

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	10437
Project Name:	Financial tools for small scale fishers in Melanesia
Countr(ies):	Regional, Fiji, Papua New Guinea
Implementing Agency:	WWF-US

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW3

A. Description3

B. Key Dates3

C. Disbursements3

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES4

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings4

B. Stakeholder Engagement10

C. Gender Equality13

D. Knowledge Management14

III. CORE INDICATORS17

IV: CO FINANCING23

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS23

VI. ANNEX23

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Financial tools for small scale fishers in Melanesia

Country

Regional, Fiji, Papua New Guinea

GEF ID

10437

Implementing Agency

WWF-US

Executing Entity

Willis Towers Watson

Trust Fund

SCCF

Project Type

MSP

Objective

Objective: to improve the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to the adverse impacts of climate change, including major shock events, in Fiji and PNG

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

5/28/2021

Agency Approval

2/22/2022

Implementation Start

3/1/2022

First Disbursement

3/28/2022

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

8/29/2025

Actual MTR

Expected Completion

3/31/2025

Actual Completion

3/31/2025

Actual TE

7/17/2025

TE Submission

8/29/2025

Final Disbursement

8/5/2025

C. Disbursements

Project Financing

1,095,500.00

Cumulative Disbursement

1,005,046.00

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The Financial tools for small scale fishers in Melanesia project's overarching objective was "to improve the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to the adverse impacts of climate change, including major shock events, in Fiji and Papua New Guinea (PNG)." The project worked in three communities. In Fiji, the project focused on Tavua District on Fiji's main island of Viti Levu, and Nadogo District in Macuata Province, on Vanua

Levu's north coast. In PNG, the project focused on Madang Province, settling on partnering communities in Bogia, Sumkar and Madang Districts.

For these coastal communities, the project sought to address an absence of financial protections to assist recovery from increasingly frequent climate-related shocks. Specifically, the project sought to create an enabling environment to overcome gaps in the accessibility to insurance markets for small scale rural producers, low levels of financial and insurance literacy among such remote communities, and a lack of financial mechanisms to protect and restore ecosystem services in the face of climate and weather hazard impacts.

To achieve its objective, the project was organized into the following three components:

Component 1: Enabling environment for ex ante risk financing to improve resilience for coastal communities in Tavua District and Nadogo district (in Macuata Province) in Fiji, and three districts in Madang Province in PNG.

Component 2: Financial products and incentives for coastal communities.

Component 3: Knowledge Management and Monitoring & Evaluation.

Summary of Findings

Project Design

Seizing upon the GEF's call for innovative, private sector solutions under its Challenge Program for Adaptation

Innovation, the project design pursued an ambitious intent: to research, assess, and nurture an enabling community and policy environment necessary to "develop and deploy innovative ex ante risk financing products" within three years, in two countries.

The project design grew out of discussions between WWF and WTW to identify innovative approaches for achieving greater community and ecological resilience by building financial resilience to climate-related natural disasters in the Pacific. Being open to considering a wide range of potential financial products depending on the results of community-based assessments, the design evolved over the course of its development, eventually narrowing to a focus on developing a parametric, community-level insurance product for natural disasters in the target communities.

The project's Theory of Change contained assumptions and risks which were mostly found to be justified in implementation, with appropriate measures put in place in the design to manage these.

Relevance

The project's high-level objectives were very relevant to Fiji's government policy context where the national Insurance Regulations Act was being updated, and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Fiji

Development Bank were both exploring options for “derisking” for vulnerable communities. In PNG, government stakeholders affirmed the relevance of the project’s objectives but ultimately could not engage sufficiently due to political instability that arose in the country after the project commenced.

In relation to ensuring relevance to residents of partnered communities in the three locations, project designers’ efforts were constrained by the rise of COVID-19 travel restrictions. Thus, WWF’s GEF Agency and

WTW designers were required to rely heavily on existing research and contextual insights from WWF Pacific partners. Once baseline consultations and implementation began, project decision-makers demonstrated responsiveness to community input. Communities in Fiji were in a better position than their peers in PNG to grasp concepts of parametric community-scale insurance in relation to their own circumstances.

Developing a community-focused parametric insurance product to financially recover their livelihoods and the ecosystems on which their livelihoods depend following climate-related shocks, is found to be highly relevant to the mandates of WWF, WTW, the GEF, and its Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation.

Coherence

The project aligned well with WWF Pacific’s broader programming to support coastal communities’ management of the marine ecosystems on which they depend by reducing the need to overexploit resources in times of crisis, and by formulating sustainable incentives for good environmental stewardship.

In Fiji, the project’s objectives have a degree of coherence with parallel initiatives of the Ministry for Environment and Climate Change and the Fiji Development Bank, both of which were developing disaster financial risk mitigation strategies for vulnerable communities. In PNG, at community level, the project had a degree of coherence with other NGO initiatives focused on climate resilience and financial literacy, but neither national nor provincial government agencies were pursuing programs that this project could align with.

Country ownership

Country-level governance of the Project was predominantly through Project Steering Committees (PSCs). Each country’s PSC was comprised of representatives of stakeholder government ministries. In Fiji, the PSC model catalyzed moderate success in nurturing country buy-in, but not so in PNG, where political instability within the government and staff changes in WWF PNG made ongoing engagement difficult. Thus, while WWF

PNG continued to hold PSC meetings after the first year, attendance was low for the remainder of the project. The PSC operated effectively in Fiji, and by the end of the project, the PSC had secured a relatively willing, potential policy holder in the Ministry of ITaukei Affairs (MIA) but had not catalyzed natural champion among

government ministries to continue to drive momentum of project achievements to fulfilment.

Relevance and effectiveness of the project’s M&E design

By the time the project design reached the GEF’s Project Implementation Form (PIF) stage, the project’s Results Framework’s core indicators and targets had been set too high, relative to the size of target populations, the potential pace of roll-out, and context of geographic coverage. WWF proposed lower, more realistic indicator targets at CEO Endorsement stage. However, these were not approved by the GEF review process. Consequently, reporting against the results framework understates the progress of the project. In contrast to the core indicators, the indicators linked to outputs of individual components much better represented the incremental progress of the project and the M&E system’s reporting and consultation elements were an asset that enabled ongoing adaptive management of implementation.

Project Implementation

Assessment of the project’s performance

The project had successfully educated partnered communities in Fiji to a point of being ready to mobilize around insurance for climate-related shocks, and had finalized the research, documentation, and much of

the institutional stakeholder preparation to do so. Therefore, in relation to establishing the knowledge base and enabling environment to enhance financial risk protection for Pasifiki coastal communities, the project has accomplished much: consistent with the GEF Challenge Program's focus on innovation, climate adaptation, and private sector engagement.

In relation to accomplishing its ambitiously high population coverage targets at Objective level, project results are comparatively modest. Without the deployment of a community-wide insurance scheme, beneficiary coverage was limited to community members trained and equipped with insurance awareness and financial literacy, and national institutional stakeholders equipped with knowledge of the purpose and mechanisms of parametric insurance for climate-related hazards.

Against an overly ambitious target of benefitting 7,500 people, the lack of viable insurance product resulted in the project documented financial literacy education for 182 women and men – though the actual undocumented number is likely to be higher. The results framework listed influence of national policy as an indicator. However, with long lead times required for such outcomes, the project design sensibly set a target of zero.

Project activities were categorized into two main components: creating an enabling environment for ex ante risk financing and developing suitable financial products and incentives for coastal communities to adopt. A third component related to monitoring and communication. The project achieved robust progress under both key components. Results under each component are summarised as follows.

Component 1: Enabling environment for financial products to improve resilience for small-scale fisher communities in Tavua District and Nadogo District in Fiji and Madang Province in PNG. Implementation led with community baseline assessments in all three project locations. These informed subsequent planning. Financial literacy training and awareness sessions on climate change and insurance were conducted so that 182 representatives of the target communities gained the skills and mindset to be ready to engage with an insurance program. Content of training modules benefited from incremental improvements over time, as executing partners learned from early efforts and adapted. While project outreach generated awareness and interest in partnered communities, this component did not achieve its targeted number of beneficiaries. By the end of the project, against a target of 18 communities, an estimated 10 communities - all in Fiji - were considered sufficiently knowledgeable and interested to engage with a community-based parametric insurance product. In PNG, however, by the end of project, implementers had already determined that conditions were not appropriate in the partnered Madang communities.

Component 2: Financial products and incentives for small-scale fisher communities. Most technical aspects of the research and design of a potential insurance product were successfully accomplished during implementation, resulting in three financial instruments designed against a target of three. Product elements included hazard identification, community-level price points for premium payments and the basic pay-out structure to be applied. Many discussions were also held on premium financing and finding a suitable policy holder, with promising, but not concluded results. Within the project's limited timeframe, relevant institutional stakeholders expressed support for the launch of a relevant insurance product, the required external support for premium financing was not obtained by the project's close, and final agreement had not been reached on community-level premium financing or a pay-out disbursement mechanism.

Sustainability

The overall rating of sustainability of the project's intended outcomes is 'moderately likely'. The project improved community understanding of the connection between climate hazards and insurance. Potential for sustained community interest and engagement hinges on whether a parametric insurance product can be piloted or sustained after the project has ended – which has little likelihood in PNG and reasonable potential

in Fiji. Similarly, at institutional level, knowledge and interest were generated among relevant government ministries and national insurance providers, but ongoing support beyond the project lifecycle is fragile. WTW has completed technical reports and guidance documents that provide comprehensive instructions for deploying a community/meso-level parametric insurance product. The essential, immediate next step in Fiji would be to secure a financier willing to fund the policy premium. If this was accomplished, the remaining steps required to enable community coverage would be to negotiate with an insurance company to take-up and apply the product, finalize what institution would become policy holder on behalf of covered communities, and negotiate payout mechanisms for household and ecosystems recovery. Thus, future sustainability of achievements depends on WWF securing resources and partnerships to resolve these final steps. By the close of the project, all listed steps were close to fruition but not yet accomplished.

M&E implementation: adaptive management and capacity

While high-level indicators and targets in the M&E system were set too high to fairly represent the project's achievements, the M&E system's reporting around output indicators and consultation processes were an asset that enabled ongoing adaptive management of implementation. Critical moments for reflection in the project's lifecycle enabled timely insight-generation and decision-making. As examples of key moments for learning and revision, diverse informants cited participatory baseline climate vulnerability assessments, progress reporting, periodic reflection workshops and a mid-term review. Early learning reoriented implementation efforts towards research, learning, and scoping whether, where and how parametric insurance might work for remote Pacific communities.

Governance and management arrangements in implementation plus coordination, integration and operational management

The project benefited from a clear definition of responsibilities among WWF GEF Agency, WTW, and WWF Pacific. Communication effectiveness between entities encountered some constraints due to geographical distance and related time zone challenges, insufficient in-country presence of insurance expertise, and insufficient budget for in-country management and activities. Technical expertise from WTW and field experience from WWF Pacific were valuable, but WWF Pacific's gaps in insurance knowledge and heavy workloads strained execution for Fiji and PNG personnel.

Gender Equality and Mainstreaming

The project design incorporated multiple practical steps to ensure gender responsiveness. These steps related to community engagement and consultation, focusing on women's economic empowerment through financial inclusion initiatives, promoting inclusive beneficiary engagement, and training and capacity building content.

Gender-responsive adaptive management: the project succeeded in ensuring both women and men had equal opportunities to participate and benefit. In Fiji, implementers followed project guidance to equally recruit female and male Community Facilitators (CFs). In practice, it quickly became apparent that significantly more women embraced the role and project activities than men. Thus, project implementation adjusted to a degree of participant self-selection or opting-out over time, which resulted in more female CFs than male CFs and more women in communities showing interest in project lessons than men.

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement was diverse and well-targeted. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan, established in the design phase, sets out how and when the project would engage with diverse stakeholder groups. The evaluation found that project implementation carried out the stakeholder plan's guidance as intended. In Fiji, WWF and WTW personnel were active in consulting with private sector insurance providers, UNCDF, the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Insurance Company, Global Shield, and the Fiji Development Bank in their pursuit of

an appropriate product design, and potential policy providers. Community stakeholder engagement was consistent via WWF Pacific's cascaded training of CFs, and WWF Pacific facilitation of national government relations via the PSC in Fiji and PNG. In PNG, the project had some limited collaboration and information - sharing with NGOs World Vision and CEFI to exchange knowledge resources and learn from each other's experience in relation to their own financial literacy work in Madang.

Safeguards Review

An 'Environment and Social Safeguards Screening Tool for Landscapes and Seascapes' was completed in both countries during the design stages as part of the Safeguards Review. The Environment and Social Safeguards Screening determined that the project design presented no environmental or social impacts. Due to the project being categorized as low risk, the assessment did not need to complete an Environmental and Social Management Plan, which would have included an Indigenous People's Risk Plan. Reflecting on the project experience, some informants posited that the safeguards mechanism rating should have been set higher due to frequent staff engagement with community members. Consequently, the project risked privileged engagement with ITaukei (Fijian indigenous) communities over local-level non-indigenous Fijian fishers. Information about a grievance reporting and response mechanism (GRM) was distributed to target communities as planned. No community or institutional informants cited any times a community member needed to use it. WWF's international GRM information did not accord well with partnered community culture or preferred avenues for redress. Therefore, in consultation with communities, WWF Pacific staff adapted the process and information to suit what Pasifiki women and men were comfortable with. This culturally adapted version was formalized by WWF Pacific and was reflected in the posters provided to partnered communities.

Finance and co-finance review

Despite some shortcomings against its core indicator targets, the project has accomplished significant results relative to its budget of little over US\$ 1 million over three years, over two countries. The innovative research and nurturing of an enabling national and community-level environment for climate-resilience parametric insurance represents very high value for money against this budget.

A review of project progress against annual workplans and expenditure against annual budgets identified that both remained sufficiently on track throughout the project. These findings indicate project management kept progress and budget expenditure on track throughout the three-year implementation period. WWF GEF, WTW and WWF Pacific informants all reported very good coordination, and cross-agency support and collaboration, which helped implementation to be cost efficient. Several of the project's organizational structures were also found to be purposefully designed to reduce costs and increase cost efficiency – especially in relation to containing management costs to respect GEF Project Management Cost guidelines to within 10% of total project cost. Although these steps minimized costs, decisions required operational compromises. Subsidization by other projects was needed to cover shortfalls in in-country project management and activity execution costs.

The Project Close-out Report recorded that \$US 7,330,578 of co-financing had materialized by the end of the reporting period in March 2025. This is the same amount that had been committed before implementation began. The evaluation review was able to find documentary evidence for \$7.12 million of this co-finance, with the remainder likely to be undocumented in-kind contributions. The co-finance contribution was largely achieved via in-kind contributions of Staff salaries, Operational Costs and related Field Activities from the three project partners, plus a significant grant from the Government of Canada's Ocean Risk and Resilience Action Alliance.

Best practices and key challenges

Three best practices for replication and expansion in future projects were identified. These related to:

- Parametric insurance for climate vulnerable communities
- The Tripartite organizational collaboration, organizational structure and reporting lines between WWF GEF, WTW and WWF Pacific
- The Community Facilitator model for culturally adapted extension.

Six key challenges encountered by the project were identified, to inform future design. These related to:

- Conflicted objectives between research and development versus broad community development outcomes.
- Grassroots feedback missing from the reporting system
- Remote expertise constrained efficiency of alliance-building – especially in the Melanesian context
- Missing key stakeholders in the governance model
- Inadequate in-country execution budget
- Misalignment of indicator targets with pilot innovation aspirations

Recommendations

1. For projects with a principle focus on researching, developing, and piloting a significant innovation, objectives, indicators and targets related to community engagement should be limited to consultations for learning and not mainstreaming development outcomes.
2. To ensure management-level decision-making is informed by robust stakeholder data, project monitoring and reporting systems should incorporate processes that routinely capture beneficiary and community-engagement staff perspectives.
3. To optimize in-country implementation in a niche sector – such as insurance – design and budget for a national or international staff member specialized in that sector to spearhead progress.
4. For insurance-sector initiatives, key national insurance actors must be incorporated into the project's governance processes.
5. For multi-country and multi-executing agency projects, design an in-country management and activity execution budget that is greater than for single-country projects.
6. Projects with a heavy research and innovation focus should choose and justify conservative population and geographic coverage targets at concept and design stages.
7. When commencing projects in newly partnered communities, conduct a participatory review of WWF's GRM to test its suitability for women's and men's cultural preferences - especially to include input from marginal sub-groups of the society
8. Ensure that safeguards screening tools rate projects with regular community engagement as an elevated social risk to compel further assessment.

Evaluation criterion	Design Rating	Implementation Rating
Relevance	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
Coherence	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Effectiveness	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
Cost-Efficiency	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Sustainability	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely
M&E	Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory
WWF GEF Agency Implementation	N/A	Satisfactory
Executing Agency Execution	N/A	Satisfactory
Overall evaluation rating	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Overall, Stakeholder engagement was diverse and well-targeted, guided by its Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan was a seven-page document containing descriptions of the main types of Project stakeholders, regulations and requirements for engaging with stakeholders, and a summary of previous stakeholder engagement. These sections served as background information for the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, which consisted of a table outlining the various ways that the Project intended to engage with each category of stakeholders. This section evaluates the projects' performance against the Plan's stated engagement objective with each stakeholder category.

In summary, project implementation carried out the stakeholder plan's guidance. WWF and WTW personnel in Fiji were active in consulting with private sector insurance providers, UNCDF, PCRIC, and the Fiji Development Bank in their pursuit of an appropriate product design, and policy provider. Community stakeholder engagement was consistent, especially via WWF Pacific cascade training of CFs, and WWF Pacific facilitation of government relations via the PSC in Fiji. The project had some limited communication with NGO World Vision in relation to its financial literacy work in Madang.

A WWF Pacific informant explained that they consulted several times with Fiji-based private-sector insurance companies, Tower Insurance, and Sun Insurance. Though, ultimately, neither expressed interest in moving forward. The gap in inclusion of national insurance companies may have constrained progress by project managers and PSC not benefiting from crucial industry expertise in the national context.

They also consulted UNCDF on several occasions throughout the project lifetime. As a multilateral entity that was ahead of this project in its operationalization of a parametric insurance company, the WTW informant described UNCDF personnel as "good in that sense of sharing lessons and their products. What we are doing is quite different from what they are doing in their design. It was still useful to see how things were being rolled out."

In the final year, the project team of WTW and WWF Fiji met several times with Global Shield (an initiative for G7 countries to assist vulnerable country governments to establish "Greater financial protection and faster and more reliable disaster preparedness and response" and also the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Insurance Company (PCRIC), a regional entity that underwrites both sovereign and non-sovereign policies across the Pacific which support innovation in disaster risk finance. The engagement centred around gauging PCRIC's willingness to support a pilot insurance program should one be rolled out in the future.

The Fijian Development Bank was a significant local market actor who engaged with the Project through its attendance in PSC meetings. The FDB representative recalled them being consulted and asked to contribute their expertise during these meetings but that the process did not have as much active engagement as he would have liked, stating that "[WWF] was informing us and allowing us to make comments to shape how things work from our different expertise. Suggest alternatives. I don't think it was happening quite as we

would like it. Many of us members would quietly sit there and listen. But we had to contribute to what was presented, critique it and make suggestions.”

