discussion with community members
Friday, November 9, 2018	SOL	Auki	return overland to Auki
Saturday, November 10, 2018	SOL	Honiara	return Auki to Honiara
Sunday, November 11, 2018	AUS	Brisbane	depart Solomons to Australia; overnight transit in Brisbane
Monday, November 12, 2018	TIM	Dili	travel Brisbane to Darwin to Dili
Tuesday, November 13, 2018	ТІМ	Dili	meeting with Conservation International; meeting with Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Wednesday, November 14, 2018	TIM	Dili	travel to Atauro Island; focus group discussion with representatives of several Atauro communities; rapid site inspection of MPAs
Thursday, November 15, 2018	TIM	Dili	underwater site inspection (scuba) on coral reef within marine protected area; return to Dili
Friday, November 16, 2018	TIM	Dili	meeting with WorldFish; meeting at ADB Country Office
Saturday, November 17, 2018	TIM	Dili	research
Sunday, November 18, 2018	TIM	Dili	research
Monday, November 19, 2018	INO	Denpasar	meeting with Conservation International; depart Dili for Denpasar (overnight transit)
Tuesday, November 20, 2018	INO	Denpasar	(off day)
Wednesday, November 21, 2018	USA	Washington, D.C.	depart Denpasar, transit Doha, arrive Washington

Annex D: List of Persons Met / Interviewed

Contained in this annex are the names of persons consulted during the course of the terminal evaluation; information was gathered from close to 100 people. Unless otherwise indicated in the "comments" column, communications with the people listed was through direct person-to-person meetings and discussions.

1. <u>Fiji</u>

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Apisai Bogiva	Marine Coordinator	Conservation International	
Bridget Kennedy	Pacific Regional Development Manager	Conservation International	
Eliki Senivasa		Conservation International	
Semise Meo	Marine Program Manager	Conservation International	
Sera Janine	Logistical Assistant	Conservation International	
Susana L.W. Tuisese	Fiji Program Director	Conservation International	
Eleni Tokaduadua	Principal Environment Officer	Department of Environment	
Isoa Korovulavula	Manager—Environment Unit	Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific	
Mere Lakeba	Principal Fisheries Officer	Ministry of Fisheries	
Rusi Waqata	Fisheries Assistant	Ministry of Fisheries	
Elimi Rokoduru	Provincial Administrator	Ra Province	
Kaveni Raseru	Assistant Reko	Ra Provincial Government	
Mosese Nakaroi		Ra Provincial Government	
Amdia Ravu	Assistant Reko	Ra Provincial Government/ITAB	

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
liutuatua Muasiyou		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Siduatua Muasivou		Association	
lotamo Ciriana		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Kamuwioli Naprabo		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Kasanita Tinanidrua		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Luisa Saloko		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Euisa Saloko		Association	
Luciana Lotu		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Eusiaria Eulu		Association	
Maraia Dikovevaruo		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Maraja Nagura		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Bakiavosia Leani		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Salata Niugumu		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Salata Niuguniu		Association	
Sera Baleisasa		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Sela Daleisasa		Association	
Taini Bayusali		Namuaimada Fishers'	
		Association	
Vuleri Nateruila		Namuaimada Fishers'	
Vulen Nalei ulla		Association	

Focus Group Discussion: Community Participants from Namuaimada Fishers' Association, Rakiraki, Ra Province

2. Papua New Guinea

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
David Lucock	Development Planning and Investment Specialist (consultant)		by e-mail
Ambroise Brenier	Director	Wildlife Conservation Society	by e-mail
Jonathan Booth	PNG Marine Conservation Advisor	Wildlife Conservation Society	by e-mail

3. <u>Solomon Islands</u>

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Jackson Gege	Permanent Secretary (P.S)	Malaita Provincial Government	
Peter Ramohia	Premier	Malaita Provincial Government	
Agnetha Vavekaramui	Chief Conservation Officer and CTI- CFF National Coordinator	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, Environment and Conservation Division	
Ivory Akao	Principal Fisheries Officer (PFO)	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources	
Priscilla Pitakaka	MISSIFF Project Officer	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources	
Assaneth Buarafi	Principal Fisheries Officer (PFO)	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Community Based Resource Management	
David Aram	ERSI Assistant Coordinator	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Community Based Resource Management	
Duta.B.Kauhiona	ERSI Coordinator	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Community Based Resource Management	

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Hana Matsubara	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) volunteer	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Community Based Resource Management	
Peter Kenilorea	Senior Fisheries Officer (SFO)	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Community Based Resource Management	
Delvene Boso	Country Director	WorldFish Center	
Meshach Sukulu	Research Analyst	WorldFish Center	

Focus Group Discussion: Community Participants from Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
David Ama	Managed area committee Chairman	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Bryan Samani	Managed area committee member	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Texly Fa'asi	Managed Area committee member; Pentecostal church Pastor	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Lodes Wasi	Church Catechist	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Jimly Fafaluta	Secretary, managed area committee	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Wesley Ben	Treasurer of managed area committee	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Margaret Sauna	Youth representative	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Annie Kelesi	FAD committee member	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Shadrach Sam	Managed area committee Vice Secretary	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Jullian Mafiliu	Women's representative	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Adam Kwairumi	Tribal Chief	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Annie No'oga	Managed area committee member	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Jullian Fa'asi		Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	
Cathy Ben	FAD committee member	Adadaitolo Village, Suava Bay, North Malaita	

