

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00086015
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	TV Ridge to Reef
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-06-01 / 2022-12-31

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

R2R project took advantage of technical expertise available at the University of the South Pacific (USP), and Secretariat of the Pacific Community and used it to its advantage. Given the ongoing travel restrictions resulting from Covid 19, international consultants could not travel to Tuvalu to conduct biodiversity rapid assessments. Therefore an expert was hired from USP to provide a field guide, provide technical overnight remotely /guiding national experts and was responsible for compiling final report. Professor Randy Thaman also of USP was contracted to facilitate a status of biodiversity and ecosystem services in Tuvalu. The SPC was engaged to conduct an assessment of ground water in Nukufetau and Nanumea. Mr Antoine N'Yuert of the University of the South Pacific was recruited to conduct an algal bloom assessment in Funafuti lagoon

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TuvaluBioRAPReportFinal_9722_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TuvaluBioRAPReportFinal_9722_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TuvaluBioRAPReportFinal_9722_301.pdf</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 4:09:00 PM
2	r2r-biorap_9722_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/r2r-biorap_9722_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/r2r-biorap_9722_301.pdf</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 3:52:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings<sup>1</sup> as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

- UNDAF Focus Area 1: Environmental Management, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management and Regional UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management through:

- Total Marine Conservation area expansion for all islands of Tuvalu is 234.608km<sup>2</sup>; Total Terrestrial Conservation area expansion for all islands of Tuvalu is 4.845km<sup>2</sup>;

- 9 formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas with management plans (hotspots, PAs, bio-indicators, etc.) and 8 finalized, reviewed and endorsed ISPs have incorporated and integrated R2R principles into the ISP;

- Tuvalu UNDAF Outcome 1.1: National and local authorities and partners enhance resilience of vulnerable communities and natural ecosystems to threats, shocks, disasters, and climate change, Output 1.1: Strengthened capacity of national and Falekaupule to develop and mainstream integrated policies on natural resources, environment, climate change, disaster risk reduction and management into national, sectoral, planning and budgetary processes. The project has contributed to Tuvalu's UNDAF through:

- At the national level the completion and cabinet endorsement of an Integrated Environment and Natural Resources Policy.

- At the local level, more than 10% of budget allocated under the project for ISPs have been used for Kaupule conservation area management plans to integrate R2R principles. ISPs for all Islands have been finalized, endorsed by local communities are ready to be launched.

- UNDP Strategic Plan Indicator: Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation has been achieved through the government approval and cabinet endorsement of Tuvalu's Integrated Environment and Natural Resource Policy.

Relevant Project indicators :The integration of new ridge to reef (R2R) knowledge and information into all appropriate national and island wide policy and legislation, Number of formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas (shared with Outcome Indicator), Expansion area (in ha) over existing conservation areas

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

### Relevant

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

### Evidence:

(1) Inclusion of Children in environmental awareness :Refer to in Activity 2.1.2c.1 as per quarter 1 report of 2021 (children often miss out on project activities with adults benefiting as these are usually conducted during school hours):

- Tuvalu Young Hands - Freshmen course

The R2R in collaboration with the Department of Environment had organized a Freshmen course for the Tuvalu in Young Hands that kicked started in January 18th 2021. More than 30 students interested and engaged with this program. Initial program begins with introductory session to educate students from Nauti and SDA primary school on the importance of biodiversity and ecosystems services to nature and human livelihood. Site visit to R2R and agriculture nursery site was followed after classroom session to familiarize students with ecological services of biodiversity in particular with nurturing of plants

(2) Men and women of communities participated in training conducted through through the R2R project .For example, 25 men and women, benefited from training on R2R principles conducted

Refer to Activity 3.2.1c.1 of quarter 1 progress report, 2021:

- Trainers to conduct island level training on R2R principles using manuals for Funafuti Community R2R had organized a community training to Funafuti community that held at Funafuti Community hall (Tausoa Lima) on March 24th – 26th 2021. The training focusing on R2R principles using manuals (SLM, IWRM, ICM, LMMA/MPA) that applicable to Tuvalu cultural context. More than 25 participants attended this training including women and men. The training comprises of 3 days' lead by Individual expertise on different manual delivered and facilitated the training. The objectives of the training to educate community on diverse skills and knowledge on R2R principles to apply on household level in order to sustain livelihood and improved resilient. Refer to link for evidence: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZZDQDrDLF1FdWcKABRqr6JzDWG6QRMvg/view?usp=sharing>

(3) Project Board -had a wide representation of stakeholders from government departments (Rural Development, Fisheries, Agriculture, Finance), Non Governmental Organisations (Tuvalu National Council of Women) and community representatives . Refer to link for minutes of board meetings ([https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Fkss157FfoDRc8\\_Ib\\_IzykhIU DH-U6R?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Fkss157FfoDRc8_Ib_IzykhIU DH-U6R?usp=sharing))

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: *Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

#### Evidence:

Knowledge and lessons learnt resulted in the development and endorsement of an "Integrated Environment and Natural Resource Policy" , a first for Tuvalu . This policy will continue beyond the life of R2R project.

The R2R project took advantage of experiences and lessons learnt in conducting bio rapid assessments. It worked with with an expert based in Fiji who provided virtual training for a team of local consultants and experts. This resulted in the successful completion of a biorap surveys and compilation of a final report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TuvaluIntegratedenvironmentpolicy-final_ed2508201_9722_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TuvaluIntegratedenvironmentpolicy-final_ed2508201_9722_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TuvaluIntegratedenvironmentpolicy-final_ed2508201_9722_304.pdf</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 1:16:00 PM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

An Integrated Environment and Natural Resource Policy was developed through this project  
Refer to 2020 PIR - project target of 235sqkm was achieved and an additional area of 136sqkm expansion area. All 9 islands in Tuvalu have established Locally Managed Marine Areas

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Tuvalu2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550_9722_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Tuvalu2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550_9722_305.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Tuvalu2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550_9722_305.doc</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 1:22:00 PM

**Principled****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project’s measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**

Refer to updates in gender action plan and section on Gender equality and women’s empowerment as per terminal evaluation report

Refer to updates as per gender action plan

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1TuvaluGenderActionplan_9722_306 ( <a href="http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1TuvaluGenderActionplan_9722_306.doc">http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1TuvaluGenderActionplan_9722_306.doc</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 1:00:00 PM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?



- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Risks (including environmental and social) were tracked on a quarterly basis, with updates in quarterly reports and annual PIR reports

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Project had established good governance through a project board which proactively discussed issues and discussions solutions. However, there were not serious grievances brought to the boards attention or Department of Environment. Project Implementation Unit has adopted an inclusive and participatory approach by engaging community members, island councils, government departments and non governmental organisations throughout the life of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

**Evidence:**

Terminal Evaluation rated Monitoring and Evaluation as Satisfactory .Refer to Table 2 (Evaluation Ratings Table) of Terminal Evaluation Report

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_309.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_309.doc</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	10/7/2021 8:00:00 AM

10. Was the project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: *The project’s governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project’s governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project’s governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

The Project Board was proactive as meeting regularly and proactively discussing issues and solutions/ways forward. For example, during the 2021 PIR reporting period at least 3 board meetings were conducted. As per the 2021 PIR ( page 29) , the Project Board is referred to as exemplary.Their participation levels and pro-activeness in decision making was noted as commendable.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550TuvaluR2R_9722_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550TuvaluR2R_9722_310.doc)	floyd.robinson@undp.org	10/7/2021 8:25:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: *The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

Refer to PIRs of 2019 and 2020 where risks were documented including relevant responses. Risks were also updated annually in Atlas and through conversations with the Project Implementation Unit, these were regularly reviewed. During the last two quarters of the project, both UNDP and the remaining two project implementation unit officers held regular discussions to keep tabs of progress and ensure ensure proper closure of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

As per the Terminal Evaluation Report co-financing of USD 232,318.55 was materialized.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	GEF5414_UNDP4570_FY20Co-financingfor R2R_Tuv_9722_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEF5414_UNDP4570_FY20Co-financingforR2R_Tuv_9722_312.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEF5414_UNDP4570_FY20Co-financingforR2R_Tuv_9722_312.docx</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 2:04:00 PM
2	Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_312.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_312.doc</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	11/3/2021 12:22:00 AM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The project procurement plan was embedded into to Annual Work Plans which were approved by the project board. Bottlenecks were often discussed with UNDP throughout life of project when these were encountered and ways forward identified. Through an Letter of Agreement signed with UNDP, the project sometimes sought UNDP support with especially recruitment of consultants

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

Refer to 2020 PIR \_\_ project collaborated with Tuvalu Fisheries Department, Kaupule (Local Council) and communities on all 9 islands to establish and demarcate protected areas.

Refer to report attached - Project collaborated with Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) which successfully conducted a ground water assessment for Nanumea and Nukufetau atoll

Refer to page 38 of Terminal evaluation report. During implementation several adaptive measures were taken to ensure smooth implementation. One good example was the inclusion of joint missions to visit communities, instead of individual partners visiting communities. Joint missions were undertaken with all partners (i.e. Department of Environment, Fisheries, Agriculture etc.) to conduct raising awareness, collect samples and undertake the training workshops. These joint missions have been cost-effective and also effective in raising community awareness as all stakeholders were available to answer questions on the Tuvalu R2R strategies. During interviews conducted for the TE, several government partners mentioned that these types of joint missions allowed them to better coordinate and collaborate with their counterparts in other departments

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TheTuvaluRidgetoReefProjectWeb_9722_314.pdf">TheTuvaluRidgetoReefProjectWeb_9722_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TheTuvaluRidgetoReefProjectWeb_9722_314.pdf)</a>	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 2:29:00 PM

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

As per 2021 PIR, the UNDP-NCE Technical Adviser, UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and Project manager provided an overall rating of satisfactory.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550_9722_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5220-GEFID5550_9722_315.doc)	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 2:36:00 PM

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

Throughout the life of the R2R Project, the Project Implementation Unit regularly reviewed progress with UNDP focal Points. Some key achievements (recorded in 2021 PIR) is a testimony to this approach:

successfully supporting the establishment of 23 4.806 square kilometers of marine protected areas and 4.854 square kilometers of terrestrial protected areas. In addition, this project exceeded its targets by 136 square kilometers. In total, all 9 islands of Tuvalu were included in the protected area management development of 9 island community integrated



management and monitoring plans

GIS based information – maps of all LMMA/MP A produced and disseminated to all island councils. All GIS based information was moved to the Department to Environment. Subject to approval of the Department of Environment, it is accessible. Some organizations have begun to for planning purposes.

Development and promotion of a Sustainable Land Management tool kit. A composting and agroforestry promotions was conducted 3 islands. In total, 34 male and 101 females participants participated and have enhanced knowledge of improved land management.

National government endorsed an Integrated Environment and natural Resource Policy in first quarter 2021. In addition, a policy action guide was also compiled to guide implementation. A participatory approach was adopted during the formulation of this policy. This is a first integrated policy of its nature, a milestone achievement for the project and Tuvalu.

An e library system is established under the Tuvalu National Library Archives. Since its launch the project has continued to populate R2R project. Throughout the project, at least 33 male and 30 female participants have been trained in data information. This represents 47.6% percent, exceeding the end of project target of at least 30% female participants

Adaptive management - despite an initial slippage with the recruitment of project implementation unit by about 1 year (after the document was endorsed by UNDP and Government of Tuvalu), the project exceeded achievement of targets. This is reflecting commitment and dedication of the project implementation unit and Department of Environment.

signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in April 2021 through which partner have committed to sustaining and facilitating activities of the R2R upon completion of project in August. The MoU was signed by Department of Environment with Department of Agriculture, Department of Fishery, Department Public Works, Local Government, Education and Public Health. The MoU identifies respective tasks assigned to each agency. This is perhaps the first MoU of its nature and is encouraged for future UNDP -GEF supported projects in Tuvalu

Ground Water Investigations conducted on Nanumea and Nukufetau, by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in 2019. Results were reflected in a regional project involving Tuvalu, Palau and Marshall Islands. The Managing Coastal Aquifers in Selected Pacific SIDS Project was approved by the GEF in 2020 and funded by a grant of USD 5,261,356. The Project implemented by UNDP and executed through the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

As per conclusion 8 of the Terminal Evaluation there was focus on empowering Kaupules and community members through training and joint implementation of project activities which resulted in a greater degree of community ownership.

An increased awareness of communities and Kaupule in the importance of biodiversity and environment can be seen through inclusion of more environment and biodiversity projects in their ISPs. The project also built the capacity of Kaupule staff in managing and monitoring and reporting on their conservation areas.

Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA) were established by all 9 islands (Nanumea, Nui, Nukufetau, Funafuti, Vaitupu, Nukulaelae, Nanumaga, Niutao, Niulakita). Through the consultation process, island councils and community members were engaged in discussions and planning leading to establishment of LMMA's.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: *Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Refer to conclusion 3 and 5 of Terminal evaluation report: Conclusion 5. Project partnerships with key stakeholders were conducive to strong implementation of activities: Through interviews with the different government departments involved in the project, the ability to undertake cross-departmental activities helped to improve communication across departments and build a shared understanding of the work that needed to be done, how to avoid duplication of work, and how to develop cross-sectoral synergies. The joint missions to outer island communities were cost-effective and built partnerships among stakeholders.

Conclusion 3. Wide participation of stakeholders during project design laid ground work for strong participation during project implementation: During the formulation stage at the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting -there was wide participation from government agencies, NGOs and community representatives. During the implementation stage, these participants at the LPAC became part of the project board and directly or indirectly supported implementation of activities. UNDP and the government can take advantage of the project preparatory grant (PPG) stage to ensure that the groundwork for building partnerships, securing co-financing, and engaging stakeholders is laid out for implementation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: *Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

A Letter of Agreement was signed between Government and UNDP i.e. NIM with UNDP Support Services

- Development of script for the R2R Project video documentary through consultancy:

An International Consultant named Mr Larry recruited by the R2R to develop script documents for the R2R Documentary. The consultant developed two script document, first script for a 15 minutes' video documentary on Impact of R2R project on the people of Tuvalu. While second script is a 3 minutes social-media video for Tuvalu R2R, capturing overview of the 15 minutes' script video documentary. All script had finalized and submitted to R2R PIU.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cbLCQ9uA4YB7yNj9r0njjanmQVWgHJNV/view?usp=sharing>

- Compile documentary for R2R Project
- A Local Consultant Mr Tala Simeti recruited to compile a 15 minutes' video documentary on Impact of R2R project on the people of Tuvalu and also compiling a 3 minutes social-media video for Tuvalu R2R. All these video documentary had finalized and submitted to R2R PIU.

R2R Documentary <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Fgtowkdh1BayuVbZvgbZkQaLpf6ufca/view>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1G9BtFGgNB6TuT6AQapGDuS-BydGImzVQ/view?usp=sharing>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_319.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-Tuvalu-R2R-TerminalEvaluationUNDP-GEF-08Sept21_9722_319.doc</a> )	floyd.robinson@undp.org	9/23/2021 3:14:00 PM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

#### Evidence:

Refer to page 58 of Terminal evaluation report in April 2021, key government partners (DoE, DoA, DoF, WD-PWD, DLG, DoED, and PHD) signed an MOU committing to (i) facilitate the sharing of data and information; (ii) continue to promote environmental training to communities on both Funafuti and other islands; and (iii) encourage the trainings of trainer's or new resources persons.

Through the MOU the government partners also committed to collaborating on the following:

1. Retain the R2R Project Board in an ad hoc manner through regular meetings until formalized by the Government;
2. Empower the Falekaupule through the conduct of trainings for community members on data collection methods;
3. Continue the training of stakeholders in the use of GIS;
4. Maintain the mobile app or endeavor to find new ways to improve its functions;
5. Support the establishment of posts in the civil service for an IT officer within the DoE and a LMMA officer within the DoF;
6. Conduct biodiversity and monitoring survey;
7. Continue to conduct and support school awareness programs including the Tuvalu in Young Hands Program; and
8. Strengthen missions for environmental training to the outer islands on data recording, collection, management, access, accountability and reporting.

Roles and responsibilities for each of the government partners are also delineated in the MOU.

The project has also formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas with management plans to the outer islands. This aspect is essential to ensuring the more effective management to outer island levels. In addition, the strengthening of capacities along a number of dimensions through

project activities should render the management of the targeted ecosystems more sustainable over the long-term. Knowledge and technology transfer have also taken place at the Department of Environment in Funafuti and at each of the 9 islands on GIS capacity and facilities. GIS equipment (hardware and software) has been installed in all outer islands and in Funafuti. Knowledge has improved on GIS mapping of LMMAs and Conservation areas and GIS facilities have been established in the country to undertake GIS mapping for the R2R Project and also to service the Department of Environment in its GIS work.

An exit strategy was also compiled. Refer to attachment for evidence

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Exitstrategy_9722_320">Exitstrategy_9722_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Exitstrategy_9722_320.docx)</a>	floyd.robinson@undp.org	10/11/2021 1:18:00 PM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**