The representative suggested part of the problem was the long gaps between meetings: The meetings seemed too far apart because you lost momentum and memory of what was being dealt with. If they were closer together, there would be more momentum, and we would feel more involved than we would if met more often. That was the biggest challenge. You missed one meeting and it is six months until the next one. Then you forget what it is doing and then feel less motivated to attend the next.

Private sector involvement was also intended to occur through the PSC in Papua New Guinea. The PNG Fishing Industry Association (FIA) was listed as a PSC member in the Project Closeout Report. However, like most other stakeholders in PNG, it only had minimal involvement in Project activities and had a different perspective on its participation in the PSC.

The FIA contributed to the Project during the first (and possibly only) PSC meeting towards the beginning of the project. At that meeting, it reviewed and commented on the project Work Plan. Overall, the association was less engaged than it expected because it thought it was supposed to sign a memorandum of understanding with WWF which did not eventuate. A FIA representative reflected that, “While FIA’s engagement with WWF has been positive with good communication, a formal MoA should be established. This would help clearly define our roles and responsibilities and strengthen collaboration between FIA and WWF.” Local communities in Fiji and PNG – “will be invited to participate in surveys and consultations to identify climate hazards and discuss solutions. Second, they will be invited to workshops and trainings that promote financial literacy.”

Community engagement via surveys, consultations and training has been documented in previous sections. CFs have been the primary conduit. There is no doubt that all the target communities were engaged but both the extent of engagement and the number of community members involved was less than intended when the Project was designed.

Nurturing Community Facilitators as knowledge liaison agents between WWF and partnered communities is a model that WWF has established and proven in PNG and other countries such as Solomon Islands. Thus, it again proved to be appropriate and culturally sensitive in this project. Community members and leaders shared that the CF model promoted community decision-making, culturally relevant communications, women’s empowerment (as noted under Section 3.3 above), and enabled an optimal team to form by enabling the most motivated to continue, and low performers to self-select out.

PNG and Fijian governments – “will be heavily involved in the design of the financial products and roll-out plans. The project will conduct interviews with members of the government to discuss risk financing options, as well as discuss different mechanisms to aggregate premiums and distribute the product.” Various PNG and Fijian government ministries linked to climate change, environment, fisheries, and economic

development were engaged through both the PSC and individual consultations. However, like the private sector and communities, from their perspective their engagement was not as comprehensive as they expected.

Officers from the Commerce and Tourism Division of the Madang Provincial government spoke about an array of activities taking place in the province relating to financial literacy, microfinance and SME empowerment. However, none of these activities linked with the Project and a PNG staff member recalled that the provincial government had very little engagement in the Project, either through the PSC or elsewhere. They believed this was partly caused by a lack of clarity about the PSC's role.

From my experience, clearer roles and responsibilities would help. PSC members should have well-defined Terms of Reference to ensure accountability and clarity in their involvement. (WWF informant, Papua New Guinea) Changes within the Fijian government hindered engagement but regardless of those changes, MECC representatives would have preferred more contact with the project.

There was some level of engagement with WTW. But only when there was a need. It was rare. I did not meet them last year. I do not know if they were here. It would have been helpful to have more engagement with them. ... When this project started it was such a good sure thing. Then people changed and the project got stalled. Partners changed. At the PSC meeting, some people came for the first year. Then in the second year, there are new faces. So, we have all these ideas about increasing revenues. But next year, there might be different priorities. Next election, the whole government might change. (Climate Finance Office, Ministry of Environment)

The Project sought to engage with the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs as the policy holder for the insurance program, although there was some discussion and concern about the potential for this to exclude non-indigenous Fijians from any future program. While several WWF and other ministry stakeholder continue to hold some optimism that the MIA will come on board as a policyholder, by the end of the project, the connection had not developed as Fijian Project staff had hoped. As one stated, I went to his office unannounced (to follow-up a query). The secretary said, 'why are you here? WWF deals with fisheries, not ITaukei [Affairs]. And that is why we did not respond.' It was a slap in the face for us.

NGOs and GEF multilaterals – “will be interviewed and consulted on the possibility of incorporating environmental management into the application of the insurance pay-outs.

As cited above, the Project was in frequent contact with multilaterals, UNCDF, PCRIC, and Global Shield. UNCDF

was consulted in both countries, as it was already operating a land-based insurance program that community members could sign up for individually. In PNG, the NGO World Vision was also consulted and insights traded,

given their significant support for VSLAs and climate resilience in Madang, which the Project viewed as a prerequisite to entry in an insurance program. The project also collaborated with economic empowerment NGO, CEFI to discuss incorporating topics on insurance into CEFI's training modules and share the project's research outcomes with them. However, there is no evidence of discussions with NGOs specifically about mobilizing other NGOs' support for community insurance or incorporating environmental management into insurance pay-outs.

77 See Global Shield website at <https://www.globalshield.org/>

C. Gender Equality

WWF's Gender Policy (2011) commits the organisation "to ensure that WWF's conservation policies, programmes and activities benefit women and men equally and contribute to gender equity, as part of WWF's broader commitment to strengthen the social dimensions of its projects, programmes and policy work... [and to] integrate a gender perspective in our programmatic and operational structures and procedures." As evidenced above, the evaluation finds that the project has complied with WWF's gender policy such as by incorporating consultation approaches that ensured women's perspectives were sought, women were provided and actively took-up opportunities to participate in, and shaped implementation of the project.

GEF's Policy on Gender Equality (2017) contains five guiding principles and three Policy Requirement areas.

These are:

Guiding Principles:

1. Efforts to Mainstream Gender and promote Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women are pursued in accordance with the decisions on gender under the MEAs that the GEF serves, and in recognition of related international and national commitments to gender equality and human rights.
2. GEF-Financed Activities address and do not exacerbate existing gender-based inequalities.
3. Stakeholder Engagement and analysis are conducted in an inclusive and gender responsive manner, so that the rights of women and men and the different knowledge, needs, roles and interests of women and men are recognized and addressed.
4. GEF-Financed Activities are conducted, designed and implemented in an inclusive manner so that women's participation and voice are, regardless of their background, age, race, ethnicity or religion, reflected in decision-making, and that consultations with women's organizations, including Indigenous women and local women's groups, are supported at all scales.
5. A Gender-Responsive Approach is applied throughout the identification, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of GEF-Financed Activities.
6. Opportunities to address Gender Gaps and support the Empowerment of Women are seized in order to help achieve global environmental benefits.

Policy Requirements:

1. Project and program cycle (In summary, agencies must provide information on gender differences and gaps, and design and oversee measures to address them, including via data collection.)
2. Monitoring, learning and capacity development (this section's details related only to the GEF secretariat)
3. Agency policies, procedures and capabilities. (In summary, agencies demonstrate they have gender policy and implementation guidance in place to guide project design and implementation to ensure gender equality is considered and addressed.

As evidenced in the preceding section, the evaluation finds that WWF and the project itself are compliant with GEF gender equality requirements.

D. Knowledge Management

Project implementers apparently delivered all required monitoring, evaluation, and financial reporting. Project staff report effective collaboration between its three key organizations: WWF GEF, WTW and WWF Pacific.

A small number of indicators were adjusted based on experience implementing the project during the first two years.

Executing agency WTW achieved most of the planned communication tools for engaging communities and institutional stakeholders. Knowledge products by WTW were informative and have the potential to provide authoritative guidance for future efforts by WWF, WTW, or other agencies engaged in parametric insurance in the Pacific, to develop insurance programs in the target countries.

Routine semi-annual reporting as well as periodic and ad hoc partner meetings were found to be important and practical opportunities for the three agencies to identify adaptive management opportunities to keep implementation progressing well. However, the project's evaluation function was under-resourced.

Indicator 2: Percentage of communications and knowledge management plan implemented

Target: 100%

Achieved: Less than 100% but no clear percentage (see below)

The Knowledge Management and Communication section of the Project Document (Appendix 6) described the intended knowledge management and communication products. The completed products are compared against the intended products in Table 8.

Overall, the Project's knowledge management approach followed the incremental approach of knowledge generation. That is to say, consultations and research were undertaken, and resultant knowledge products were used to inform directions for subsequent research steps. For example, early in the project, climate risk and vulnerability assessments were undertaken in each community. WTW used the resultant baseline climate vulnerability reports to guide which weather and climate hazards were of most significance to partnered communities, which informed their subsequent research into insurance product feasibility.

From Year 2 onwards, internal knowledge products were complemented with the generation of external stakeholder communication products. These were especially relevant to institutional stakeholders to better understand potential benefits and mechanisms of a climate-resilience-focused parametric insurance scheme for targeted countries and partnered communities.

As is predictable under such an incremental knowledge generation approach, the most significant communications products generated by the Project were the final Technical Reports and Operationalization Strategy that WTW handed over to WWF and PSC stakeholders at the conclusion of the project. These provide

for potential insurance companies, policy holders, premium financiers, and other stakeholders the assessment of viable climatic hazards for coverage, the actuarial calculations for premiums, and a pathway to deployment of such a product.

As noted throughout the report, with the project ending just as these key knowledge documents were produced, the project has no further resources to ensure the technical reports and operationalization strategy make their way into the hands of institutions best positioned to make use of them. Thus, the benefit of these

products is heavily reliant on WWF and WTW continuing to promote and share them with non-project means. A minor gap in the knowledge management approach was raised by CFs in PNG. These CFs cited that the communication media they were provided to train community members were not sufficiently diverse of engaging to sustain the interest of community members.

Table 8 - Knowledge and communication products

Intended Products	Completed Products
Climate risk and vulnerability assessments per community	Completed for all communities
Report on survey results per community	Embedded in y1 progress report
Training manual for community facilitators and community members to engage with project- developed financial products.	
Communications products to Fiji and Papua New Guinea governments	WTW developed a policyholder guidance document outlining the role and responsibilities of the policyholder. This was shared with WWF Pacific.
Insurance roll-out plan for local insurers	PCR refers to roll-out strategy
Insurance market and analytics packet	According to the Project Closeout Report, the same Operationalization Report also includes a “market-ready documents such as a term sheet or marketing deck.”
Long-term ex ante financing strategy	An ex-ante financing strategy was not provided
Financial products and program design	WTW produced 2-page document titled ‘Fiji Fishing Community Tropical Cyclone, Parametric Insurance Programme Overview, and Technical Product Report per country
Formal, publicly available communications products	According to the PIR, project published survey results for both countries, the GRM and educational project brochure. All these documents were publicly available. According to the Year 2 PIR, several other communications documents were available on the Project website, but no titles were provided in the PIR
A public-facing website, hosted by WTW	Such a website operated during Project implementation
Climate risk and vulnerability assessments	Desktop Climate Risk Reviews were included as appendices in the Year 1 Project Progress Report.
Training manuals on financial products	The Year 1 report states that a training manual was drafted.
Communications products to Fiji and Papua New Guinea governments	WTW developed a policyholder guidance document outlining the role and responsibilities of the policyholder. This was shared with WWF Pacific.
The PMU will coordinate and share information as relevant to support up-scaling of project-developed financial products	Project staff communicated with the managers of other insurance products, including UNCDF.

Monitoring and evaluation reports 6-monthly Project Progress Reports

Partial. Two of three six-monthly progress reports were provided. April to October 2023 was missing.

Annual Results Framework Achieved. Three annual reports filed, plus Project Close-out Report.

Results of Annual Adaptive
Management meetings recorded in
Years 1 and 2

Indeterminate. No minutes of meetings provided.

Reflection meeting at project close

Achieved. Informants described a final presentation meeting by WTW and WWF Pacific in Fiji.

Terminal Evaluation This report.

Knowledge and Communication products

Year 1

Climate risk and vulnerability assessments per community

Completed for all communities.

Report on survey results per community

Reports on survey results were embedded in the Year 1 progress report.

65 Extracted from Appendix 6 of the Project Document.

Training manual for community facilitators and community members to engage with project-developed financial products.

No training manual was provided but the Year 1 Project Progress Report (PPR) stated that WTW had created a financial literacy training course which had already been used to teach community members. The Year 1 report also describes Train the Trainer courses to Community Facilitators to help them explain Index Insurance to community members.

Year 2

Insurance roll-out plan for local insurers

The Project Closeout Report refers to a roll-out strategy within an Operationalization Report.

Insurance market and analytics packet

According to the Project Closeout Report, the same Operationalization Report also includes a “market-ready documents such as a term sheet or marketing deck.”

Long-term ex ante financing strategy

An ex-ante financing strategy was not provided.

Year 3

Financial products and program design

Willis Towers Watson produced:

- Two-page document titled ‘Fiji Fishing Community Tropical Cyclone
- Parametric Insurance Programme Overview.
- Technical Product Report per country

Communication product development and sharing

Formal, publicly available communications products

According to the Year 1 Project Implementation Report (PIR), the Project published the survey results for both countries, the Grievance Redress Mechanism and an educational project brochure. All these documents were publicly available. According to the Year 2 PIR, several other communications documents were available on the Project website, but no titles were provided in the PIR.

A public-facing website, hosted by WTW

Such a website operated during Project implementation.

Climate risk and vulnerability assessments

Desktop Climate Risk Reviews were included as appendices in the Year 1 Project Progress Report.

Training manuals on financial products

The Year 1 report states that a training manual was drafted.

Communications products to Fiji and Papua New Guinea governments

WTW developed a policyholder guidance document outlining the role and responsibilities of the policyholder. This was shared with WWF Pacific.

The PMU will coordinate and share information as relevant to support up-scaling of project-developed financial products

Project staff communicated with the managers of other insurance products, including UNCDF.

III. Core Indicators

SCCF INDICATOR

Please provide the culminative total achieved from the inception,if available in the implementation document.

Core Indicator				
CORE INDICATOR 1				
Total number of direct beneficiaries	Total	Male	Female	% for Women
	0	0	0	0.00%
CORE INDICATOR 2				
Area of land managed for climate resilience(ha)	0.00			
CORE INDICATOR 3				
Total No. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	0			
CORE INDICATOR 4				
Total number of people trained	182	83	99	54.40%

SUB INDICATOR

OBJECTIVE 1			
Reduce the Vulnerability and Increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaption			
OUTCOME 1.1			
Technologies and Innovative solution piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and / or enhance resilience			
OUTPUT 1.1.1			
Physical and natural assets made more resilient to climate variability and change			
Total number of direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical assets	Total	Male	Female
	0	0.00	0.00
Ha of agriculture land	Ha of urban landscape	Ha of rural landscape	No of residential houses
			0.00
No of public buildings	No of irrigation or water structures	No of fishery or aquaculture ponds	No. of ports or landing sites
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Km of road	Km of riverbank	Km of coast	Km of storm water drainage
			0.00

Others (Specify below) 0	Other(unit)	Comments
--------------------------------	-------------	----------

OUTPUT 1.1.2

Livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable populations diversified and strengthened

Total Number of direct beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	Total 0	Male 0	Female 0
Livelihoods and sources of incomes strengthened/introduced			
Agriculture false	Agro-processing false	Pastoralism/dairy false	Enhanced access to markets false
Fisheries/aquaculture false	Tourism/ecotourism false	Cottage industry false	Reduced vulnerability of supply chain false
Beekeeping false	Enhanced opportunity for employment false		
Others (Specify below) false	Comment		

OUTPUT 1.1.3

New/improved climate information systems deployed to reduce vulnerability to climatic hazards/variability

Total number of direct beneficiaries from the new/improved climatic information systems	Total 0	Male 0	Female 0
Climate hazards addressed			
Flood false	Storm false	Heatwave false	Drought false
Others (Specify below) false	Comment		
Climate information system developed/strengthened			
Downscaled Climate model false	Weather/Hydromet station false	Early warning system false	

Others (Specify below) false		Comment		
Climate related information collected				
Temperature false	Rainfall false	Crop pest or disease false	Human disease vectors false	
Others (Specify below) false		Comment		
Mode of climate information dissemination				
Mobile phone apps false	Community radio false	Extension services false	Television false	
Leaflets false	Others (Specify below) false	Comment		
OUTPUT 1.1.4 Vulnerable natural ecosystems strengthened in response to climate change impacts				
Types of natural ecosystem				
Desert false	Coastal false	Mountainous false	Grassland false	
Forest false	Inland water false			
Others (Specify below) false	Comment			
OUTCOME 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience				
OUTPUT 1.2.1 Incubators and accelerators introduced				
Total no.of entrepreneurs supported	Total 0	Male 0	Female 0	
No. of incubators and accelerators supported	0	Comment		

No. of adaptation technologies supported	0	Comment	
OUTPUT 1.2.2			
Financial instruments or models to enhance climate resiliency developed			
PPP models false	Cooperatives false	Microfinance false	Risk insurance true
Equity false	Loan false		
Others (Specify below) false	Comment		
OBJECTIVE 2			
Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact			
OUTCOME 2.1			
Strengthened cross-sectoral mechanisms to mainstream climate adaptation and resilience			
OUTPUT 2.1.1			
Cross-sectoral policies and plans incorporate adaptation			
Will mainstream climate resilience 0	Of Which no of regional policies/plans 0	Of Which no of national policies/plans 0	Of Which no of regional sub-national policies/plans 0
Sectors			
Agriculture false	Fishery false	Industry false	Urban false
Rural false	Health false	Water false	
Others (Specify below) false	Comments		
OUTPUT 2.1.2			
Cross-sectoral institutional partnerships established or expanded			
No of institutional partnerships established or strengthened 0	Comment		
OUTPUT 2.1.3			
Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation			

No. of systems and frameworks 0	Comment		
OUTPUT 2.1.4 vulnerability assessments conducted			
No. of assessments conducted 3	Comment		
OUTCOME 2.3 Institutional and human capacities strengthened to identify and implement adaptation measures			
OUTPUT : 2.3.1 Number of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses			
Total no. of people trained	Total 182	Male 83	Female 99
Of which total no. of people at line ministries	0	0	0
Of which total no. of community /association members	182	83	99
Of which total no. of extension service officers	0	0	0
Of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff	0	0	0
Of which total no. of small private business owners	0	0	0
Of which total no. of schoolchildren, university students or teachers	0	0	0
Other (specify)	Comments		
OUTPUT : 2.3.2 Number of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses			
no. of people raised awareness	0	Male 0	Female 0
Please describe how their awareness was raised			

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
GEF Agency	WWF-US	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	126,605.00		80,609.00
Civil Society Organization	WWF Pacific	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	150,000.00		
Private Sector	Willis Towers Watson	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,816,320.00		2,967,991.00
Civil Society Organization	ORRAA	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,128,589.00		2,003,000.00
Civil Society Organization	ORRAA	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,109,064.00		2,070,945.00
Total Co-financing				7,330,578.00	0.00	7,041,936.00

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Low		Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category M and E Document	Title Management Response to Terminal Evaluation Melanesia Fishers
Document Category M and E Document	Title WWF GEF Melanesia Fishers Terminal Evaluation Report