4. <u>Timor-Leste</u>

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Anselmo Amaral	SMP Manager	Conservation International	
Dorine Onenah	Operations Manager	Conservation International	
Jose Maria de Jesus	MFA Atauro	Conservation International	
Simao de Araujo	MFO Atauro	Conservation International	
Trudiann Dale	Project Team Leader and Country Director	Conservation International	
Acacio Guterres	Director General	Directorate General of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	
Celestino da Cunha Barreto	National Director	National Directorate for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Alex Tilley	Scientist (Fisheries)	WorldFish Center	
David Jonathan Mills	Senior Scientist	WorldFish Center	
Mario Pereira	Senior Research Analyst, Natural Resources Management	WorldFish Center	

Focus Group Discussion: Participants from Various Communities, Atauro Island

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Arnelu de Araujo	Komunidade, Beloi	Atauro Community	
Asao D.C. Nores	Xefe Suku, Beloi	Atauro Community	
Belarmino C.S.	Chefe Ilimanci, Vila	Atauro Community	
Daniel Martins	Xefe Suku, Bikeli	Atauro Community	
Domingo N.S.	Komunidade, Vila	Atauro Community	
Domingo S. Pereira	member MPA, Vila	Atauro Community	
Francisco da Cose	Ser Local PDL, Administracao Posto	Atauro Community	
Jesuinho C. Freitas	Ser Local DC, Administracao Posto	Atauro Community	
Julio Aco Gomes	Xefe Suko, Administracao Suku	Atauro Community	
Leonito M. Nunes	Chefe Suco, Makadade	Atauro Community	
Tomas Altres	Chefe Teknik, Beloi	Atauro Community	
Tome Sarmento	CBFA	Atauro Community	

5. <u>Vanuatu</u>

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Johann Bell	Team Leader	Conservation International	by e-mail
Sue Taei	Executive Director, New Zealand and Pacific Islands Programme	Conservation International	by e-mail

6. Asian Development Bank and others

Name	Position/Title	Organization/Office	Comment
Haidy Ear-Dupuy	Senior Social Development Specialist (Core Labor Standards)	Environment and Safeguards Division (SDES), Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department (SDCC), ADB	teleconference
Lainie Thomas	Senior Social Development Specialist (Civil Society Participation)	NGO and Civil Society Center, Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department, ADB	teleconference
Hanna Uusimaa	Climate Change Specialist (Project Officer)	Pacific Department, Pacific Subregional Office, ADB	
Masayuki Tachiiri	Regional Director	Pacific Department, Pacific Subregional Office, ADB	
David Fay	Head, Project Administration Unit	Pacific Department, Pacific Subregional Office, ADB	
Ferdinand Reclamado	Project Analyst (Consultant), ADB	Project Analyst (Consultant), ADB	by e-mail
Thomas Gloerfelt-Tarp	Project Director (Consultant), ADB	Project Director (Consultant), ADB	
Haezel Barber	Project Planning and Coordination Specialist (Consultant), ADB	Project Planning and Coordination Specialist (Consultant), ADB	
Bruce Dunn	Director Environment and Safeguards Division (SDES)	Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department (SDCC), ADB	by e-mail
Paolo Spantigati	Country Director	Timor-Leste Resident Mission, ADB	
Ana Ilic	Chief Executive Officer	FCG ANZDEC	

Page 57

Annex E. GEF Rating Scales²⁹

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in terminal evaluation are: outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution.

Outcome Ratings

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the following criteria:

- a) Relevance
- b) Effectiveness
- c) Efficiency

Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A sixpoint rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:

• Highly satisfactory (HS): Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings.

• Satisfactory (S): Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings.

• Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.

• Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings.

• Unsatisfactory (U): Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.

• Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings.

• Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.

The calculation of the overall outcomes rating of projects will consider all the three criteria, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical. The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall outcome rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU = unsatisfactory range). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range, then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (HS to MS), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range.

The second constraint applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than

²⁹ From: GEF. April 2017. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects. Annex 2.

During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluator should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.

Sustainability Ratings

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

- Likely (L). There is little or no risks to sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks to sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU). There are significant risks to sustainability.
- Unlikely (U). There are severe risks to sustainability.
- Unable to Assess (UA). Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

Project M&E Ratings

Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:

- Design
- Implementation

Quality of M&E on these two dimensions will be assessed on a six-point scale:

• Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.

• Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations.

- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some shortcomings and quality of M&E design/ implementation more or less meets expectations.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected.

Terminal Evaluation: Draft Final Report	Page 59

• Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/ implementation.

• Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / implementation.

Implementation and Execution Rating

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

• Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations.

• Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations.

• Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations.

• Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected.

• Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected.

• Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation / execution.

• Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution.